

Copyright

by

Karen Kulhanek-Rochin

May 2013

ANALYSIS OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR PERCEPTIONS OF THE
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT APPRAISAL SYSTEM TO IMPROVE
LEADERSHIP CAPACITY

A Doctoral Thesis Presented to the
Faculty of the College of Education
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education
in Professional Leadership

by

Karen Kulhanek-Rochin

May 2013

ANALYSIS OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR PERCEPTIONS OF THE
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT APPRAISAL SYSTEM TO IMPROVE
LEADERSHIP CAPACITY

A Doctoral Thesis for the Degree
Doctor of Education
by
Karen Kulhanek-Rochin

Approved by Doctoral Thesis Committee:

Dr. Steven Busch, Chairperson

Dr. Angus MacNeil, Committee Member

Dr. Rayyan Amine, Committee Member

Dr. Robert McGowen, Committee Member

Dr. Robert McPherson, Dean
College of Education

May, 2013

Dedication

No hay nadie como mi querido Gerardo Antonio, vales por tres.

Acknowledgements

The completion of a doctoral degree is not possible without the support and encouragement of many people. First and foremost, I would like to express my gratitude to my gracious, supportive husband, Gerardo Antonio Rochín Vega, who provided a quiet, peaceful refuge and kept all of my worries at bay. This goal could not have been met with all of his behind-the-scenes support. You are as resourceful as MacGyver, as patient as Job, and as chivalrous as Edward Cullen. Thank you for your unwavering love and kindness. I know that whatever the challenge, I will never face it alone.

Next, I would like to thank my role models, my parents, Madeline and Jim, AKA “Mighty Mouse” and “Dr. Oz.” Knowing that my mom graduated Summa Cum Laude while working and managing two children is an inspiration, especially during challenging days. Hearing her say, “Have a cup of hot tea!” (her cure for all ailments and challenges) if not a full proof solution, can be comic relief, a moment to slow down, and a comfort. Both are role models of quiet integrity, service to others, commitment, and tenacity. Happy 45th Anniversary (6-29-13)! You are a testament to love.

One simply could not complete such an audacious goal without the support and flexibility of coworkers and friends. Mil gracias to my chief, Cissy Saccomanno and A-team members, “brother” Larry Domino and Ursula Johnson, for their above and beyond support of this goal, tolerating the chess game of evening duty scheduling and lending an ear during the process. Thank you, as well, to all the team members on campus due to their excellent organization, support, and work ethic, I had peace of mind that all would run smoothly. Special thanks to Sharon Cook for her expertise on the finer points of

Microsoft Word© and Excel© and her amazingly efficient multitasking ability. The entire staff was supportive and encouraging of my efforts to be a life-long learner.

Thank you to Kay Dawdy, who has been a voice of reason, friend, and great mentor. I need a bracelet that says, “WWKDD?” You were a most legendary and classy school leader.

Thank you to the “Bilingual Babes of Cy-Fair ISD” for your consistent affirmation and encouragement, especially all of my “M” friends, Melody, Miriam and Moira. You have each kept my morale high during this challenging process.

Thanks to friend and fellow cohort member, as well as Spring Branch ISD Principal of the Year, Valerie Hernandez, for her support during this process and a challenging December 2011. Upon entering this cohort as the only person from my district, I prayed for at least one great connection and the prayer was answered in spades. Such an intense process turns out to be quite a bonding experience. I have learned a lot from you and am blessed to share this experience with you. I admire your spirit of learning and look forward to watching all your future contributions to the field.

I feel fortunate to have gained many new friends from this cohort and feel sincere gratitude for each of your contributions and acts of kindness.

Thanks to all of my Buckeye State family and friends who made a point to check in and cheer from 1,200 miles away. O-H-I-O!

I am also grateful for my exceptional doctoral committee, led by chairperson, Dr. Steven Busch and team, Dr. Rayyan Amine, Dr. Robert McGowen, Dr. MacNeil. Thank you for your time, advice, and dedication throughout this process.

Finally, thanks to my editor, Dr. David Villareal, for polishing this thesis.

ANALYSIS OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR PERCEPTIONS OF THE
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT APPRAISAL SYSTEM TO IMPROVE
LEADERSHIP CAPACITY

An Abstract
of a Doctoral Thesis Presented to the
Faculty of the College of Education
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education
in Professional Leadership

by

Karen Kulhanek-Rochin

May 2013

Kulhanek-Rochin, Karen. "Analysis of School Administrator Perceptions of the Professional Development Appraisal System to Improve Leadership Capacity." Unpublished Doctor of Education Doctoral Thesis, University of Houston, May, 2013.

Abstract

Having an effective principal leading every school is critical to ensuring schools' effectiveness (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2003). It is well documented that there is a misalignment between assistant principal training and their future role as principal (Austin & Brown, 1970; Bloom & Krovetz; 2001, Bartlett, 2011; Celikten, 2001; Hogue, 1999; Koru, 1993). Results from this study will help prepare administrators for these tasks and encourage principals to involve their assistants in all aspects of leading the school. The purpose of this paper is to compare and contrast assistant principals' and principals' perceptions about the purpose and practice of the Professional Development and Appraisal System (PDAS) process. The focus of this study is to determine differences in assistant principals' and principals' perceptions of PDAS as an effective instrument and the implications for enhancing leadership training of assistant principals for their future role as principals.

The findings from this study indicate that the pre-service training, induction, and on-the-job training for assistant principals are inadequate for their future role as campus instructional leaders. The need for improved teacher appraiser training and recalibration is also noted. Additionally, the research reveals that the efficacy of the PDAS tool is largely dependent on the practices of the appraiser. Recommendations include: ongoing mentors to guide, prepare and empower assistant principals; in-box activities for assistant principals to develop leadership skills; training for principals in the area of leadership

development to allow for a less constricted view of campus leadership for assistants; job-embedded, planned opportunities to experience full leadership; training for principals on the best mentoring and grooming practices to empower assistant principals; intentional, strategic human resources planning to build assistant principals' leadership capacity; job-embedded development on how to shape campus culture, conduct transformational leadership, facilitate improvement, and be a steward of ongoing learning; extended internship experiences for administrators-in-training; more specific teacher appraiser recertification, appraiser calibration, teacher conferencing collaboration, and appraiser refresher requirements for quality implementation of the process; additional training on the purpose of and proper implementation of the PDAS system; and the use of a variety of teacher effectiveness measures.

Table of Contents

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Brief Review	2
Statement of the Problem.....	3
Significance of the Study	6
Research Questions	7
Organization of the Study	7
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	9
History of Teacher Evaluation	9
A Shift in Focus for Teacher Appraisals.....	11
No Child Left Behind (NCLB)	13
Race to the Top	14
Purpose of Teacher Appraisals and Supervision	15
Professional Learning Versus Evaluation	16
Effective Adult Learning Practices	20
Overview of the Current Texas PDAS and State Mandates	22
Texas Administrative Code Chapter 150 Subchapter AA:	
Teacher appraisal	22
Texas Administrative Performance TAC 150.1002:	
Assessment of teacher performance.....	23
Texas Administrative Code 150.1003: Appraisals,	
data sources, and conferences	24
Appraisal qualifications and training	28
Criticisms of Current Appraisal Traditional System	35
Effective Practices for Improving Instruction.....	45
Alternate Methods of Teacher Appraisal.....	49
Professional Development and Planning	55
Building Leadership Capacity.....	58
The Value of Perceptions.....	61
The History and Role of the Assistant Principal.....	62
Preparing Assistant Principals for the Principalship.....	72
The Role of the Principal	80
III. METHODOLOGY	90
Introduction.....	90
Description of the Research Design.....	92
Participants.....	94
Procedures	100
Variables	102
Instrument	102
Research Questions	103

Table of Contents (continued)

Data Analysis	103
Limitations of the Study.....	104
IV. RESULTS	106
Research Question One.....	106
Research Question Two	113
Community type demographic disaggregation of principals’ perceptions	117
State accountability rating of campus demographic disaggregation of principals’ responses.....	118
Research Question Three	118
Research Question Four	121
Summary	124
V. CONCLUSIONS and RECOMMENDATIONS	125
Research Question One.....	126
Research Question Two	132
Research Question Three	134
Research Question Four	135
Summary	136
Recommendations	138
Implications for Further Research	142
REFERENCES	143
APPENDIX A: UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN CONFIDENTIAL RESEARCH	167
APPENDIX B: UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON LETTER OF DATA DE-IDENTIFICATION	170
APPENDIX C: ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL JOB DESCRIPTION.....	172
APPENDIX D: INTERMEDIATE ASSOCIATE PRINCIPAL JOB DESCRIPTION	174
APPENDIX E: INTERMEDIATE PRINCIPAL JOB DESCRIPTION.....	176
APPENDIX F: UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON SURVEY INSTRUMENT	179

List of Tables

Table	Page
1-1 Advantages and Disadvantages of Observation-Based Appraisal Practices	34
3-1 Frequencies and Percentages of Assistant Principals and Principals by Gender	94
3-2 Frequencies and Percentages of Assistant Principals and Principals by Ethnicity	95
3-3 Frequencies and Percentages of Assistant Principals and Principals by Age Range	96
3-4 Highest Degree Earned by Assistant Principals and Principals	96
3-5 Years of Service in Current Position by Assistant Principals	97
3-6 Years of Service in Current Position by Principals	98
3-7 School Characteristics by School Location	98
3-8 School Characteristics by Texas Accountability Rating	99
3-9 School Characteristics by Grade Level	99
4-1 Principals' Perceptions of the Purpose of Teacher Supervision	107
4-2 Assistant Principals' Perceptions of the Purpose of Teacher Supervision	108
4-3 Principals' and Assistant Principals' Perceptions of the Effectiveness of PDAS in Achieving its Intended Outcome	114
4-4 Principals' Versus Assistant Principals' Perceptions of Who is Best to Conduct Teacher Supervision	118
4-5 Principals' Versus Assistant Principals' Documentation Practices of Supervision Report	122

Chapter 1

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to analyze principals' and assistant principals' perceptions regarding the purpose and practice of using the PDAS. This study compared and contrasted assistant principals' perceptions with principals' perceptions of PDAS in order to identify similarities and differences. The goal was to improve the effectiveness of teacher appraisal practices and build instructional leadership capacity. The information gained from this analysis may be used to improve appraisal practices, protocol and professional development opportunities planning, and principal preparation programs to improve school leadership.

The study of principals' and assistant principals' perceptions is crucial, according to McREL (2011); having an effective principal leading every school is critical to ensuring that schools are effective. McKinsey and Company (2007) affirmed that strong school leadership positively affects learning. Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, and Whalstrom (2004) also concurred that school leadership is a key ingredient in determining if students have a positive academic learning experience.

The study included cognitive interviews, collected through an investigation conducted by a university in the Gulf Coast Region regarding assistant principals' and principals' perceptions about the purpose, outcomes, personnel, and other factors involved in the teacher appraisal process (Waxman, MacNeil, & Lee, 2006). The investigation was conducted to determine what principals and assistant principals consider most critical factors. An in-depth analysis of the data and descriptive methodology was conducted to ascertain the differences found in the principals' and assistant principals' responses. The study attempted to decipher the significance of the

differences, the potential that those responses have for understanding and improving the success of principal succession, career planning, and assistant principal development in school districts.

Brief Review

The existence of an effective teacher appraisal practice is crucial to improving student learning (OECD, 2009; Weisburg, Sexton, Mulhern, & Keeting, 2009). The appraisal process has several purposes. First, it is intended to be used as a guide to develop professional development plans and provide authentic feedback to the teacher. Secondly, it exists as an evaluation tool for documentation of teacher effectiveness. One objective is for the teacher to learn new skills and strategies targeted at their weaknesses which, in turn, improves student learning. Ultimately, the goal is to replace ineffective teaching strategies with research-based, highly effective ones that have the greatest impact on student learning (Marzano, Pickering, & Pollack, 2011).

Assistant principals have multiple and varied duties, the majority which are related to student discipline (Martinez, 2011). Often, there is little or no time to dedicate to assist teachers with true professional learning through the PDAS system. Although the ideal purpose of PDAS is to ensure quality teaching and provide professional support, it is often seen as a mandated checklist for accountability. The manner in which the instrument is implemented often depends on the evaluator, training quality, and personal philosophy.

The public is concerned about the improvement of the teacher evaluation and appraisal systems. President Obama spoke about it during a 2009 speech,

If a teacher is given a chance or two chances, but still does not improve, there is no excuse for that person to continue teaching. I reject a system that rewards failure and protects a person from its consequences. The stakes are too high. We can afford nothing but the best when it comes to our children's teachers and the schools where they teach (as cited in Weisburg et al., 2009).

A great deal of pressure is placed upon public school administrators to prove the success of their labors. Principals and assistant principals have many varied responsibilities including instructional leader, financial compliance insurer, public relations diplomat, documentation keeper, teacher evaluator, motivator, educational coach, and supervisor. At times, these responsibilities conflict with one another.

Statement of the Problem

There is a misalignment between assistant principals' induction and their future role as principals. Their duties as disciplinarian, manager, and "all other duties as assigned" do not lend themselves to providing proper training for the role of campus instructional leader. This issue is highlighted by principals' and assistant principals' perceptions of the PDAS. A critical component to student academic success is the continuous improvement process and collaboration between teachers and administrators (PDAS, 2007). Without the proper leadership, administrators will be stagnant and unprepared to lead. Fuller and Young (2009) indicated that a new campus leader is often inexperienced and has not had the opportunity to develop the required skills. Bloom and Kravets (2001) asserted that serving as an assistant principal does not guarantee that one is prepared for the role of campus leader. Having an effective principal leading every

school is critical to ensuring that schools are competitive and increasing student academic achievement (McRel, 2011). Therefore, the process for developing leadership is vitally important.

Downey (2006) asserted that despite years of research on teacher supervision and appraisal systems, principals continue to practice in ways that have been consistently shown to be ineffective. Often, these practices are mandated by the school districts or states. These practices occupy the limited time that could be better utilized by administrators to engage teachers in authentic and collaborative ways to lead school improvement and professional growth.

Teacher Evaluation 2.0, published by The New Teacher Project, found that the evaluations are “infrequent, unfocused, undifferentiated, unhelpful, and inconsequential” (Milner, 2010, p. 1). They are rarely used to create precise professional development plans, to laud and identify outstanding teaching, or to terminate underperforming teachers. The system is time-consuming and unproductive. Time invested in these mandated practices would be better spent in other ways that lead to improved teaching and student learning. Despite research that overwhelmingly suggests the ineffectiveness of these practices, states and districts continue with the same rote processes (Donaldson, 2010, Hoglund, 2012, Moe, 2011, Weisburg et al., 2009).

Dufour and Marzano (2009) concluded that “the hours that principals devote to formal teacher evaluation and walk-throughs contribute little to the overall improvement of the school” (p. 64). Additionally, they noted that, although the stated objective of the appraisal and development process is to improve instructional strategies, those who are veterans in the teaching field are not likely to change their practice based on the current

process (Dufour & Marzano, 2009). Typically, principals use other factors for teacher placement, promotion, and dismissal recommendations. Many teachers attribute a poor appraisal to relationship issues with the evaluator rather than reflect on their own weaknesses (Dufour & Marzano, 2009); therefore, they do not attempt to further their professional development and engage in self-reflection.

Additionally, the capacity-building aspect of the evaluation system may not be utilized in the most effective manner by assistant principals, whose plates are full with managerial duties such as discipline and other supervisory duties. The assistant principal may be under-utilized in the area of school transformation due to the clerical and managerial tasks dominating their daily lives. Improving teachers' capacity and ensuring student learning is often reported as the primary purpose of teacher supervision, but in practice, many are just going through the bureaucratic motions in order to be in compliance with district mandates. The analysis of the assistant principals' responses and how they differed from the responses of the principals provided a window into how this issue can be remedied. It also provided information on how assistant principals may be better prepared to assume the principal role with the mission of transforming from managers to those who guide the staff towards common instructional goals.

The focus of this study was to analyze archival data collected from principals and assistant principals on how they perceived the purpose and effectiveness of teacher supervision, who was the most qualified person to perform the appraisal, what factors should have been included, and what outcome was considered most effective. The original responses were analyzed, compared, and categorized by Robinson (2009) and Begum (2008). This new study determined if there was a variance in the responses and

revealed a need for further development of assistant principals to assume the campus leadership role, as well as further training for all administrators.

Significance of the Study

The data analyzed in this study has the potential to impact the field of education in several ways. Information resulting from this study may be used to focus a dialogue between teachers, administrators, district and state executive leaders, and board members, which will impact future policy and legislation. The results can help to refine how leadership training is conducted for current and aspiring administrators. Additionally, the results of this study may change current teacher supervision and evaluation practices. The results may also change what documentation is used for teacher assignments. Principal preparation and succession planning may improve based on the analysis of the variation in responses. This inquiry may provide suggestions for improving assistant principals' preparation for leading school transformation through collaboration with staff to improve student achievement.

According to Fuller (as cited in Bartlett, 2009), the literature consistently suggested that minimal time is spent in planning for future principals. Fuller (as cited in Bartlett, 2009) indicated that, many times, a new campus leader is inexperienced and has not had the leadership opportunities to develop their skills at the level needed to efficiently lead a campus. This assertion is supported by the responses in this study. Bloom and Krovetz (2001), as well as Goodson (2000), asserted that the role of the assistant principal may not be the best training for aspiring principals to gain needed leadership skills. The study was designed to understand principals' and assistant principals' perceptions about teacher appraisal, as well as the implications of how the

responses demonstrated the degree of preparedness or lack of preparedness for assistant principals to assume the leadership role of principal. This study may assist in changing the way that principals envision their mentoring role to better prepare assistant principals for succession, as well as promote a more comprehensive principal leadership training process.

Research Questions

1. Do principals and assistant principals differ in their perceptions regarding the purpose of teacher evaluation?
2. Do principals and assistant principals differ in their perception that PDAS is effective in achieving its intended outcomes?
3. Do principals and assistant principals differ in their perceptions about who is the best person to conduct teacher supervision?
4. When reporting on teachers' performance, do principals differ in their practices from assistant principals regarding the inclusion of only those behaviors that they observe, or do they include other factors?

Organization of the Study

This study consists of five chapters. Chapter 1 is an introduction of the study and states the problem, the purpose of the study, the research questions, and the relevance of the study. Chapter 2 is a review of the relevant literature in the field that supports the significance of the study. Chapter 3 articulates the instruments, participants, variables, and design of the study. Chapter 4 is a presentation of the results and analysis of the data through the framework of the research questions. Chapter 5 is a discussion and

interpretation of results within the context of the study. Implications for current practices and recommendations are also addressed in this chapter.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

History of Teacher Evaluation

There is a long standing debate over teacher evaluation that is gaining momentum. State legislators are proposing new laws and are under pressure due to federal grants such as the Race to the Top competition to secure billions of dollars (NEA, 2011). Often, the focus is only on replacing poor performing teachers and more focus and time could be spent on supporting all teacher to become more effective (NEA, 2011). There is a lack of consensus and shared vision regarding how to proceed with teacher evaluation practices. Across the nation, several districts are debating the use of the value added system of utilizing student achievement data to determine teacher rating, salary and contracts.

In Chicago, teachers went on strike during the fall of 2012 to oppose the new teacher evaluation plan. Chicago Public Schools is the third largest school system in the United States. The main issue being debated was the proposed change in the teacher evaluation process, which had remained unchanged since 1967 (Lah & Botelho, 2011). In Los Angeles, there is a disagreement between the unions and the L.A. Unified School District regarding certain elements of the teacher evaluation plan (Watanabe & Mishak, 2012). In Houston, Texas, Houston Independent School District leaders are contemplating a postponement in commencing the new teacher appraisal system (Mellon, 2012).

Despite the recent attention and controversy over effective teacher evaluation, the debate is not new. As far back as the 1700s, church members were designated as

teachers' supervisors, despite their lack of proven pedagogical knowledge (Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston, 2011). With the change in societal needs, driven by industry, came growing cities and large schools. This caused a need for more specialized schooling and supervisors with knowledge in specific subjects and instructional strategies. Church leaders were no longer deemed appropriate for evaluating teachers due to their lack of development for such a role. Typically, a teacher was chosen to take on this role.

There was a philosophical shift in the mid-1800s. The importance of teachers' instructional knowledge and strategies became a new focus. In the 1900s, there were varying schools of thought on how to approach the educational process. One was a view that schools were similar to factories, in that there should be one most efficient system to educate students (Taylor as cited in Marzano et al., 2011). The opposing view to this was the idea that schools should serve to promote democracy and citizenship (Dewey as cited in Marzano et al., 2011). Dewey's ideas of engaging students in the lesson, differentiated instruction, and connecting lessons to real life relevance are all re-emerging themes in modern day public education. Literature regarding the training of evaluators during this time is scant, implying that there was little preparation for the role.

In the early 1900s, Taylor's notion of viewing schools as factories that produce educated children fomented the thought that one best set of instructional strategies should be sought for effective instruction. At this time, measuring student learning using reliable assessments and analysis of data became a primary way to gauge teachers' effectiveness (Marzano et al., 2011). The role of the supervisor during these years was to serve as an inspector. During this period, teachers using strategies other than those

deemed most effective by a few theorists were assessed as weak and given redirection. The dependence on standardized tests versus the emphasis on the development of citizenship seemed to be opposing philosophies at this time in history, one relying on hard data and the other focusing on the global view of the purpose of education, to assess teachers' success in the classroom.

Over the years, the philosophical framework for the most effective approach to educating students in public schools has swayed back and forth. In the early 1940s, the job description of an administrator read very similar to what it reads now--a jumbled assortment of responsibilities, such as ensuring that teachers have the needed materials, distribution of textbooks, curriculum compliance, lunch duty, and attendance monitoring. In the mid-1950s, the job was described as meetings with teachers and staff, as well as classroom observation (Melchoir as cited in Marzano et al., 2011). At this time, the job description of a supervisor was still focused on managerial and monitoring tasks rather than instruction.

A Shift in Focus for Teacher Appraisals

It was not until the 1950s that supervisions began to be viewed as a process for professional development of the teacher. In a March 1958 issue of *Life Magazine*, an article appeared entitled *Crisis in Education*. The article was part of a series that emphasized perceived negative aspects in public education (Weber, 2011). The follow up article claimed that there was a scarcity of teachers in the U.S. and that a large number of those in the field were ineffective (Weber, 2011). The perception of a failing public school system was prevalent. This is when the cycle of observation, feedback, and conferencing began as an accepted practice and supervision gained importance. A

philosophical shift began swaying from the inspector-style practice to facilitating teachers' participation in their professional growth.

A 1983 government report, *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform* was published, leading readers to believe that teachers and public schools were failing, despite statistics demonstrating that high school and college graduation rates were rising (Bracey, 2006). Criticism of schools was continually present and became more intense during this era. Many Americans were concerned that students were not learning at a competitive rate with other countries; therefore, the importance of distinguishing effective teachers from poor performing teachers increased. Since the 1980s, the supervision process has emphasized teacher reflections and personal development, with the role of the supervisor as coach in assisting teachers to clarify their strengths and weaknesses in order to improve instructional strategies (Ebmeir & Nicklaus, 1999). Since this time, teachers have been given the opportunity to engage more collaboratively in the appraisal and growth process.

Working collaboratively to improve student supervision has been a recent emphasis since the early 2000s. Dufour and Marzano (2009) asserted that teacher collaboration is more impactful than traditional supervision practices. They found that the "hours principals devote to formal teacher observation and walk-throughs contribute little to the overall improvement of the school" (Dufour & Marzano, 2009, p. 64). Although the current Texas teacher appraisal system is one of shared responsibility for improving the learning process, it is still perceived by many as a hierarchical process and checklist. This perception may exist due to the poor implementation of the system or poor communication clarifying the goals and process. On some campuses, the appraisal

system is lacking the proper reflective and iterative process. Additionally, a lack of evaluator calibration and sustained appraiser training exists. Refresher courses to ensure accuracy of appraisals are brief, incomplete, or scarce for administrators in some school districts.

Currently, the debate continues concerning the most effective system for determining teacher effectiveness. Similar to the opposing viewpoints of the early 1900s, critics decry the appraisal system as relying too heavily on classroom observation and call for more standardized testing and student learning data as tools to determine teacher effectiveness. Tucker and Stronge (as cited in Marzano et al., 2011) maintained that due to the correlation between student learning data and teacher performance, the use of such results must be a basis of distinguishing high and low performing teachers. Current federal and state legislation also have an effect on how states develop and mandate teacher appraisal practices.

No Child Left Behind (NCLB)

The goal of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 is to ensure that every student is taught by a highly qualified teacher. The law defines “highly qualified” as a teacher who has a bachelor’s degree, state certification, and has demonstrated competency in the core subject(s) that they teach (USDE, 2012). The NCLB Act promotes professional development as the main means of improving teachers’ capacity and focuses the spotlight on teacher accountability by requiring states to assess students’ basic skills. There are many benchmarks that schools must meet, such as Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). When the AYP is not met, steps must be taken to intervene and remediate (e.g., free

tutoring, replacement of staff, student transfers to other schools, and campus-wide restructuring), depending on the level of improvement needed.

The NCLB Act is a reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965, which focused on equal access to education, high standards, and accountability. The NCLB Act requires all states to develop assessment tests for public schools and is correlated with federal school funding. The two main components of the NCLB Act that have an effect on teacher evaluation are the use of standards-based assessment in an attempt to measure individual student educational outcomes and the teacher quality standards which mold teacher appraisal and hiring.

NCLB mandates the use of test scores to rate schools and school districts. The primary goal of this act is accountability for student learning. As of December 2012, executive powers were used to permit waivers for more than half of the schools in the nation if those schools committed to set new accountability standards targeting low performing groups and correlates standards to teacher evaluations and student test results (NCLBA, 2012).

Race to the Top

Race to the Top is a competitive incentive program designed to promote challenging standards to ensure that students are adequately prepared for college and careers. The program includes: incentives for districts to create improved assessments, ensure that effective principals and teachers are in place, and the use of data to track students' progress. Additionally, there is a focus on improvement of low performing schools. States are competing for grants based on the changes implemented in the schools, particularly aimed at closing the achievement gap (Lee, 2010). Over a billion

dollars has been set aside for this program. The Race to the Top also contributes to the federal impact on local appraisal policies.

Purpose of Teacher Appraisals and Supervision

Although the debate continues regarding the most effective system for teacher appraisal, the reasons for the existence of the Professional Development Appraisal System (PDAS) are clear. The goal of the system is “to improve student performance through the professional development of teachers (PDAS Teacher Manual, 2005, p. 6). The PDAS system, if implemented as intended, has the potential to assist, monitor, and coach teachers to meet their potential, as well as identify those who are ineffective. Schriener (1973) stressed the need for a clearly stated purpose as a critical factor in an effective appraisal system, meaning that the teachers have the right to know the instrument’s intended purpose, whether it is to assess areas in which they need support or to be used for placement, promotion, and termination decisions. The PDAS system is not designed as a legal document for termination decisions. Extensive, further documentation is typically required to separate a teacher from their position.

The primary purpose of teacher evaluation systems across the nation is to improve student achievement by determining what is working and where there are areas that need to be targeted for instructional improvement. Peterson (2000) suggested that teacher appraisal practices should highlight and document effective teaching, glean what further training is required, and use many sources to make decisions. Additionally, Peterson (2000) emphasized that more than one appraiser should be used to evaluate teachers, and the decision making role of that evaluator should be limited. The aim of teacher appraisal is to confirm student learning and enrich teaching strategies (OECD, 2009).

Typically, the appraisal process is composed of two main elements: the opportunity to address weaknesses through professional development and the accountability or summative evaluation element (OECD, 2009). Bloom (2007) suggested that if the classroom observation is well implemented, it can have a significant role in school improvement. According to the OECD (2009), the goal should be to make certain that teacher appraisal adds to the increase in student learning results by improving educator capacity. Daniel and McGreal (2000) argued that teacher evaluation should be used to improve professional strategies and instruction. They suggested building teachers' professional capacity through precise and supportive feedback (Daniel & McGreal, 2000).

The stated that the purpose of teacher appraisal must be clear before commencing any teacher supervision and development program (Bloom, 2007). Goldsberry (1998) advocated that the goal of appraisal should be to increase teachers' professional ability. In the past, teacher evaluation has been about improving instruction and firing those with unacceptable evaluations (Hogland, 2012). Partly due to the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, the goals of teacher evaluation have again begun to shift from a focus on instructional strategies, process, and professional development to the use of students' assessment scores as a means of proving a successful product and teacher quality. This shift has caused the goal of appraisal processes to become nebulous with teachers and appraisers unclear about whether the purpose is to prove or to improve the quality of instruction.

Professional Learning Versus Evaluation

The two goals of teacher appraisal are in discord. One goal is for the teacher to develop professionally and put new learning into practice in the classroom. The other goal is to evaluate the teacher with a summative appraisal rating. The notion of a final evaluation often triggers fear in teachers, which may alter the performance and lead them to be less productive. Evaluations may be perceived as threatening and cause the teacher to feel uncomfortable (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2011). When concerned about criticism or possible termination, a teacher feels insecure (Hoglund, 2012). “When fear is present or when teachers perceive evaluations to be a little more than ‘hoops’ to be jumped through, there is virtually no chance for evaluation to be useful” (Hoglund, 2012, p. 1).

Tschannen-Moran and Tschannen-Moran (2011) found that evaluations have a role in bureaucratic organizations, whereas development is the main goal of professional organizations. Both types are mixed together in the Texas PDAS process. Unfortunately, this has eroded teachers’ trust in the system and increased administrative micromanagement. Under the PDAS evaluation system, teachers are less likely to share areas of weakness that need assistance and improvement. Combining the two elements decreases the opportunity for open communication and collaboration (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2011). Hogland (2012) suggested that employees will not likely request assistance from an administrator who has the power to terminate their job. The teacher must know the goals of the appraisal and be aware that it is a process to help the teacher continually increase capacity (Hogland, 2012).

In the best of circumstances, the appraisal process is meant to be used as a reflective tool and conference dialogue guide regarding which instructional areas need

improvement and how to address them effectively. According to Ellis (2011), the most crucial aspect for students' learning success is the ability of the teacher.

The primary purpose of teacher evaluation is personal and professional growth that leads to improved performance. The principal (or other evaluator) acts as a facilitator for each teacher, just as the teacher serves as a facilitator for students in the classroom. The principal makes it clear that the evaluation or walk-through is part of a continuous improvement cycle designed to help the teacher. As the school leader, the principal plays an active role in the teacher's professional growth. This may include the following: asking questions that help the teacher self-evaluate; helping the teacher design a plan for improvement; and providing opportunities for professional development. It is crucial that the school leader be perceived as a *facilitator of improvement*, rather than an *enforcer of directives*. (Hoglund, 2012, p. 2)

Teacher coaches have become a valuable resource in schools (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2011). Coaches are non-judgmental and assist teachers to build on existing strengths. Coaching the teacher to refine their instructional capacity is a core goal of the professional development process. Teachers must learn to self-evaluate constantly to ensure that they are meeting the needs of the students (Hogland, 2012). Research has suggested that the most impactful element on students' academic performance is the teacher, even more than family background, socioeconomic status,

and the school (Center for Public Education, 2011). Supporting teachers to continually improve is the primary purpose of teacher supervision:

By improving teacher effectiveness, districts could improve student achievement and save money at the same time, because they would be able to identify ineffective teachers early and provide them with the appropriate support, rather than having to replace struggling teachers who leave the profession because of lack of assistance. (Center for Public Education, 2011, p. 1)

Coaches are skilled in the theories of adult learning processes and are able to enhance teachers' strengths (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2011). Building on existing strengths will improve instruction and student learning.

Coaching is a strategy used to collaborate, in a collegial way, with the teacher which will lead to professional growth. To the contrary, an evaluation is a way of forming a judgment about the teacher's performance in official documentation, which may be punitive. According to the new teacher evaluation system in the Houston Independent School District (HISD), leaders have found a way to assist teachers and supervise by having "roving advisors" in the classroom (Mellon, 2011, p. 1). HISD's former chief of human resources, Ann Best, stated, "The specialists are not there to conduct job evaluations and their notes are not shared with principals unless the teacher is on an improvement plan" (2011, p. 1). The reviews are mixed, as some teachers affirm the mentors for their helpful ideas, and others feel that they serve as spies with negative intentions. Two of the main concerns are the credibility and experience of the specialist, as well as the challenge of confirming objectively if these mentors improved teachers'

effectiveness. Despite the uncertainty, using coaches in the classroom holds true to the PDAS goal “to improve student performance through the professional development of teachers” (PDAS Teacher Manual, 2005, p. 6).

Effective Adult Learning Practices

The main goal of the PDAS system is to ensure professional growth that transfers to improved instructional practices in the classroom. The PDAS system is designed to engage the teacher in reflective practice with the initial teacher reflection forms, choice of professional development, and feedback conferences with the appraiser. However, the implementation of PDAS varies and sometimes fails to meet the intended best educational practices. According to Knowles’s study of adult learning, there are several characteristics that differentiate adults from younger students (Knowles, 1980, 1984). Knowles (1980, 1984) noted that the role of the teacher is to coach the student to reach their potential. He studied and observed the adult learning process and discovered that adults are students who come to the classroom ready to learn and are motivated intrinsically (Knowles, 1980).

Typically, the adult learner is self-directed and can attach new knowledge to a vast amount of stored experience. In regards to an appraisal process, Knowles’s theories suggested that an adult is innately motivated and can set goals and monitor progress, without depending on the appraiser. Adult learners can be motivated by external factors, such as gaining a promotion; however, external factor are often just surface rationale for learning. Internal motivations, such as a sense of competence, are powerful motivators for adults (Knowles, 1980, 1984).

There are many implications of relating adult learning to the appraisal process. Reflecting on Knowles's theories in regards to the teachers' professional learning, the appraiser should take on the role of a coach or mentor, who is mindful that each teacher has their own learning style and varying degrees of need. Knowles (1980) also suggested that the experience that learners bring to the environment is valuable. He emphasized collaboration to share experiences, resources, and talents within a group. There are several steps that Knowles (1980) suggested for educators of adults including planning goals mutually, understanding learner interests, setting goals based on their needs, and cooperative learning.

"People will make the best use of experiences if they are part of an intentional plan for development" (Boyatzis, Cowen, & Kolb, 1995, p. 76). The process of reflection helps instructors to analyze their performance and to implement new instructional strategies. Hord and Hirsch (2008) outlined several steps for principals to support adult learning, which included "expecting teachers to keep knowledge fresh," "making data accessible," "taking time to build trust," and "guiding learning communities to self-governance" (p. 1).

According to DuFour (1991), "Treating our teachers like professionals is at the very heart of the issue of creating a school climate conducive to staff development (p. 31). Teachers need to feel that they have a true voice in professional development decisions and that they are heard. The implementation of the PDAS process, at times, can be more about policing and documentation than professional learning. Dufour (1991) stated that "developing a vision for the school should be a collective endeavor" and that

the vision must come from the “needs, hopes and dreams” (p. 17) of the people within the organization.

Knowles (1980) also promoted the connection between life outside the classroom and new learning, which is Domain I, attribute 5 of the PDAS process. Adult and young learners need to understand the relevance of what they are learning and how it will benefit them outside the classroom walls. If the new learning is relevant and immediately applicable, the learner will be more engaged and put the new learning into practice. With the current appraisal system in Texas, many of these adult learning theories are included in the process of the PDAS (PDAS Teacher Manual, 2005).

Overview of the Current Texas PDAS and State Mandates

Texas Administrative Code Chapter 150 Subchapter AA: Teacher appraisal.

The driving legislative forces for teacher appraisal, in addition to the NCLB Act, are the Texas Administrative Code (TAC) and the Texas Education Code (TEC). According to the provisions set by the TAC 150.1001, beginning in the 1997-1998 school year, school districts have two options for teacher appraisal methods. The system recommended by the commissioner is the PDAS, which was created in compliance with the TEC 21.351 (PDAS Teacher Manual, 2005). According to the TAC, an alternate option is for the superintendent and school board of each school district to develop an alternate system in compliance with TEC 21.351.

Currently, school districts must apply for a waiver with the Texas Education Agency (TEA) if they are using an appraisal system other than PDAS. According to the TEA, 1,086 (86%) of Texas school districts are currently using PDAS, while 173 (14%) of districts are using alternate appraisal instruments. The districts not using the PDAS

must submit to TEA the alternative system that they are employing. Of those districts, a variety of appraisal sources are used, such as assessment scores, monitoring checklists, formal observations, staff development, collaboration, portfolios, and self-assessments (TEA, 2012).

It is important to note that although 14% of Texas school districts use an alternative method, the systems have nearly the same essential elements due to the requirements in Texas Education Code 21.351. Some districts may require that the teacher be notified before the formal observation, while others adjust the way that student results are linked to the appraisal. However, the basic framework remains similar.

Texas Administrative Performance TAC 150.1002: Assessment of teacher performance.

The teacher proficiencies outlined in *Learner-Centered Schools for Texas: A Vision for Texas Educators* are the basis for PDAS and were approved by the State Board of Education on February 11, 1994 (PDAS Teacher Manual, 2005):

In the PDAS system, the eight domains are:

1. Active, Successful Student Participation in the Learning Process;
2. Learner-Centered Instruction;
3. Evaluation and Feedback on Student Progress;
4. Management of Student Discipline, Instructional Strategies,
Time/Materials;
5. Professional Communication;
6. Professional Development;
7. Compliance with Policies, Operating Procedures and Requirements; and

8. Improvement of All Students' Academic Performance.

Each domain is scored independently. Administrators are given a scoring criteria guide with a rubric and a list of considerations and expectations for each domain. There are over 35 pages of rubrics to determine the quality and quantity of effective teaching for the administrator to consider during the appraisal process with several subcategories per each domain. Per TAC Chapter 150, the appraiser must use data from observations, teacher self-reports, and other documented sources to determine if student achievement was increased, if the teacher contributed to the “safety and order of the whole school,” and if the teacher created a “stimulating learning environment” (p. 21). Teachers earn a rating in each domain using the categories: exceeds expectations, proficient, below expectations, and unsatisfactory. Domain VIII refers to “efforts to enhance academic performance, efforts to enhance student attendance, efforts to identify and assist students in at-risk situations; and campus performance rating” (p. 21).

Texas Administrative Code 150.1003: Appraisals, data sources, and conferences. Teachers must complete a Teacher Self-Report, a goal-setting document during the first three weeks of school based on the needs of the students they serve, which aligns instruction and provides teachers an opportunity to provide input. All teachers must also be oriented to the PDAS system, receive the local and state policies, calendar, and all information regarding expectations.

The PDAS Domain VI relates to the teacher's professional development. This domain requires that teachers participate in professional development that meets the needs of the students they serve, as well as any targeted areas in the teacher's prior performance appraisal. In most districts, the professional development is a combination

of mandates and personal choice intended to improve the teacher's ability to reach the instructional needs of the students.

Although there are several state and district-mandated professional development trainings for legal compliance and district goals, teachers have the liberty to choose some of their professional development hours. Those hours, according to PDAS Domain IV, should be in alignment with student needs, campus goals, and the prior performance appraisal of the teacher. However, many administrators are overwhelmed with documentation and have scarce time to truly dedicate to properly supervise and advise teachers toward appropriate professional development choices. .

Cross City Campaign researchers (as cited in Fullan, Hill, & Crevola, 2006) found that most teachers experienced professional development as fragmented and not linked to their classroom practice. At times, there is a lack of follow-through, which is a crucial element for implementing new strategies in the classroom to benefit students. Although PDAS addresses the need to plan for and follow up with precise professional development for every teacher, these feedback conferences do not always occur. Professional development is successful when it is "school-based and embedded in teachers' daily work" (Fullan et al., 2006, p. 24).

There are several sources of data used to collect information for the PDAS. The formal appraisal consists of a minimum of one 45-minute classroom observation, as well as classroom walkthroughs and observations "conducted at the discretion of the certified appraiser" (PDAS Teacher Manual, 2005, p. 22). The 45 minutes may be conducted in shorter time segments if agreed upon by the teacher and appraiser, as long as it totals 45 minutes. According to the TAC, advanced notice of the appraisal is permitted but not

required. In some districts using alternate versions of the appraisal, the advance notice is required.

Teachers must complete a self-report form. Additionally, written documentation related to teacher performance is included. Any documentation used in the appraisal process “must be shared in writing with the teacher within 10 days of the appraiser’s knowledge of the occurrence” (PDAS Teacher Manual, 2005, p. 22). Unless waived by the teacher, a summative conference must be held within the time frame dictated by the school district to discuss the written summative report and other related data. PDAS and the alternative instruments both must include a conference that is “diagnostic and prescriptive with regard to remediation needed in overall performance by category” and based on “performance of the teachers’ students” according to TAC 150.1009 (TAC, 2011, p. 1).

Teachers in need of assistance are addressed in TAC 150.1005. These are teachers who are not performing to the expectations by being rated unsatisfactory in one or more domains, and they will be consulted with to create an intervention plan. Elements of the growth plan include recommendations and directives for professional development related to the poor performance documented in the PDAS domain(s) with a timeline for improvement. If the requirements are not met, the teacher will be “considered for separation from the assignment, campus, and/or district” (TAC, 2011, p. 25).

Teachers may also appeal their appraisal and request a second appraisal. The second appraiser evaluates the teacher in all domains. Each district develops its own grievance process. A teacher who received a less than proficient rating under the Texas

PDAS system may appeal and request another appraiser. Teachers may submit a response or rebuttal within 10 business days of receiving an appraisal (19 TAC 150.1005). The rebuttal becomes a part of the teacher's personnel file. Additionally, a district cannot deny a teacher's request for a second appraisal. Local districts decide the process for selecting a second appraiser and how the second appraisal will be combined (or not) with the first. In some districts, the teacher is given three choices of appraisers from off campus. The second appraiser enters the teacher's classroom without the daily operating knowledge of that teacher. This procedure is meant to safeguard the teacher from a biased and inaccurate appraisal.

This protocol promotes indifference in some appraisers after realizing that their efforts to accurately appraise an educator have been rejected in favor of teachers' rights. It also makes the appraisal seem trivial since educators know that it can be overruled.

According to *The Widget Effect*,

One side claims that teacher tenure and due process protections render dismissal a practical impossibility, shielding ineffective teachers from removal in all but the most egregious instances. The other argue that the process provides only minimal protection against arbitrary or discriminatory dismissal, but that administrators fail to document poor performance adequately and refuse to provide struggling teachers with sufficient support.

(Weisburg et al., 2009, p. 2)

Appraiser qualifications and training. According to the Texas Administrative Code 150.1006, “teacher appraisals require at least one certified appraiser” (PDAS Teacher Manual, 2005, p. 27). Appraisers must be certified by having completed the Instructional Leadership Development (ILD) and the PDAS training. Typically, this training is conducted by a regional education service center, but in larger districts it may be conducted by a trainer-of-trainer method within the district. The appraiser is usually a campus administrator unless the district has an insufficient team of appraisers. Currently, at the Region IV Educational Service Center in Houston, TX, the cost of the four-day ILD training is \$600.00 per person online and \$450.00 for face-to-face training (ESC Catalog, 2012). The two-day PDAS training session costs \$400.00 for the 21-hour certification (ESC Catalog, 2012). The TAC 150.1006 states that “periodic recertification and training shall be required” (PDAS Teacher Manual, p. 27). However, the refresher training requirement is not specific.

The PDAS system requires only one appraiser; however, using multiple appraisers increases credibility of the evaluation and is critical to successful practices. More than one appraiser should participate in evaluating teacher quality, as well as multiple observations (Milanowski, 2004, Peterson, 2000; Stronge & Tucker, 2003). The full range of teachers’ skills cannot be seen in a classroom observation visit by one appraiser. For that reason, it is advisable to utilize many appraisers, so that the instruction can be observed from many angles (Danielson & McGreal, 2000). The use of multiple appraisers strengthens the credibility and reliability of the appraisal.

In order to establish equivalency with other areas of high stakes appraising, one might think of appraisers like judges of a sporting event such as dressage competition or

gymnastics. Dressage is a competition in which the horse and rider must perform certain movements from memory. In this analogy, the rider is the teacher and the judges are the appraisers. The rider must demonstrate that the horse has learned certain paces and movements (such as figure of eight, volte, serpentine) (Federal Equestre Internationale, 2012). According to the Federation Equestre Internationale (FEI), “a panel of five judges assesses the figures, awarding each a mark from 0 to 10” (FEI, 2012, p. 1). Judges are seated on different sides of the ring to best assess the movements from different angles. The judges have significant, previous experience and have proven their appraisal abilities. According to the FEI rule 9.11-9.14, there must be a minimum of three judges (FEI, 2011). The teacher PDAS system relies on only one appraiser to see all the aspects and angles of the teaching process and judge the efficacy of classroom instruction and teacher performance.

Another example of the use multiple appraisers is Olympic gymnastics:

For each Olympic gymnastics event, 8 judges are chosen from a FIG pre-approved pool of multi-national judging candidates. The chosen judges are categorized into 3 groups:

1. The D panel, who calculate the Difficulty Score (2 judges)
2. The E panel, who judge the Execution Score (6 judges). (NBC, 2012, p. 1)

In order to become an Olympic gymnastics judge, there are several steps, such as written and practical tests. There are different ratings for judges and continuing professional education (C.P.E) requirements” (USA Gymnastics, 2005).

Although appraisers must go through significant training before they evaluate teachers, training occurs through the one-time ILD and PDAS workshops, which each are less than one week in duration. The PDAS appraisers must take assessments to demonstrate that they are able to accurately rate video-taped lessons during the process of their certification, as well as demonstrate understanding of the elaborate rubrics and teacher expectations. With the PDAS appraisal system, the accuracy of the final score is dependent on the diligence of one person. Therefore, that appraiser must be highly skilled and have credibility within the learning community. According to the OECD Review on Evaluation and Assessment Frameworks for Improving School Outcomes (2009), “the success of any teacher evaluation system greatly depends on the in-depth training of the evaluators” (p. 18).

One way to enhance and sustain appraiser skills, as well as inter-rater calibration over time, is the use of “instructional rounds” also known as group walk-throughs (City, Elmore, Flareman, & Teitel, 2009). A group of appraisers, teachers, and other instructional personnel can visit classrooms, observe, and then discuss their observations to improve expertise and promote reflection. Walk-throughs are a required element of the PDAS system. Appraiser skill is critical to ensuring that an appraisal system is effective. According to Danielson (2002), “trained evaluators who can make consistent judgments based on evidence” are a main element to reliable appraisals (p. 9).

The skill of appraising teachers is a science and an art. As Troy Kilzer stated, “you know when a good lesson is being taught without looking at a rubric” (Anderson, 2012, p. 1). The system can stifle creativity, with administrative appraisers feeling tied to rubrics for scoring and teachers aware of the marks they must hit. Gera Summerford,

president of the Tennessee Education Agency “compared the new evaluations to taking your car to the mechanic and making him use all his tools to fix it, regardless of the problem, and expecting him to do it in one hour” (Anderson, 2012, p. 2). The proper training of appraisers is critical to the credibility of an evaluation system. Referring to the upcoming appraisal system in HISD, Gayle Fallon, president of Houston Federation of Teachers, stated, "You're putting an arbitrary instrument in the hands of people who have been badly trained in it. It has caused chaos in the schools” (Mellon, 2012, p. 1). This serves as a reminder that a different or better instrument does not equate to more accurate evaluations of teachers, nor can teacher quality be judged by one measurement (Peterson, 2012). All evaluations are subjective in some way, but the bias can be reduced based on the best research and expert training (Peterson, 2012).

The PDAS formal and informal observation process is still the main tool for teacher evaluation in Texas today. The process consists of several professional conferences between the teacher and their supervisor to promote effective teaching and student achievement. The observations are tools used to collect data regarding the instruction in the classroom. In *Professional Learning Communities at Work: Best Practices for Enhancing Student Achievement*, Dufour and Eaker (1998) discussed that information gleaned during observations helps educators to engage in productive, reflective discussions, evaluate current practices, and discuss new ideas. PDAS’s greatest strength is that administrators who evaluate teachers can use it to help teachers grow and improve. According to Lauralee Pankonien, Region XIII’s senior certification coordinator, “It’s intended to be used as a developmental tool. When administered as

designed, we would expect that teachers benefit from the information that is exchanged and have a chance to improve” (TASB, 2009, p. 3).

Communication between the appraiser and the teacher is critical. In the current PDAS system, face-to-face conferences can be waived. Some administrators conference often with teachers and give specific feedback on how they can improve instructional practices; others give minimal feedback. Pankonien believed that PDAS “would be stronger if there were more mandates for communication with teachers” (TASB, 2009, p. 4).

Administrators also must periodically meet with the leadership team to ensure PDAS is being implemented in accordance with its intended purpose to ensure equity and teacher development. Calibration between evaluators is also key in reaching the goal of proper implementation and to maximize teacher growth. According to Marzano and Toth (2012), calibration between evaluators is accomplished with a thorough introduction to the model; evaluator immersion in the model; practice without the high stakes of a real evaluation; inner-rater reliability training; team practice with videos of lessons; proctored scoring with a baseline; becoming certified in a progressive fashion; and maintaining high criterion and reliability data. Calibration among teacher evaluators increases the reliability of the appraisal results. Without calibration, the results from the instrument may decrease in reliability and validity.

Unfortunately, appraisers’ evaluations can vary greatly. Fink (2009) conducted an experiment to determine reliability of ratings by asking leaders to rate the quality of a lesson with the numbers between one and five, five being the highest quality. Fink found that consensus has never been reached about this rating among appraisers. Fink (2009)

also cited another study by the University of Washington that rated the appraiser between novice (1) and expert (4), finding that the average appraisers' score was 1.70. One may conclude that very few appraisers are able to reach consensus regarding what qualifies as effective teaching.

The question remains as to the validity of the PDAS instrument. According to Milanowski (2003), validity evidence exists pertaining to several different implementations of the framework. The research suggested that the evaluation ratings using systems based on the framework have a moderate correlation with value-added ratings systems. Milanowski's (2003) study implied that the framework, observation-based ratings can suggest substantial inter-rater agreement and reliability if multiple observers and multiple occasions of observations are used during the appraisal process. The reliability of a single observation by one appraiser has a low reliability (Milanowski, 2004).

Marford (2011) noted that principals are searching for strategies to make the instrument more effective. The National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) is pushing for an improved, more effective, accurate teacher evaluation system (Marford, 2011). In a statement by the NASSP board of directors, they recommended that teacher evaluations be based on research and include many types of measurements, such as student portfolios (Marford, 2011). The group also requested Congress to establish a definition of a "highly effective teacher" based on multiple measures of performance (Marford, 2011). McLaughlin (1990) noted that most educators believe the current teacher appraisal system is a waste of time, ritualistic, and does not improve educational practices. However, Dufour and Eaker found that observations assist

educators in having productive, reflective conversations, to assess current strategies, and to discuss new ideas. The findings by Kane, Taylor, Tyler, and Wooten (2010) stressed the importance of identifying quality teachers and pointed to the use of a teacher evaluation system that combines multiple factors to determine teacher effectiveness. Although many authors emphasized the disadvantages of the traditional system, many benefits exist.

Table 1-1

Advantages and Disadvantages of Observation-Based Appraisal Practices

<u>Advantages</u>	<u>Disadvantages</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can provide useful, immediate feedback for teachers when well-implemented. • Provides opportunity to observe and document qualitative aspects of teaching, such as teacher rapport with students and instructional strategies. • Allows for teacher input with the teacher self-report/goal-setting. • Designed to improve student learning through teacher professional development. • Is a continual, iterative process. • Can be used to affirm teachers' daily efforts. • Includes built-in feedback conference requirements throughout the process. • Acknowledges the complex set of elements involved in quality pedagogy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extremely time-consuming. • Same instrument is used for all teachers, regardless of experience level or subject taught. • Can give an inaccurate interpretation of daily work based on limited time spent in classroom. • Goals may be unclear; dual goals of educator growth and summative evaluation are conflicting. • Lack of reliability and validity data. • Limited training for appraisers and dependent on diligence of evaluator. • Appraisers may inflate teachers' ratings to avoid conflict. • Teachers' results differ very little; high achievers are often not rewarded and poor performers are not sanctioned; assumes intrinsic motivation.

Table 1-1 (continued)

Advantages and Disadvantages of Observation-Based Appraisal Practices

<u>Advantages</u>	<u>Disadvantages</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows the appraiser to observe innovative strategies. • Places value on process and pedagogy, rather than just teaching to the test. • Aligns well with adult learning theory. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subjective; possible bias. • Results rarely linked to rewards or consequences.
Donaldson, 2010; Hogland, 2012; Knowles, 1980; Koppich & Showalter, 2008; Moe, 2011; New Teacher Project, 2009.	

Criticisms of Current Appraisal Traditional System

As the literature revealed, there are many concerns regarding the current state of the teacher appraisal process. One of the issues raised by several authors is the lack of differentiation between teachers (Donaldson, 2010; Weiss, 2012). According to *The Widget Effect* (Weisburg, Sexton, Mulhern, & Keeling, 2009), a Gates Foundation study of teacher effectiveness, it is common knowledge that ineffective, veteran teachers are rarely dismissed, and there is a culture of apathy regarding appraising the quality of teachers' instructional abilities.

The work of teachers is important. "Highly effective teachers routinely propel students from below grade level to advanced in a single year" (Ryan, 2010, p. 2). Despite the push for smaller classes, the smaller class does not impact a child's development as much as an effective teacher (Ryan, 2010). Due to the importance of their work, Moe (2011) believed that teachers receive a salary regardless of what the students learn and feels that teacher evaluations should be correlated with incentives. The importance of an

effective teacher is well-documented in research. “Teachers had three times as much influence on a student’s academic development as the schools they attend” (Ryan, 2010, p.2). However, distinguishing effective teachers from ineffective teachers remains a challenge. Moe (2011) felt that unions are against accountability and do not support consequences if teachers do not meet standards. Teachers do not want their salary linked to student learning, and unions do not want teacher performance to be measured (Moe, 2011). In spite of the knowledge that teachers make a difference, findings show that a lack of differentiation currently exists among the quality of teachers.

In Donaldson’s (2009) *No More Valentines*, she asserted that her analysis of teacher evaluations demonstrate that the majority of teachers are rated above average. The same lack of differentiation between teachers is currently occurring in Texas. According to Weiss (2012), less than 4% of teachers are rated anything less than “proficient” on the PDAS. This year, “state education officials told school districts to stop sending in PDAS results because the data gathered after the 2010-2011 school year indicated there was little variation in teacher appraisal results across Texas” (Weiss, 2012, p. 1).

According to the statistics in the five districts studied for *The Widget Effect*, those teachers with unsatisfactory ratings were less than .9% at the highest to zero at the lowest. “Almost no teachers were identified as delivering unsatisfactory instruction (Weisburg et al., 2009, p. 11). The inability to assess the instructional performance

...not only keeps our schools from dismissing poor performers, but also prevents them from recognizing the excellence among the top-performers or support growth among the broad plurality of hard-working teachers

who operate in the middle of the performance spectrum. Instead, the school districts default to treating all teachers as essentially the same, both in terms of effectiveness and need for development. (Weisburg, Sexton, Mulhern & Keeting, 2009, p. 2)

The lack of differentiation between teachers creates a challenge for several reasons. One is the inability to identify areas that need improvement. Another is the low morale of hard-working teachers who do not earn affirmation or rewards. Donaldson (2010) noted that leaders see many evaluations that were full of “vague, meaningless praise-and largely devoid of constructive criticism or concrete feedback” (p. 54). It often appears that after reading the teacher appraisal documents in a single district, all the teachers perform at nearly the same level of effectiveness. Donaldson (2010) discovered that “any school is likely to employ more underperforming teachers than its evaluation rating suggests” (p. 55). “The failure to assess variations in instructional effectiveness also precludes districts from identifying specific development needs in their teachers” (Weisburg et al., p. 6). More than 70% of the teachers surveyed indicated that their “recent evaluations did not identify any development areas and only 45% of those who did have development areas identified said they received useful support to improve” (Weisburg et al., p. 6).

Often the result of this inflated ratings issue, which causes the inability to distinguish poor teachers from strong teachers, is appraisers who are unwilling to use the appraisal process to differentiate between teachers and document the variations in quality. Bridges (1992) stated that “they ignored or overlooked the poor performance, filled written observation reports with glowing generalities such as: ‘I really enjoyed my visit’

(p. 148). Bridges (1986, 1992) found that the only occasion in which administrators took action was when teachers committed a grave, inappropriate action or when there was external pressure. Yariv (2009) found that “in half the cases investigated, principals preferred to ignore the difficulties until the serious nature of the failures forced a response” (p. 447). Donaldson (2010) found that inflated ratings of teachers “seriously limit the extent to which evaluation could improve instruction and achievement” (p. 55).

Administrators often choose the path of least resistance. Yariv (2009) asserted, “Some principals are extremely reluctant to discuss shortcomings with their incompetent teachers. Some principals simply cannot handle that stressful situation. They replace high professional standards with maintaining good relationships with their teachers” (p. 447). This is a common thread throughout the research on this topic. Donaldson (2010) cited the “culture of nice” (p. 55) as a detriment to effective appraisals.

The evaluation instrument is, at times, used as a way to affirm teachers. According to Strauss (2007), employees in any field are motivated by recognition of a job well done. People tend to work harder if they are recognized for their good work and if they feel valued. Some businesses affirm an employee’s job well done through newsletters, notes home to families, an evaluation, and department emails. In the business world, some employees are motivated by intrinsic factors. Additionally, according to Knowles (1980, 1984), adult learning is intrinsically motivated. Recognition can make employees feel appreciated, raise morale, and increase productivity (Gregory, 2012). Using affirmation to motivate is used in many fields, such as athletics, the business world, and in education.

Another explanation for the inflated ratings is the cultural norm in North America that encourages the belief that “everyone is a winner” (Osborne, 2012; Woodcock, 2010). In young children’s sports leagues, our society raises children to believe that everyone should win and often does not prepare young children and adolescents for reality, hard work, discipline, and constructive criticism. Over eagerness to create a positive experience for our youth fails to prepare them for life’s later challenges and may contribute to feelings of entitlement (Osborne, 2012). In our society, many have grown up with the notion that one should only receive positive feedback. However, the proper management of human resources and organizational improvement still depends on the diligence of the appraiser for noting and discussing areas that need improvement.

Utilizing a teacher appraisal to manage human resources can be challenging for a campus principal or school district for several reasons. Mead (2009) argued that the state laws and district policies severely limit principals’ ability to hire and fire teachers based on quality due to seniority and other policy factors. Yariv (2009) also discovered that “legal constraints and militant teachers unions prevent, in many cases, assistance from the court” (p. 448). Mead believed these policies prevent schools from having effective human resource strategies that are in the best interest of students, rather than adults (2012). Teachers and administrators may display apathy towards the appraisal process due to the dearth of sanctions for those who do not perform well. Although it is largely cited that in school districts, under 5% of the teachers are rated as “unsatisfactory,” “2.5 million hours” have still been devoted by principals to evaluate teachers (Reeder, 2012, p. 1). Teachers are not typically given raises for excellent performance, and very few are dismissed based on the evaluations. When growth plans and professional development

fail to assist the teacher in becoming competent, it is extremely challenging to dismiss them.

Dismissing a poor performing teacher is an expensive challenge. A plethora of cases exist across the nation of teachers maintaining their jobs, despite evidence of incompetence. Court cases and the appeals process is costly for school districts. In Illinois, terminating a tenured teacher costs an average of \$219,000 in legal fees (Reeder, 2012). For this reason, growth plans and remediation are tools that schools use in attempt to assist with teacher improvement. Educational reforms in Illinois dictate that any teacher who earns an “unsatisfactory” rating must be placed on remediation and receive coaching (Reeder, 2012). In Texas, any teacher who has a “below expectations” rating must have a growth plan with steps to improve by a specific deadline (PDAS Teacher Manual, 2012).

Many times, school districts avoid the expense of the appeals process. Even after a school district goes through the appeals process with a teacher, few of them result in dismissal (Reeder, 2012). It costs the district money, human resources, and time. Other school districts have resorted to paying off the remainder of the teacher’s contract (Reeder, 2012). In one case, the district paid \$30,000 for a teacher to be bought out of his contract and resign from his post, which is less costly than a full trial (Reeder, 2012).

According to the Chicago Tribune (2005), “Only two teachers a year, on average, get fired” (p. 1) for incompetence, out of 95,000 tenured educators. Only 7% of 876 school districts studied in Illinois made an attempt to dismiss a teacher in the last 18 years. Most districts do not attempt to dismiss underperforming teachers, and only two-thirds of those who try are successful. It can be extremely costly to fire an incompetent

teacher. Some districts wait for the teacher to retire while others arrange to pay a teacher to leave. The extreme challenge of dismissing a poor performing teacher is another reason for the perceived or actual apathy that appraisers have regarding the appraisal process.

One key factor in the success of the teacher appraisal process is the diligence of the appraiser (Toch, 2008). How an appraisal is implemented determines the quality of the system. Appraisers' attention to detail is crucial to the effectiveness of the intended continual improvement goal of PDAS. Donaldson (2010) emphasized the potential problem area of "lack of evaluator skill" and "lack of evaluator will" (p. 55). She asserted that "evaluators often lack specific knowledge about the content areas in which they evaluate teachers, especially at the secondary level (Donaldson, 2009, p. 55). Koppich and Showalter (as cited in Donaldson, 2010) found that "districts typically give little direction regarding what evaluators should look for. Instead of providing guidelines and rubrics about the substance of evaluations, districts are more likely to set out timelines and explain processes" (p. 55).

Another issue in productive evaluations is the lack of effective supervision. In *Change Leadership: A Practical Guide to Transforming Our Schools*, Wagner and Kegan (2006) stated that supervision should be "frequent, rigorous and entirely focused on the improvement of instruction" (p. 30). According to the authors, at times, the supervisor looks for compliance rather than rigor. The administrator fails to assess if the students are learning what the teacher is trying to teach.

Another scholar opposed to the current evaluation system is Sergiovanni (1992) who asserted that it is not effective. He stated:

Evaluation systems don't matter a nickel. They're one of the biggest wastes of time in the world, because it's not important what a person does the two times you're in the classroom observing him or her. When you're not there, teachers teach in ways that make sense to them according to the norms. (Sergiovanni, 1992, p. 48)

Peterson (2000) suggested that the ineffective appraisal practices are accepted by the staff. Several of the following authors also believe there is an urgent need for effective teacher appraisal practices. "Teacher evaluation is a disaster. The practices are shoddy, and the principles are unclear" (Scriven, 1981, p. 244). McLaughlin (1990) noted that "in most school districts, the norms and expectations that surround teacher evaluation preclude meaningful activity (p. 404). "Evaluators are mistaken if they assume they are observing the typical behavior of a teacher with the usual evaluation procedure" (Stodolsky, 1984, p. 17). Teachers "regard the practice as an institutional obligation to be endured rather than an opportunity to be seized" (Johnson, 1990, p. 266). Scriven's 1981 review of summative teacher evaluations stated that classroom observations should not be used just for evaluation purposes because having an observer in the classroom changes the dynamics of what occurs. Scriven (1981) also found that teachers do not find appraisal systems to be credible due to their incomprehensive nature. A proper evaluation system must also have as many sources of data as possible, according to Peterson, Stevens, and Ponzio (1998). It must also have "transparency of process and protection from political influences" (Peterson, 2000, p. 84). A balanced appraisal process should allow teachers to collect data from multiple sources.

Toch (2008) confirmed that there is much room for improvement with the current appraisal practices in schools, although some elements of each system are valuable. He

also believed that teachers ignore the appraisal system and that any teacher can put together a lesson that will earn high marks (2008). Toch stated that the “typical evaluation of a public school teacher” is “the traditional drive-by” and “involves a single, fleeting visit by a checklist toting building administrator” (2008, p. 1). Some principals do not conference with teachers to review results and determine areas in which improvement is needed. The appraiser rarely differentiates the amount of time spent with a low performing teacher as compared to a highly rated teacher (Weisburg et al., 2009). In Texas, the concern of differentiating for novice teachers is being addressed directly with the Beginning Teacher Induction Mentoring (BTIM) program (TEA, 2011). This program is designed to support new teachers through training and mentoring targeted to improve student achievement. This is one strategy Texas is using to address new teachers’ effectiveness.

In *Fixing Teacher Evaluation*, Toch (2008) discussed ways that teacher effectiveness and school quality can be improved. The author noted that some existing rating systems may not measure teacher effectiveness accurately and suggested utilizing peer reviews, as well as avoiding rating teachers based on students’ scores from standardized tests. He cited that most school districts

...lack a credible system of measuring the quality of student work.

Many other factors, including staffing practices that remove a school system’s incentive to take teacher evaluation seriously, and using teacher credentials as a proxy for teacher quality, have produced superficial systems that don’t relate to instructional quality or measure student learning. (Toch, 2008, pp. 32-37)

Stodosky (1984) reviewed the current teacher evaluation practices with a focus on observation. The author stated that the value of observation is an inadequate technique because it assumes that stability and consistency are necessary for effective teaching. The author noted data that demonstrate flexibility more accurately characterizes elementary teaching. Differentiating to meet student needs is a part of the PDAS appraisal system. Domain VIII, “Improvement of Academic Achievement of All Students,” implies differentiation (PDAS Teacher Manual, 2005, p. 11). Additionally, the requirement for variety is covered in the PDAS as it states, “Varied student characteristics and Differentiated Instruction” are both expected (PDAS Teacher Manual, 2005, p. 14). According to PDAS Domain III, the subcategories state that the teacher will monitor and assess students’ progress; use the data to align goals, objectives, and instructional strategies; vary instructional strategies based on the characteristics of students; give specific constructive feedback to the students; and provide opportunities for relearning (PDAS Teacher Manual, 2005).

Each teacher may have different needs from an appraisal system in order learn and improve. Zepeda and Ponticelli (1998) surveyed 114 teachers regarding their needs, wants, and expectations. Examples of best practices included “validation, empowerment, visible presence, coaching, and professionalism” (p. 1). Examples of worst practices included “dog and pony show, weapon, meaningless routine, fix-it list, and unwelcome intervention” (Zepeda & Ponticelli, 1998, p. 1). Wise and Darling-Hammons (1985) observed that teachers typically associate assessment/observation with evaluation and do not think the process assists them. A study of best practices, such as those mentioned

above, can assist teacher appraisers glean what is necessary to lead school educators towards a common vision for student achievement.

Effective Practices for Improving Instruction

Dufour (1991) asserted that the appraisal system can be made valuable as a systematic process to promote reflection and discussion. Supervision can be utilized as a powerful tool to promote staff development if the principal implements it well. Some of the important points are that “clinical supervision encourages the professional development and personal autonomy of the teacher” (Dufour, 1991, p. 75). It should be focused only on what is observed in the classroom, not on personality, and it requires “trust and collegiality” (Dufour, 1991, p. 75). Furthermore, principals must affirm the teachers’ efforts and acknowledge that not all attempts to improve instruction will be successful. Teachers’ efforts to improve should be viewed as an opportunity to improve and strengthen instruction and student learning (Dufour, 1991).

Dufour and Marzano (2009) suggested that developing “high-performing collaborative teams” is a more effective use of time (p. 65). They found that the excessive time spent evaluating and observing teachers was not a productive investment of time (Dufour & Marzano, 2009). Marzano (2003) stated that leaders must reflect on the intended content and objective of the coursework, how it is taught, and what learning students gain. Dufour and Marzano (2009) asserted that teacher collaboration is more impactful than the current supervision practices.

Shifting from supervision to capacity-building is the goal these authors believe should be a priority. Under the scenario of accountable, collaborative teams, there is an ongoing opportunity to discuss, disseminate data, and improve effectiveness. “The

repeated message from the research is that improving student achievement across schools requires more than competent individual teachers” (Dufour & Marzano, 2009, p. 67). They proposed that more time be spent on “working collaboratively with teams examining evidence of student learning” (Dufour & Marzano, 2009, p. 68). Anderson and Pellicer (2001) presented strategies for involving peer teachers in the teacher instructional supervision process through observation, modeling, and sharing. The authors stated that, if implemented well, this strengthens and improves teacher quality. Dufour (2009) believed in setting goals as a professional development community and stated that school leaders must have specific skills, such as “assessing needs and identifying problems” and “action planning” (p. 24).

Attinello, Lare, and Waters (2006) encouraged the use of teacher portfolios for professional development. Their study focused on the benefits of a portfolio-based teacher evaluation system. Findings indicated that educators perceived these as more accurate than brief observations. Bird (1990) agreed with Dufour and Marzano (2009) that a balanced and effective teacher evaluation process should include data from many sources. Bird (1990) also reflected on the possibilities with peer review for instructional teaching supervision.

Bloom (2007) suggested that that if the classroom observation protocol is well implemented, the model can have a significant role in school improvement. He stated that the purpose must be clear before commencing the program. He also found that classroom observations are useful in collecting data and impacting professional culture and student achievement.

Boyatzis, Cowen, and Kolb (1995) solidified the case for the collaborative and the reflective aspects of the teacher appraisal system. The authors concluded that teachers are most successful when plans are created through collaboration (Boyatzis, Cowen, & Kolb, 1995). Their work cited cases of self-observation and cultivating one's ability to analyze one's own performance (Boyatzis, Cowen, & Kolb, 1995). Brighton (2009) also confirmed the utility of PLCs and outlined how an educator or group of educators may work as a team in collecting data, analyzing it, and drawing conclusions. This leads to a change in instruction and professional development planning, which correlates with PDAS Domain VI, relating to professional development (PDAS Teacher Manual, 2005).

Danielson and McGreal, (2000) argued that teacher evaluation should be used to improve professional strategies and instruction. They attempted to identify a systematic approach to evaluating teaching strategies by helping teachers build their professional capacity through precise and supportive feedback. Ineffective teacher evaluation systems have come under pressure in the last two years with the push for documented student achievement. These researchers discussed the strengths and weaknesses of each type of approach. The report argued that the best approach is a combination of these methods: classroom observations, assessment-based on student learning and test results, and portfolios.

Another element of teacher evaluation is the link to further staff development. Dufour (1991) noted that the teacher observation/assessment process can be linked to staff development to supplement and complement the existing professional development program that is guided by the principal. Dufour (1991) also noted that supervision is known as the most potent instrument for teacher improvement, with the goal of

improving instruction. Dufour and Marzano (2009) studied classroom observation and found collaborative planning is more effective than traditional appraisal practices. Jackson (2009) encouraged the use of reflection and practice to improve instruction as opposed to terminating teachers based on students' test results. Jackson (2009) asserted that anyone can become a master teacher, which correlates with the reflective aspect of the PDAS process. She emphasized the importance of developing teachers through reflection and professional development (PDAS Domain IV) rather than dismissing the teacher (Jackson, 2009). Johnson (2004) concurred with the notion of developing teachers rather than dismissing them. He promoted collaboration, stronger bonds, investing in teachers' growth, and keeping quality teachers in the classroom, with good teaching as a priority (Johnson, 2004).

Dufour and Marzano (2009) suggested that teacher supervision and development would be more successful if school leaders would dedicate the hours used for pre-observation, observation, walk-throughs, post-observation conferences, and documentation in a more productive way. They asserted that principals should invest in creating

..structures to ensure collaborative team time focused on issues and questions that directly affect student learning, such as 'What evidence do we have that our students are acquiring the knowledge and skills we have agreed are most essential to their continued success?' (Dufour & Marzano, 2009, p. 65)

This strategy would promote the expectations of Domain III of PDAS by truly monitoring students to provide precise feedback. Additionally, the principal-teacher

relationship, trust, and respect also impact the potential for a high quality appraisal, collaborative process (Yariv, 2009).

One advantage of the current Texas PDAS system is that it takes into account adult learning characteristics, which contributes to a more effective system. Adult learners are typically self-directed and intrinsically-motivated (Knowles, 1980, 1984). The self-reflection and goal setting aspect of PDAS allow for the teachers to set their own goals. The Professional Learning Community process also promotes teacher engagement for improving instruction and collaboration with others in the school community to work towards a common vision.

Alternate Methods of Teacher Appraisal

Overcoming the challenges of the current appraisal practices is an issue at the forefront of education today. Donaldson (2010) cited that school districts are attempting to improve their ability to identify teachers who were making a difference in student learning. The Ohio teacher evaluation system is showing promise for increased teacher and student learning (Kane, Taylor, Taylor, & Wooten, 2010). The new system “mitigates some of the common problems with teacher evaluation” (Donaldson, 2009, p. 56). Cincinnati Board of Education and the Cincinnati Federation of Teachers worked together to create the new system (Donaldson, 2009). Donaldson’s (2009) review explained that the district focused on four domains: “planning and preparing for student learning, creating an environment for student learning, teaching for student learning, and professionalism” (p. 56).

Teachers were able to be part of the system and play a significant role as teacher evaluators for a three-year period. In this role, teachers serving in the role of appraisers

conducted three-fourths of the observations and administrators conducted one of the tenured teachers' four evaluations, which occur every five years (Donaldson, 2009). Novice educators and teachers in need of more guidance were evaluated with a different set of criteria, which differs from current practice in Texas, where all teacher groups receive the same evaluation instrument. The evaluators received training and passed a certification test. Calibration was ensured through two hours of training every 10 days to review standards. Teachers returned to teaching positions after three years serving as appraisers. Having multiple appraisers addressed the common challenge of limited time because the responsibilities were divided among more personnel. It also decreased the chance for accusations of personality conflicts between appraiser and appraisee.

However, Ellis (2011) found that administrators were skeptical of the peer evaluating system. Ellis (2011) noted that principals perceived it as ineffective. She discovered that many administrators did not think that the peer system was effective and that more professional development to improve instructional practices, observations, and evaluations was needed (Ellis, 2011). Ellis's (2011) recommendation was to study the topic more profoundly before determining its effectiveness. Although peer review helps teachers receive constructive criticism and recommendations for improvement, it may not replace an administrative evaluation. Teachers who are not performing well may only respond to supervisors' feedback (Reeder, 2012).

Differentiating between teachers is one aspect of the Texas PDAS evaluation system that needs to be further explored. The practice that all teachers need to be measured by the same document does not take into account the varying levels of teacher competency. Zepeda and Ponticelli (1998), Danielson and McGreal (2000), and

Anderson and Pellicer (2001) believed that it is incorrect to assume that all teachers should be evaluated in the same manner. Many Texas students receive modifications for their state assessment needs. Teachers may need the same type of differentiated opportunities with their appraisal because they are at all different stages in their instructional and professional development growth. Supervisors should individualize the support for teachers based on observations and data.

In some school districts, such as Cincinnati Public Schools, new and struggling teachers are evaluated under a different system than veteran teachers. Several other systems categorize teachers by their needs, such as new teachers and teachers who have demonstrated professional success. This practice of utilizing differentiated evaluation instruments and processes also affirms the successful veteran teachers. This enables the overwhelmed administrators to focus their time on the educators that are in need of growth and assistance. According to Mannat and Benway (1998), these systems also empowered veteran teachers to set their own goals and choose their own professional development plan.

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) uses a two-part appraisal system (Toch, 2008). Teachers create a portfolio of instructional materials, lesson plans, videos of lessons, reflections on the lessons, and evidence of collaboration. Secondly, teachers write essays to prove their subject matter expertise (NBPTS as cited in Toch, 2008).

Appraisal by Collaboration (ABC) is another system that empowers teachers to self-evaluate (TASB, 2009). In this process, teachers set their own goals and define students' needs. Teachers must meet with their appraiser to discuss and develop a

targeted question to focus their goal and ensure that it increases student achievement and aligns with district goals (TASB, 2009). Teachers gather in small group meetings to collaborate four times a year. Finally, they develop a professional portfolio (TASB, 2009). The summative conference of the ABC process includes the same job performance standards as PDAS. The teachers use a reflective process to determine the success of their teaching practice on student achievement. Those in favor of the ABC process perceive it as a process that provides teachers with relevant feedback on best practices (TASB, 2009). The ABC process promotes collegiality, continual learning, and teacher engagement.

In the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP), there are three main categories and 19 subgroups. The appraiser's role is to find the weaknesses and mentor the teacher to improve those areas (TASB, 2009). Some teachers perceive this as a positive and opine that it improves teaching. Others have negative perceptions about the time consuming tasks, the extra effort, and accountability (TASB, 2009). One teacher commented that she received the district ranking as a number on a page with no explanation or suggestions for improvement (TASB, 2009). The teacher felt that neither of those activities helped her to improve her instructional practices (NJEA, 2011). This implementation of the system was lacking communication, conferences, and feedback.

In Tennessee, the value-added model has been used for years (NJEA, 2011). The system has been in existence for approximately 15 years and is still undergoing changes (NJEA, 2011). According to Goe (NJEA, 2011), teachers would benefit from using portfolios, collaboration, professional development, and data-analysis discussions, among other elements.

In New York City District 2, one superintendent conducted “quarterly learning walks” with the campus principals to discuss each teacher’s work (Wagner & Kegan, 2006, p. 30). Principals developed individual plans for each teacher. In Tennessee and Pennsylvania, some principals conduct walk-throughs to observe instructional strategies and assess effectiveness (Bloom, 2007). Theoretically, that is the intent with the PDAS in Texas. The typical requirement for those on a formal observation is to have a 45-minute formal observation and at least two informal observations. The appraisers determine whether or not they conduct additional observations. Administrators have many other responsibilities, and the appraisal process can become another item to check off the to-do list versus a thoughtful and reflective process to improve instruction.

According to Donaldson and Peske’s review (2010), Five Town CSD and Main School District #28, have attempted to strengthen their evaluation system. They set a goal of improving high quality assessments and kept track of all due dates for teacher evaluations and followed up with campus administrators. “Administrators met with teachers before and after the appraisals” (Donaldson, 2010, p. 58). District leadership required the administrative team to share their first draft appraisals with another administrator before submitting the evaluation for a post-observation conference time. “This sharing has enabled administrators to clarify expectations, maintain consistency with one another, and ensure that their commendations and recommendations for improvement are accurate” (Donaldson, 2010, p. 58).

Focusing on frequent, informal evaluations and feedback is a priority for one charter school management organization, according to Donaldson and Peske (2010). “In this organization, teachers receive one-on-one and small group coaching” (Donaldson,

2010, p. 56). This type of appraisal process is more targeted to the individual needs of the teacher. This protocol also reflects a long-term process of observation and feedback rather than a one-time visit to the classroom. The ratio of teacher-to-evaluator was approximately six to one, allowing appraisers to spend up to five hours debriefing with teachers. This plan also reduces paperwork tasks from the principal's responsibilities to allow more focus on instruction. In contrast, the average teacher-to-evaluator ratio at an average size middle school is approximately 25:1 and can be above 60:1 at the high school level. Administrators are also challenged with many other tasks, such as a high volume of discipline issues, parent conferences, state mandated documents, and staff conferences.

Several districts in Texas are piloting new teacher evaluation systems. One challenge has been that not all students take the State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness (STAAR). Students in second grade and lower do not take the STAAR (Weiss, 2012). *Framework for Teaching*, designed by Charlotte Danielson, is one recently developed teacher appraisal system (Weiss, 2012). This system has some elements of PDAS, but they include more details about what is expected from teachers and evaluators and has a "history of producing something more like a bell curve" (Weiss, 2012, p. 1). Time will tell if these new systems will assist in differentiating effective teachers from ineffective teachers. The designer of *Framework for Teaching* is confident that her design will assist teachers in improving instruction, thereby impacting academic results (Weiss, 2012). Although there is inconclusive data on these new systems, stakeholders are searching for an improved appraisal system that accurately identifies

strong instructional practices and differentiates effective teachers from the ineffective teachers.

Regardless of the system used for teacher appraisal, the human factor will determine much of its effectiveness. In each of the examples, the system is meant to be an interactive process and not a one-time incident. Teacher appraisal is meant to promote teacher growth that will improve student achievement. Any of the instruments, if not well-implemented by a diligent appraiser, will become ineffective. The human element is also what makes it challenging to ensure that administrators are calibrated to attempt consistency in identifying quality teaching within the district, state, and nation. The appraiser is the common denominator in every traditional, observation-based system.

Professional Development and Planning

In Texas, under 21.401 of the Texas Education Code,

Teacher contracts must be for a minimum of 187 days of service.

Under Section 25.081, a school district must provide 180 days of instruction for students. How many of the remaining seven days are used for staff development is determined locally. There are not any state laws or rules regarding the days on which staff development is scheduled. The schedule is determined locally. A single planning and preparation period must be at least 45 minutes long. The 450 minute statute was written to allow districts that use block scheduling to have longer periods on fewer days. A classroom teacher, defined in Section 5.001 of the Education Code as an educator who teaches an average of four hours a day, is

entitled to 450 minutes in each two-week period for planning and preparation in blocks of not less than 45 minutes. Educators who teach less than an average of four hours a day are not entitled to a planning and preparation period under Section 21.404 of the Education Code. Planning and preparation period are typically 45 minutes every day or 90 minutes every other day. If the district provides more than 450 minutes of planning and preparation time in two weeks, the excess time could be allocated to meetings. However, the district may not require attendance at meeting during the minimum 450 minutes. (TEA, 2012, p. 1)

In a school in which a class period lasts 49 minutes, a teacher with six classes and one conferences period would be teaching 294 minutes a day with 49 minutes of planning time. In other high achieving countries, teachers are allocated more time to collaborate and develop professionally. Wei, Andrea, and Darling-Hammond (2009) conducted a study for the National Staff Development Council to examine professional learning opportunities for teachers in several high-achieving countries, such as Finland, Sweden, Japan, South Korea, Singapore, the United Kingdom, and Australia. They concluded that “in most European and Asian countries, less than half of a teacher’s working time is spent interacting with students” (p. 30). The rest of the teachers’ work day is spent learning and collaborating. Compared to the high achieving European and Asian countries, Texas teachers spent 17% of their day on planning time. Those in the other countries spend less than half of their working day with interacting with students (Wei, Andrea, & Darling-

Hammond, 2009). This contrasts with Texas teachers, who interact with students approximately 83% of each working day, with little time to collaborate or plan.

DuFour and Marzano (2009) and Brighton (2009), asserted that collaborative planning and action research create engaged adult and student learners. According to the Texas Education Code (TEC) 21.041(b)(4) and (9):

Number and Content of Required Continuing Professional

Education Hours: (a) Standard certificate. At least 150 clock hours of continuing professional education (CPE) must be completed during each five-year renewal period. Educators must complete a minimum of 20 clock hours of CPE each year of the renewal period. b) One semester credit hour earned at an accredited institution of higher education is equivalent to 15 CPE clock hours. (c) At least 80 percent of the CPE activities must be directly related to the certificate(s) being renewed. (TEA, 2012, p. 1)

This means, for Texas teachers, an average of 30 professional development hours are required per year. The goal is for teachers to develop skills and enhance their ability to help students learn efficiently.

Due to the limited time, school leaders must make the most efficient use of the time to impact teacher and student learning. It is well established that a teacher is the primary influence on a student's academic achievement. Additionally, there is a strong correlation between school leadership and student learning (Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003).

Building Leadership Capacity

An abundance of literature exists in which researchers, philosophers, and business entrepreneurs attempted to define and summarize what it takes to be an effective leader. Mid-Continental Research for Education and Learning researchers stated that “educators have long known intuitively that school leadership makes a difference” (2003, p. 2). The results from the McRel study (2003) suggested that there was a significant correlation between school leadership and student learning. One key factor in school success is the principal (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004). In the research, the main theme that emerged was the importance of identifying the instructional strategies that had a significant impact on student learning.

Richard Elmore, as cited in McRel’s research, found that knowing what to focus on is a key element to improving schools. In his report, *Knowing the Right Things to Do: School Improvement and Performance-Based Accountability*, Elmore stated,

Knowing the right thing to do is the central problem of school improvement. Holding schools accountable for their performance depends on having people in schools with the knowledge, skills and judgment to make the improvements that will increase student performance. (2011, p. 9)

Both Elmore and the McRel researchers emphasized that knowing the right focus is key to successful schools. In addition to correlating leadership and student achievement, the earlier studies by Walters, Marzano, and McNulty (2009) noted a strong correlation between specific teacher instructional strategies and student learning results. “Certain classroom and school practices can change a school’s passing rate from 50

percent to 72 percent” (Walters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2009, p. 6). Marzano and Waters (2009) found that “one of the greatest factors central office can contribute is to maintain a singular focus on improving instruction” (p. 6). Marzano and Toth (2012) asserted that an effective principal equals an effective teacher and that an effective teacher equals increased student achievement. School principals and assistant principals need to be aware that their focus and the classroom practices can make an enormous impact on school effectiveness.

Society is undergoing changes that place additional pressure on school leaders, with new accountability expectations, overflow of data, pressure from the public, and an overwhelming list of principal responsibilities (McRel, 2006). District and campus leaders cannot accomplish these lofty goals in isolation. The principal must be ready to share leadership, delegate responsibilities carefully, motivate others to optimize their talents, and work toward the common goal as a purposeful community (McRel, 2006). These findings spotlight the crucial importance of principal training, hiring, and succession planning. The principal’s leadership style influences both the decision making process and the culture of the campus.

Burns (1978) defined a leadership style called *transformational leadership*. This is a style in which the leader and subordinates go through a mutual process of elevating each other to a higher level. He defined transactional leaders as those who lead based on the common values and high ideals of the group members. His view is that the collaborative style of leadership is more successful, rather than working in competition and that the transformational leadership style is an ongoing process. The transformational leadership style may also “give people a sense of being connected to a

higher purpose” (Burns, 1978, p. 1). Burns’ style relates to the school principal’s need to collaborate with the staff to set a mission and vision for the school, as well as to give meaning to the teachers’ professional development goals. This theory promotes the belief that working together is more effective than working alone.

In the Texas Principal Competencies, these leadership strategies relate to the three domains expected of Texas school leaders: “School Community Leadership, Instructional Leadership, and Administrative Leadership” (TExES Principal Preparation Manual, 2012, p. 1). The leader must have a vision in order to take the campus to a higher level. The competency emphasizes that the principal “knows how to shape campus culture by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community” (TExES Principal Preparation Manual, 2012, p. 5). Competency four expects that principals know how to strategically plan to “enhance teaching and learning” and “ensure alignment of curriculum and instruction” (TExES Principal Preparation Manual, 2012, p. 8).

The instructional leadership provided by the principal and their assistants is, in part, demonstrated through the implementation of the PDAS system. The PDAS system has the potential to assist, mentor, and monitor teachers to meet their potential. The teacher evaluation system should also determine and identify which teachers are effective teachers. Principals and assistant principals must be adept at implementing the PDAS in a way that results in improved teaching and student success.

In Buchanan’s (2012) work, *13 Ways of Looking at a Leader*, she described several types of successful leadership styles. She asserted that successful leaders do not get off course with distractions and are able to interpret data to focus on what is

important. Emotionally intelligent leaders gain success with “awareness of one’s own feelings and the feelings of others” and are “expert managers of themselves and their relationships with others, and consequently they are masters of influence” (Buchanan, 2012, p. 74). The ability to manage relationships is a key factor in the successful implementation of the PDAS teacher appraisal system because the principal is walking a fine line between coach and evaluator. Some other successful leadership styles highlighted by Buchanan (2012) are: “authentic; mindful; no-excuse; resonant; servant; storytelling; and tribal” (p. 74). She noted that it is the leader’s job to bring together groups with divergent viewpoints in order to unite the groups towards a common vision. This is also a Texas principal competency, as stated in the Texas principal expectations, “The principal knows how to shape campus culture by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community” (TeXes, 2012, p. 5). Buchanan emphasized the importance of enhancing the strengths of employees and knowing one’s own individual strengths. When implemented with the strengths-based leadership style, the PDAS reflective appraisal system has the potential to assist teachers in refining the skills they excel in and strengthening their areas of weakness.

The Value of Perceptions

In *Perception is Reality: Your Strengths Matter*, Jackson suggested that people’s perception of effective leadership colors the way that they lead. She stated that “possessing a keen sense of self will help you to be an authentic leader” (Jackson, 2011, p. 115). Perceptions are important because “...while not all leaders possess distinguishable leadership traits or skill sets, certain commonalities are expected from all

leaders” (Jackson, 2011, p. 115). In his article, *Leadership and Perception*, Myatt (2012) described perception as “a belief, theory, hypothesis, feeling, appearance, opinion, observation, insight, awareness, or sensitivity” (p. 1). Administrators’ perceptions have been used in numerous studies to understand an issue from their perspective (Begum, 2009; Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2008; Robinson, 2010). School leaders have a global view of how systems are working in the school (Kells, 1991). Leaders’ perceptions inform how they act and how they implement the PDAS. For that reason, it is timely and relevant to analyze administrators’ perceptions to gain insight into this process.

One of the school leader’s key tasks is to set the culture and climate of the school. “A recent study on school climate and achievement suggest that principals can enhance student learning by developing goals that are accepted and supported by the staff and by implementing structures that support individuals” (MacNeil, Prater, & Busch, 2009, p. 1). “A trusting, authentic, collaborative atmosphere that results in professional growth of the teacher is often suppressed under rigid, non-collegial mandated teacher supervision” (Begum, 2009, p. 3). The theory that school culture, climate, and leadership capacity are critical elements for successful schools is not well-aligned with the managerial tasks that assistant principals and principals face daily. There are many barriers that administrators face when using the ideal iterative practices during the implementation of the appraisal process. to implementing the appraisal process using the ideal iterative practices.

The History and Role of the Assistant Principal

During the 1950s, due to the increasing demands on the principal, the assistant principal’s position became more prominent. The student population was growing, and

the principal's job became more complex and demanding. The assistant principal position was initially focused on mainly managerial responsibilities (Armstrong, 2004). There is an abundance of literature about the principalship, but there is a void of information about the role of the assistant principal (Glanz, 1993; Hartzell, 1993). Marshall (as cited in Mertz, 2006) analyzed the position and found that "the position is marked by role ambiguity, role conflict and role overload; focused on organizational maintenance" (Mertz, 2006, p. 5). Since the assistant principal's role originated to provide relief for the principal, the role continues to be defined largely based on the needs of the campus principal and how he or she delegates responsibilities (Golanda, 1994).

Historically, the role was dominated by clerical and discipline tasks, but it has begun to change from disciplinarian to staff developer, teacher coach, and instructional leader (Donaldson, 2010; Koru, 1993; Lunenburg, 2003). However, the job description of an assistant principal is currently still quite nebulous. The random nature of campus and student needs, rather than research of clear data, dictates the role of the assistant principal (Weller & Weller, as cited in Begum, 2009). Richard (2000) observed that the assistant principal has the most challenging role in American education. He noted that it is an underappreciated role with a heavy burden.

The assistant principal is a "ready source of potential leadership" (Daresh & Voss as cited in Mertz, 2006, p. 1); however, the full potential and talents of the assistant principal are often not utilized. Many secondary assistant principals are involved with assignments, such as scheduling, but they are never involved with the budget, teacher evaluation, or matters of curriculum and instruction (Erlandson, 1994). The assistant principal is not typically involved in leadership behaviors because the principal is the key

individual to initiate and be involved in school reform (Hogue et al, 1995). Erlandson (1994) suggested that other activities such as problem-analysis, staff development, evaluation, and resource allocation are all leadership related, but they are not typically assigned to an assistant principal. Holmes (as cited in Madden, 2008) described leadership as being about influence, inspiring others, and delegating tasks. Each of these skills needs to be developed by the assistant principal who aspires to be a principal.

The assistant principal's role as a "catch-all" that only alleviates the workload of the principal has begun to change (Begum, 2008; Hausman, Nebeker, McCreary, & Donaldson, 2010). Austin and Brown (1970) confirmed that the job description and actual daily requirements are very different; the job is not well-defined. The principal still maintains the final authority, although the assistant principal is often the person who interacts directly and daily with the students and teachers. There are many assistant principal expectations and responsibilities that are not listed in the job description.

Assistant principals are charged with many tasks. One primary responsibility of the job is the discipline in a school (Marshall, 1985). According to Glantz (1994), the constant and continuous reactive problem solving (e.g., handling disruptive students, dealing with parent and teacher complaints), along with administrative duties such as lunch duty, textbook inventory, etc., leave many assistant principals with low morale and general dissatisfaction with the position. Student discipline is often a pressing issue that must be immediately attended to and often interferes with agenda items the assistant principal may have scheduled for the day (Martinez, 2011). An assistant principal's duties may interfere with their ability to observe classrooms frequently and supervise teachers more closely. Indeed, this causes frustration and obstacles to developing more

leadership capacity in schools (Darling-Hammond, 2007; Liethwood as cited in Martinez, 2011). The requirements of discipline can interfere with the assistant principal's ability to give priority to instruction, professional learning, and visionary leadership.

Assistant principals often find that time spent on the job is not spent in the way they expect. Teacher supervision may be secondary to all the other fragmented tasks throughout the day. Other assistant principals reported spending working hours during their personal, off-contract time, yet still felt they were not satisfying all the responsibilities, despite their extra work (Hartzell, Williams, & Nelson, 1995).

With the multiple and growing list of responsibilities, many assistant principals find it challenging to make teacher supervision effective. One assistant principal described it this way, "It's the type of job that you can't really plan for. It's one that's almost reactive" (Hartzell, Williams, & Nelson, p. 43). Another assistant principal found it difficult to accomplish what attracted her into administration, "My goal was to be in the classroom helping teachers and to be informally evaluating them and helping them with their problems in the curriculum, but I never got there, as much as I'd like" (Hartzell, Williams, & Nelson, p. 43). The assistant principal's role is a demanding role with many responsibilities demanding time and attention.

Much of what is written in the research about the role of the assistant principal related to administrative, managerial, and custodial duties. However, in current practice, the role requires "focused, strategic and collaborative leadership" (Weller & Weller, 2002, p. 23). Recent accountability standards and changes in educational policy have "added responsibilities and accountabilities for all school personnel, particularly those holding leadership or administrative positions" (Weller & Weller, 2002, p. 23). Assistant

principals are just beginning to participate more in evaluating teachers, school-community relations, and developing new curriculum (Weller & Weller, 2002).

Celikten (2001) researched the role of secondary assistant principals and also found that most described the job as disciplinarian, as well as clerical. These tasks do not permit the assistant principal, who is an aspiring leader, the opportunity to participate in educational leadership decisions (Zellner et al., 2002). There are many challenges that assistant principals face today, such as apathetic students and limited parenting skills (Dauber & Epstein, 1993). Koru (1993) noted that daily activities are fragmented. Assistant principals are seldom charged with instructional improvement activities. The same issue is occurring in the field of education in other countries.

The challenge of changing the role of the assistant principal is not unique to North America. In Australia, assistant principals are called deputy principals. According to the New South Wales Deputy Principal Association (NSWDPA), their role has been traditionally a managerial role. The assistant principals have often been “forgotten leaders and a wasted educational resource in the educational system, with a role defined by managerial terms” (Cranston, Tromans, & Reugebrink, 2002, p. 2). The goal is to change that perception and use the deputy principal role as more broad, embracing all aspects of leadership, to include curriculum design and implementation, as well as finance and school law. In New South Wales, the NSWDPA has affirmed that the deputy principals will “display a high level of understanding about quality teaching and learning, curriculum, assessment, monitoring evaluating, as well as developing and sustaining a professional learning community” (Cranston, Tromans, & Reugebrink, 2002, p. 2).

Harvey (1994) argued that “the position and role of deputy principal has been a wasted educational resource in education systems” (p. 7). He described the role on focusing:

...on a mosaic of administrative routines which contribute to the maintenance of organisational stability in the school. The work of the deputy principals is largely defined by the needs of other school participants. This includes supporting the principal and the teachers, as well as providing for the welfare and maintaining the standard of behavior of students. Deputy principals have not been given responsibility for the curriculum and for leadership in the teaching-learning process.

Traditionally they have had little autonomy in the responsibilities they perform and have not been the initiators of school level change. They lack opportunities for self-expression and their contribution to maintaining the administrative routines of the school has become taken for granted. (p. 7)

“Assistant principals are constantly in reactive mode, juggling the tasks that need to be done” (Cranston, Tromans, & Reugebrink, 2002, p. 4).

Unfortunately, although there have been some changes in recent years, much has remained the same in the assistant principal’s job responsibilities. The assistant principal may be tied to the position of managing, whereas the principal is in the role of leading and initiating action. Denmark and Davis (2000) suggested that the assistant principal had fewer opportunities to practice leadership skills if the principal placed more emphasis on managerial duties. The assistant principal’s job description states that he or she must “Perform all other duties assigned by the principal” (Appendix C). Job duties include

assisting with bus loading, testing, and textbook distribution. These managerial tasks are not in alignment with leadership capacity-building. Many of the assigned duties do not give the assistant principal the needed experience for making educational leadership decisions (Zellner et al., 2002).

Kaplan and Owen (1999) affirmed the potential for the assistant principals to be involved in helping principals with more visionary tasks, such as instructional leadership. Calabrese and Tucker-Ladd (1991) asserted that assistant principals can be instructional leaders by promoting a collaborative atmosphere, promoting a positive culture, and enhancing instructional time. Weller and Weller (2002) observed that the assistant principal is perceived as a manager due to their typical discipline role and supervisory duties, while the role of “leader” belongs to the principal. Important skills required in the role of the assistant principal are time management, interpersonal skills, and the ability to inspire change. However, the role contains managerial, time consuming tasks that severely limited the ability to truly transform through leadership and further develop professional learning communities (Koru, 1993). Marshall (as cited in Mertz, 2006) analyzed the position and found that “the position is marked by role ambiguity, role conflict and role overload; focused on organizational maintenance” (Mertz, 2006, p. 5). The work of the assistant principal is “too often overlooked in terms of significance and prestige” (Panyako & Rorie, 1987, p. 1).

The written job description of an assistant principal lists only a few of the duties that the administrator performs. Some of the listed examples are:

1. Provide support and assistance to individual teachers when discipline problems arise in the classroom, on the school campus or any other time students are under school supervision;
2. Responsible for the inventory and distribution of text books;
3. Supervise the unloading or loading of buses each day;
4. Assist in the preparation of campus duty assignments; and
5. Perform all other duties as assigned by the principal (Assistant Principal Job Description, Appendix D).

The assistant principal's job description largely depends on the principal of an individual campus and how that administrator views their role in mentoring an assistant principal, as well as delegating true leadership tasks.

The official job description does not encompass all of the possible duties assigned, such as maintaining compliance with special programs (e.g., special education or English as a Second Language) or organizing campus-wide student assessments from the district and state. Additionally, it does not describe the daily fragmented activities (e.g., parent conferencing, liaison with areas businesses, oversight of clubs and sports activities, and building maintenance). The job functions described in the job description are mainly managerial when compared to the job description of the principal, which includes duties such as:

1. Act as the academic and administrative head of the school building and grounds; and

2. Supervise, direct and evaluate the services of the teachers assigned to him, the general instructional program, and classroom management (Principal Job Description, Appendix E).

The principal job description demonstrates who is ultimately in charge of ensuring that the academic goals are met.

According to Gerke's (2004) observations, the "assistant principals are in a precarious position" (p. 39) due to the great deal of responsibility, but lack of autonomous image. He asserted that four main practices helped him develop a solid reputation as an administrator: instructional leadership; improving student contact; being efficient; and planning ahead. He believed that the job consisted of more responsibilities than solely being a disciplinarian.

Shoho, Barnett, and Tooms (2011) compiled several studies on the complexity of the assistant principal's role. Each study recognized the importance of collaborating with the assistant principal in the creation of productive professional learning communities. Assistant principals are often utilized as managers and disciplinarians, although in high performing schools, they provided a professional support system (Shoho et al., 2011). Their work illuminated the challenges for the assistant principal to decrease the gap between the ideal role and actual responsibilities they held in the school system (Shoho et al., 2011). In summary, the goal is for the assistant principal to experience the responsibilities of an instructional leader, although this is often dependent on the principal's capacity-building mentoring.

Golanda (1994) asserted that the role of assistant principal is viewed in terms of the relationship with the principal. He believed that the role of support to the principal

and the delegated responsibilities from the principal may insufficiently prepare the assistant principal for the principalship. Some assistant principals choose to expand upon their assigned roles and take on a more active leadership role; however, this is often dependent upon the type of leadership direction that is permitted by the principal. Kelly (1987) believed that the assistant principal should be involved in as many aspects of running the campus as possible. This may be a distinction between what is assigned and dependent on the principal's view of collaborative leadership.

Hartzell (1993) summarized that the principal is viewed as a leader, whereas the assistant principal is viewed as a manager. The term, *assistant*, can be interpreted as a pejorative term and does not acknowledge the knowledge of the assistant principal (Cranston, Tromans, & Reugebrink, 2002). Panyanko and Rorie (1987) believed that the assistant principal “brings just as much educational, academic, and professional experience in the school administration to the job as the principal, and in some cases, a higher level of academic training and a respectable number of years of on-line job experience” (p. 7). Lack of positive identity in the job of assistant principal is “compounded by a lack of control over work duties, insufficient recognition, limited resources and opportunities and unfulfilled career expectations” (Panyako & Rorie, 1987, p. 7).

In some school districts, there is a distinction in title between assistant and associate principal. Bates and Shank (1983) asserted the title change could help so that others would perceive the assistant principal role as a role which shares authority and responsibility for making decisions. They felt that the change in title also enhances the associate's self-esteem, status, and image with the community. Redefining the role of the

assistant principal is imperative, as the change in public schools demands a more visionary and transformative style leadership (Bates & Shank, 1983). Some districts differentiate between assistant principal and associate principal (Appendices C and D). Two of the additional responsibilities noted in the sample district's associate principal job description are, "Assist the principal in advising one or more assistant principals" and "Provide support to the principal in problem-analysis and solutions in involving students, parents and staff" (Appendix D). These additional responsibilities consist of higher leadership capacity-building rather than exclusively managerial or clerical responsibilities.

Preparing Assistant Principals for the Principalship

According to research by the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), there is a lack of long-term planning to properly recruit and place effective principals (Schmidt-Davis & Bottoms, 2011). Yearly, SREB estimates that 18,000 principals leave vacancies in K-12 schools and that the school principal is a critical human resource in an effective school (Schmidt-Davis & Bottoms, 2011). High performing school districts are known to promote from within (Schmidt-Davis & Bottoms, 2011). Therefore, it is critical to ensure that the upcoming leaders on each campus are well-trained, have a wide range of experiences, and develop the proper leadership characteristics to lead a school. It requires effective mentoring by the campus principal. Principal succession planning cannot be short-sighted.

Kelly (1987) believed that the assistant principal should take on as many aspects of leadership as possible to prepare for the role of principal since the position is seen as an entryway to the principalship. On many campuses, the assistant principal's duties now

include teacher supervision (Scoggins, 1993). Marshall and Mitchell (1991) also suggested that the assistant principal role is a steppingstone to the principalship. Whether or not the assistant principal position is a proper training ground depends greatly on the mentoring by the principal (Johnson-Taylor & Martin, 2007).

“The belief that traditional models of administrator selection, based largely upon anointment and a conviction that ‘good teachers make good administrators’ is no longer viable (Renihan & Leonard, 2000 p. 1). Calabrese, Short, and Zepeda (1996) reported that the role of the principal has changed dramatically when compared to past generations. The issues that the current principal encounters require innovative thinking and new skill sets (Calabrese et al., 1996). It is not just an issue of a shortage of candidates; it is also a question of finding the right, qualified candidates to fulfill this new role.

Principals are continually replaced, many times by a leader who is inexperienced (Fuller as cited in Bartlett, 2011). Leithwood et al. (2004) stressed the critical importance of the principal in student and school success. Therefore, the planning for principal replacement is crucial for school districts. Oliver (2005) argued that with the increasing demands on the principal, it is urgent that the assistant principal participate in professional growth. This will ideally increase the assistant principal’s competency, as well as inspire them to become principals (Oliver, 2005).

The assistant principal role is the “position from which the overwhelming majority of principals is drawn” (Denmark & David as cited in Mertz, 2006, p. 1). Mertz (2006) noted that it is important to reflect on how and to what extent the assistant principalship prepares the candidate for the role of principal due to the role the position

plays as a stepping stone to the principalship. Hartzell (1993) reported that there are a great variety of administrative environments. Mertz (2006) reported that “bureaucratic organizations are particularly committed to enforcing group norms (p. 7). Furthermore, Mertz (2006) asserted that the goal of socialization of an assistant principal is to ensure the person “will perpetuate the organization *as it is*” (p. 7). The notion that the assistant principal will be socialized into perpetuating norms demonstrates how important leadership practices are. It shows that how others perceive the professional appraisal process will affect how the assistant principal implements the PDAS tool.

According to Koru (1993), the training of an assistant principal for the role of principal is limited. For an assistant principal aspiring to be a principal, she needs to develop a skill set that may not be developed in the assistant principal role. Koru (1993) asserted that the role of principal requires a person “to embrace envisioning, knowledge of the curriculum and instruction, and the power to move others to commit to innovative solutions” (p. 71). Leadership encompasses influence, persuasion, and motivation as compared to management, which is about following mandates and instructions (Holmes, as cited in Madden, 2008).

The assistant principal’s role may not be a career path step to the principalship. Hartzell (1993) noted concerns that the assistant principal’s duties regarding maintenance and operations leave them with fewer opportunities to practice educational leadership, which is a key role as the campus principal. Campus principals are beginning to require more involvement from their assistant principals in instructional leadership for school level change (Harvey, 1994). According to Gorton and Kattman (1985), assistant principals wish for a “greater sense of shared responsibility” (p. 39). Assistant principals

can be a vital resource (Oliver, 2005). Most educators who accept the role of assistant principal do so as a career stepping stone to the principalship. However, Marshall (1992) found that this position does not prepare them well for the principal role.

Renihan (1999) researched the motivations of those wishing to take on the principal role. The opportunity for new challenges was the most frequent response (16%), next was the opportunity to help children/adults (14%), then the opportunity to influence change and make a difference (11%). Also named at the top of the list was the opportunity to influence school effectiveness. In *The Seven Principals of Sustainable Leadership*, Hargreaves and Fink (2003) reported that in order for leadership to be sustainable, a key force is planning for leadership succession. The authors noted the importance of the current leader in “grooming their successors” (Hargreaves & Fink, 2003, p. 2).

Visionary principals need to be cognizant that their role in the school is temporary, so they must plan for the school to achieve academic success after they transition from the role. Hargreaves and Fink (2003) further suggested that the school and district planning should include succession plans as a part of regular operations. Mentoring, coaching, opportunities for net-working, and support systems are also part of their recommended plan for success (Hargreaves & Fink, 2003). Fast principal rotation, due to reasons such as retirement, fatigue, and promotion, has created a shortage of well-prepared leaders (Hargreaves & Fink, 2003). The assistant principalship should be more thoughtfully used as training ground for the principalship.

Golanda (1991) observed the need for a shift in thinking. Golanda (1991) argued that the

...mistaken notion that mere experience within the atmosphere of the school and occasional observation of leadership behavior, regardless of its relative strength or weakness, might result over time in the acquisition of requisite knowledge, skills and attitudes required for such leadership position. (p. 274)

Golanda felt that this practice did not produce the desired results.

Calebrese and Tucker-Ladd (1991) proposed that “mentoring may provide a valuable option for deputy principals (known in the United States as assistant principals) wishing to move into the role of principal” (pp. 68-69). They felt that the principal can be enabled to facilitate the professional development of the assistant principal. The principal must be secure, confident, and willing to delegate and share in decision-making (Bates & Shank, 1983). Sharing power and empowering assistant principals is essential for the principal’s success. Kaplan and Owings (1999) noted that the workload of the public secondary school principal is becoming increasingly unmanageable and that the principal needs to share the role of instructional and curriculum leader to meet the challenge.

According to Goodson (2000), a large group of aging principals is a great concern, as 60% are eligible for retirement. Consequently, there will be a shortage of qualified candidates to fill the school principal role. It has also been cited as the reason that candidates are assigned to the role of principal before they have adequate leadership experiences (Bloom & Krovetz, 2001). Assistant principals are in their role for shorter periods of time and have little or no experience with certain aspects of leadership, such as budgeting and curriculum (Madden, 2008). The Institute of Educational Leadership

(2000) also addressed the issue of principal shortages. When surveyed, 50% of the superintendents expressed that they were experiencing a shortage of qualified candidates. One reason the new administrators received insufficient training was the rush to fill vacancies. Goodson (2000) asserted that the assistant principal position and its purpose are two-fold: (1) to help manage the campus and (2) to provide the administrator with leadership experiences as a future school principal. Goodson (2000) and Madden (2008) concurred that the preparation of future principals is important for the continuity in school leadership, and the assistant principal role is the main position in which to have relevant experiences to prepare for the role of principal. Fields (2002), Goodson (2000), and Mertz (2000) concluded that the assistant principal role does not always give the candidate the opportunity to develop their skills to become principals. For this reason, further research is needed to improve principal preparation programs.

Fields (2002) reported that “the ambiguity of the role allows for ineffective use of this position and makes it a particularly difficult role to fill” (pp. 2-3). Koru (1993) found that “during the time a future principal spends as an assistant principal, he or she is engaged in activities that offer little preparation for the kind of leadership expected of principals” (p. 71). In 1995, Hartzell, Williams, and Nelson argued that

the nature of the assistant principalship and the skills required to be successful as an (assistant principal) are oriented much more toward management than toward leadership, a condition that does not promote the development of visionary leadership in its occupants. (p. 158)

In a study by Cranson, Tromans, and Reugebrink (2002) on the assistant principal’s role (known in the study as deputy principal), 49% of the respondents answered that they had

the intention to seek a promotion to the principalship. Of those who did not want to pursue the principalship, their reasons were varied: 13% felt the role of principal was too demanding; 28% did not want the position due to lifestyle decisions of work/home/family balance being more manageable as the assistant principal; 15% felt the assistant principal role was closer to the teaching-learning context; and 23% responded that the principal has too much accountability with insufficient authority.

In a study by Cranson, Tromans, and Reugebrink (2002), assistant principals indicated the negative effects of their heavy workload included no time for professional development and no chance to take a vacation. Eighty percent indicated the pressure they felt in their role was high, and 70% felt it had increased in recent years. Some reasons given for the increase in pressure were: behavior management, challenging parents, staffing issues, low morale, and other accountability issues. The majority indicated that the work hours have increased, as well as the variety of responsibilities. When indicating the amount of time spent in a typical week on a certain task, student issues involved the greatest amount of time at 94% and management/administration came in a close second at 91%. Educational/curriculum leadership and strategic leadership and strategic leadership came in last, with 63% and 62% respectively. Cranson, Tromans, and Reugebrink (2002) indicated that leadership and management skills are crucial to their assistant principal role. Since half of the respondents indicated a desire to seek promotion to the role of principal, this once again, emphasizes the need for the assistant principalship to be developed in the leadership role.

Madden (2008) conducted a study researching the tasks involved in preparing an assistant principal for the role of principal. She discovered that while there was some

correlation between the current responsibilities of the assistant principal and the needed skills for the principalship, preparation was lacking in several areas. Madden (2008) revealed that leading the staff personnel was “ranked as the most important task that an assistant principal should perform prior to becoming principal” specifically, under that category, was “securing and maintaining the human resources necessary” (pp.73-74). This includes appraising the staff effectively and encouraging professional growth in teachers. Secondly, she found that instructional leadership ranked second, and the assistant principal needs to have experience in promoting staff development. These findings demonstrate that the managerial tasks common to the role of the assistant principal are not enough to develop them for the transformational leadership tasks needed to inspire others to achieve the common vision of the school (Burns, 1978).

According to Glantz (1994), many assistant principals expressed low morale and general dissatisfaction due to the multitude of managerial tasks. The obstacles associated with the assistant principal position stem from the current transition to emphasize leadership capacity in schools (Darling-Hammond, 2007; Leithwood, 2010). The tasks required of the assistant principal are not aligned with the problems identified by future principals. A disconnect exists between what is needed and the outdated system. New goals and initiatives set by the assistant principal, such as developing instruction and refining leadership skills, are often unmet due to the failure to account for the reality that an assistant principal encounters on a daily basis (Pounder & Crow, 2005).

Developing a future principal depends greatly on understanding the role that the campus leader has in helping the assistant principal gain the necessary skills to transform from manager to leader. Proactive principals are those who understand their role in

developing future leaders (Leithwood, 2010; Tschannen-Moran, 2011). The proactive principal also realizes that the role of assistant principal can be transformed from process manager to instructional leader, as the transformation of the school organization takes place (Leithwood, 2010).

The Role of the Principal

The United States National Policy Board for Educational Administration (Thomson as cited in Erlandson, Stark, & Ward, 1993) identified 21 domains outlining the role of what is involved in the work of the principalship. Among them were: leadership; information collection; problem analysis; judgment; organizational oversight; implementation; curriculum design; staff development; measurement and evaluation; motivating others; policy and political influences; resource allocation; and public/media relationships. The role of the principal has changed over the years. Legislation and educational reform have changed the public school system, thereby impacting the job description of the principal.

“There seems to be a general consensus of opinion that many of what were considered fundamental practices of the principalship in the 1980s will be of markedly different priority in the 2000s” (Kaiser as cited in Renihan & Leonard, 2000, p. 4). The role of the principal is a complex one. Knezevish (1984) categorized the role of the principal into its varied responsibilities, such as the communication link between student, teachers, parents and the system; the instructional leader; the catalyst to stimulate better performance; the resource manager; the disciplinarian; the project manager; and the counselor. Many would agree that there are no predictable days in the life of a principal.

According to Barth (1990), a principal who attempts to run a school alone will not be successful. He asserted that the principal must develop a community of learners by sharing authority and professional decisions, as well as articulating the vision of the school and celebrating successes. Barth (1990) suggested that “the most critical role is as the head learner, engaging in the most important enterprise in the school house” (p. 46). Although the concept of shared leadership has gained in popularity, the principal is still viewed as the main leader of the school. Sergiovanni (1991) described leadership as “acting as the guardian to protect the institutional integrity of the school” (p. 88). Sergiovanni (2000) believed that for a leader to be effective, the leader must be servant-oriented, looking for ways to help others reach the common vision. Sergiovanni (2001) believed the basis of the principalship is in building a community of learners so that teachers may grow and develop. Little (1987), Fullan and Hargreaves (1991) promoted the notion of professional and collaborative cultures that empower teachers. Short and Greer (1997) further emphasized empowerment as a key element of effective schools. Rosenholtz (1989) noted the positive impact of teachers, realizing that their input and feedback is valued.

The job of the principal is one of constant interruptions (Samentz, 1996), lack of time, fragmentation of activities, and conflicting demands (Renihan, 1985). Fullan and Hargreaves conducted a study which demonstrated that 90% of principals responded that their work level had increased. Evans (1996) found that the “explosion of demands decreases a school leader’s sense of efficiency and heightens their feelings of isolation, staff and student involvement, and social services” (p. 1). These feelings can be somewhat alleviated by the use of effective shared leadership with the assistant principal.

Marshall and Greenfield (1985) suggested that responsibility for instruction be a major component of the assistant principal's duties. In order for assistant principals to be prepared for the role of principal, principals must mentor them and provide them with opportunities for growth (Calabrese & Tucker-Ladd, 1996). Leadership development can be enhanced when the appropriate opportunities exist early in the administrator's career (Daresh & Playko, 1992).

In Cypress-Fairbanks Independent School District, leadership developed a guiding framework of which characteristics are needed in an effective administrator, called a *Portrait of a Cypress-Fairbanks Administrator* (2008). The expectations listed in the portrait include: creative visionary, effective communicator, dedicated professional, lifelong learner, and inspiring catalyst. These high expectations encompass much of what is expected in the role of the principal. Additionally, the TExES Principal exam consists of many domains which outline the minimum competencies required before a candidate can become certified as a principal in the state of Texas.

The general themes of the domains are: I. School Community Leadership, II. Instructional Leadership, and III. Administrative Leadership. Competency one states that the "principal knows how to shape campus culture by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community" (TExES, 2012, p. 5). Competency two states that the "principal knows how to communicate and collaborate with all members of the school community, respond to diverse interests and needs, and mobilize resources to promote student success (TExES, 2012, p. 6). Competency three expects that the "principal

knows how to act with integrity, fairness, and in a legal manner” (TExES, 2012, p. 7).

Instructional Leadership is covered in Domain II:

- Competency four dictates that the “principal knows how to facilitate the design and implementation of curricula and strategic plans that enhance teaching and learning; ensure alignment of curriculum” (TExES, 2012, p. 8).
- Competency five addresses that the “principal knows how to advocate, nurture, and sustain an instructional program and a campus culture that are conducive to student learning and staff professional growth” (TExES, 2012, p. 9).
- Competency six requires that the “principal knows how to implement a staff evaluation and development system to improve the performance of all staff members, select and implement appropriate models for supervision and staff development, and apply the legal requirements for personnel management” (TExES, 2012, p. 10).
- Competency seven expects that “principal to know how to apply organizational, decision-making, and problem-solving skills to ensure an effective learning environment” (TExES, 2012, p. 10).

Administrative leadership is covered in Domain III:

- Competency eight states that the “principal knows how to apply principles of effective leadership and management in relation to campus budgeting, personnel, resource utilization, financial management, and technology use” (TExES, 2012, p. 12).

- Competency nine expects the “principal to know how to apply principles of leadership and management to the campus physical plant and support systems to ensure a safe and effective learning environment” (TExES, 2012, p. 13).

These are all lofty expectations of the principal. Calabrese, Short, and Zepeda (1996) asserted that the principalship has changed greatly over the generations, and this requires new ways of thinking. Principals are expected to be leaders, not mere managers (MacNeil & Yelvington, 2005).

Assistant principal leadership development is a key aspect for the continuity and success of a school. Through collaboration, regardless of the presence of a consistent principal, others must be empowered so they are inspired to work towards the vision, especially due to the need for sustained leadership. Debbie Campbell, a director at Buckeye Association of School Administration, stated, “A system that improves the performance of a principal will improve the performance of the teachers and will improve the performance of students” (O’Donnell, 2012, p. 1). “The single most effective way to improve student learning, at scale, is to put good principals in schools” (O’Donnell, 2012, p. 1). Tozer believed that “fostering an environment in which the teachers want to learn, as well as teach, is key” (Tozer as cited in O’Donnell, 2012, p. 1).

A visionary principal works to mentor teachers, paraprofessionals, support staff, and assistant principals to achieve the vision of the school and reach their full potential. The campus principal is critical in preparing the assistant principal for their future to lead the campus. Most principals were assistant principals before reaching their post (Bloom & Krovetz, 2001). Essentially, the principal holds the passport of the assistant principal

and largely determines their ability to ascend. If the assigned role responsibilities are limited, the assistant principal will not comprehend the big picture of how to lead a school (Bloom & Krovetz, 2001; Powder & Crow, 2005). Johnson-Taylor and Martin (2007) affirmed that assistant principals need guidance as they develop towards becoming principals. They asserted that principals need to spend time and effort to build capacity with targeted, intentional goals that extend beyond just working side-by-side. If the given responsibilities are too limited, the assistant principal will not be seen as an instructional leader of the school (Marshall, 1985).

Assistant principals need feedback to guide them on their career path (Johnson-Taylor & Martin, 2007). The principal needs to assist in indoctrinating the assistant principal (e.g., working together to complete the teacher evaluations), so that the campus vision is established with inter-rater reliability. In interviewing principals on the topic of capacity building of assistant principals, several strategies emerged: always speak positively about their assistant principals to staff members, build a consensus, and involve the assistant principal in all aspects of running the school (Johnson-Taylor & Martin, 2007). Assistant principals will learn from what Pounder and Crow (2005) call “behind-the-scenes.” Much of what the principal must do is learned on the job, through experience, and not by observation. Principals need to allow the assistant principal to lead. The other strategies emerging from the principal interviews were: allow the assistant principal to hear how a decision was made, have difficult conversations, provide professional development, and cheer for the assistant principal (Johnson-Taylor & Martin, 2007).

The role of the principal is to lead, not to manage. Unfortunately, many assistant principals' roles prepare them only to be efficient managers. In order to lead a school, the culture and professional community must guide all of the staff towards achieving the vision and goals. The role of the appraiser is to promote effective teaching, guide instructional leadership, and provide feedback to teachers.

Lezotte and McKee (2006) promoted the use of collaboration as a means to school improvement and stressed that leaders must go beyond sound management. "People don't want to be managed. They want to be led" (Lezotte & McKee, 2006, p. 15). Positive rapport, collaboration, and frequent targeted teacher and leader conversations with trustworthy appraisers promote student achievement. Marzano (2005) invoked the term, *trust*, as an important factor in school leadership.

Trustworthiness, competence, forward looking, and enthusiastic are all traits mentioned as necessary for leading (Lezotte & McKee, 2006). For a principal, this means that they must do what they say, and their word must have integrity. A principal cannot make decisions impulsively, or they may lose their followers when a decision needs to be changed due to lack of forethought. Lezotte and McKee (2007) also suggested that the leader needs to create the inclusive and collaborative process. The first task is to "facilitate their involvement with, commitment to and collaboration in support of continuous school improvement" (Lezotte & McKee, 2007, p. 69).

Reflecting on the goal of facilitating the staff's collaboration, one discovers the challenges in the role of serving as principal. Drake and Roe (1986) discovered that while principals want to develop programs and staff, they spend most of their time on school management and administrative detail. The authors reviewed job descriptions

versus the reality of the job and found that the handling of management detail, discipline, and evaluation were given high priority by the executive leadership. While there are many factors that prevent principals from instructional leadership and staff development, principals know their value and attempt to accomplish both goals. The mission and vision of a campus cannot be met in isolation; therefore, creating a professional culture and working to be an effective leader are keys to the success of a principal and their campus.

There are many elements needed to achieve effective leadership. The International Center for Leadership in Education highlighted the Daggett System for Effective Instruction (2012). The system has three main themes: organizational leadership, instructional leadership, and teaching. According to their system, some of the main focuses for effective organizational leadership are: creating a culture, establishing a shared vision, aligning support, and building leadership capacity.

Building leadership capacity may be achieved through the effective use of assistant principals and teacher leaders. The Daggett System also promotes the use of data to make decisions and using research to establish urgency for high expectations. Dufour (1991) highlighted the importance of the principal as the staff developer, as well as connecting the staff development to teacher supervision. The use of professional collaboration to meet student needs also promotes a collegial atmosphere. Positive school culture and professional learning communities are an antidote to assist in turning around this dearth of reflective practice. Unfortunately, the well-researched theories of creating a professional school culture and collegiality are not well aligned with the daily managerial tasks faced by principals.

Every campus has its own culture. “Schools also have their own unique cultures that are shaped around a particular combination of values, beliefs and feelings” (Hanson, 2001, p. 641). This may translate to ensuring that students pursue higher education or having a winning team. “Although the culture of a school is not visible to the human eye, its artifacts and symbols reflect specific cultural priorities” (Hanson, 2001, p. 641). The campus leader guides and influences these priorities.

MacNeil and Maclin (2005) believed that “principals must gear the students, faculty, and staff in a common direction and provide sets of norms that describe what they should accomplish” (p. 1). Sergiovanni (as cited in MacNeil & Maclin, 2005) elaborated on the principal's influence in shaping school culture by stating that, “Once established in a school, strong culture acts as a powerful socializer of thought and programmer of behavior” (p. 1).

Creating a positive learning atmosphere that supports teacher and student learning is a crucial element of school leadership. “Principals are in an advantageous position to strongly influence the outcome of this struggle” (MacNeil & Maclin, 2005). Principals must deliberately set out to influence the culture into a shared vision which, in turn, motivates staff in the same direction. Strong school leaders use collaboration as a tool to develop school culture and bind the staff together. They must also incorporate the values and beliefs into their school by working together to form a common purpose.

Newman and Wehlage (1995) observed that successful schools are those in which the staff members are working as professional communities and take responsibility for the students' achievements. McEwan (2003) asserted that the vision statement should include ideas from everyone that will build a consensus of the school community's

direction. Sergiovanni (2001) suggested that a bonded staff with shared ideas needs a principal to strengthen the efforts through connections and collaboration. The principal's role is to promote an environment of ongoing collaboration that supports learning. Each of these works of literature emphasized the need for alignment between the theory of what needs to be done to build a supportive, collaborative atmosphere and leadership capacity in schools.

With the current scarcity in candidates for the principalship and the ongoing retirement of the Baby Boomer Generation, it is urgent that assistant principals are well trained to assume the campus leadership role (Bartlett, 2011). Planning for the principal replacement takes forethought and consideration of the many skills needed for successful schools, community building, and collaboration. School leadership must be cognizant of this as they envision the future of each campus and prepare for succession planning.

Chapter 3

Methodology

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to compare and contrast principals' and assistant principals' perceptions of the PDAS in order to determine similarities and differences, building on previous work conducted by Begum (2008) and Robinson (2009). Begum's 2008 study, *Assistant Principals and Teacher Supervision: Roles, Responsibilities, and Regulations* and Robinson's 2009 study, *Principals' Perceptions Regarding the Role of the Professional Development and Appraisal System in Teacher Supervision in Texas* were used to compare and contrast the perceptions of the two populations.

This study used the results of the previous studies to analyze the differing responses of both convenience samples. In both cases, the instrument used to survey the participants was identical. No new statistical treatment took place in this study.

In this comparative study, the researcher used a descriptive model to compare and contrast the data, made inferences, and assessed how the responses aligned or did not align with the existing literature about the roles of assistant principal and principals. The researcher also determined if the emerging themes in the data correlated with the research.

The goal was to improve the effectiveness of teacher appraisal practices and build leadership capacity. According to the researchers at McRel (2011), having an effective principal at the head of every school is a major key to ensuring that schools are effective. Having strong leadership is second only to classroom teaching as an influence on learning (McKinsey & Company, 2007). Leithwood et al. (2010) also concurred that

leadership is second only to classroom instruction among all school related factors that contribute to what students learn in school.

The existence of an effective teacher appraisal practice is critical to improving student learning (OECD, 2009; Weisburg et al., 2009). The appraisal practice has several purposes. It serves as a guide to develop professional development plans and provides authentic feedback to the teacher. It is an evaluation tool that rates teacher effectiveness. The goal is for the teacher to learn new skills and strategies targeted at their weaknesses, thereby improving student learning.

There is a misalignment between assistant principals' training, their job expectations and their future role as principals. Often, the assistant principal's duties as disciplinarian and manager do not lend themselves to providing a proper training ground for the role of campus instructional leader (Bartlett, 2011; Koru, 1993). Building leadership capacity in assistant principals depends largely on the philosophy of the campus principal and the way the principal delegates leadership tasks (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2011). Without proper leadership experience, educators remain stagnant and unprepared to lead. Fuller (2009) asserted that, many times, a new campus leader is inexperienced and unprepared to lead. The experience of working as an assistant principal may not be the most productive setting for future principals to gain the necessary leadership skills (Bloom & Kravets, 2001). The process for developing instructional leadership is vitally important.

Even though there is extensive research on teacher supervision and appraisal systems that indicate their lack of effectiveness, principals continue to employ practices that demonstrate ineffectiveness (Wagner & Kegan, 2006). Unfortunately, much of what

school administrators practice is mandated by the state, and is not within their power to modify these mandates. Additionally, the perspective of each administrator, based on their experience, age, years of experience, ethnicity, campus population, and other factors, mold how they implement and perceive the PDAS. Begum (2008) and Robinson (2009) conducted studies to determine the factors that principals' and assistant principals' perceptions of PDAS. Both studies used the same cognitive interview instrument. One study conducted the interviews with principals and the other with assistant principals regarding the effectiveness and practices of the Professional Development and Appraisal Process.

The purpose of this study was to analyze, compare and contrast how principals and assistant principals perceive the purpose, effectiveness, and implementation of PDAS building on the work of Begum (2008) and Robinson (2009). This study was a comparative study to determine similarities and differences in the perceptions. Often, the way that the instrument is implemented depends on the evaluator, their training, and personal philosophy. This study may strengthen preparation programs of principals and assistant principals by analyzing and comparing their perceptions. Chapter 3 describes the methods used to investigate these inquiries and is organized by the following sections: Research Design, Participants, Instruments, Procedures, Data Analysis, Reliability, Validity, and Limitations.

Description of the Research Design

Archival data from a larger survey project was used to conduct this study (Waxman, MacNeil, & Lee, 2006). No new statistical treatments were applied to the survey results. Two studies regarding assistant principal and principal perceptions of

PDAS were used to analyze the participants' responses and search for common and disparate themes. In addition, the researcher analyzed contrasting responses that reflected a departure in the philosophical framework of adult learning and the two job roles. The original survey was designed and implemented by senior faculty members in the Educational Leadership Department of a major, doctoral-granting university in a large, metropolitan area of the Gulf Coast Region of the United States (Waxman, MacNeil, & Lee, 2006). Both studies were analyzed using the same cognitive interview instrument questions.

Begum's 2008 study, *Assistant Principals and Teacher Supervision: Roles, Responsibilities, and Regulations* and Robinson's 2009 study, *Principals' Perceptions Regarding the Role of the Professional Development and Appraisal System in Teacher Supervision in Texas* were used to compare and contrast the perceptions of the two populations.

A cognitive interview instrument (Willis, 2005) was used and the data obtained from the responses analyzed to determine the results of a convenience sample survey. Students in the master's degree program in Education administered the survey in person with principals and assistant principals as part of a required course assignment. The data obtained from this survey process was archived and available for research in several areas of school leadership. Using the data from Begum (2008) and Robinson (2009), the study sought to analyze, compare, and contrast the responses. The section of the survey that was used for analysis was Section D (Appendix F). The demographic data collected in Section A was used to further analyze for significant relationships between the

demographics of assistant principals and principals, as well as the demographics of their campuses.

Participants

The participants for this study were a convenience sample of current K-12 public school principals and assistant principals. Retired principals and private school principals were not included, as they were not required to complete teacher appraisals or remain current in their teacher appraisal practices. A variety of respondents' demographic and school-type backgrounds were represented in the study. The principals and assistant principals had varying degrees of experience in their current roles. All accountability ratings were represented, and campus types differed from campuses with fewer than 200 students to campuses with a population of over 3,000 students. The demographic data disaggregation of the principals and assistant principals who participated in this study are presented in Tables 3-1 through 3-6.

Table 3-1

Frequencies and Percentages of Assistant Principals and Principals by Gender

Gender	<u>Assistant Principals</u>		<u>Principals</u>	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Female	261	70.35	170	60.28
Male	110	29.65	112	39.72
Total	371	100.00	282	100.00

Table 3-2

Frequencies and Percentages of Assistant Principals and Principals by Ethnicity

Ethnicity	<u>Assistant Principals</u>		<u>Principals</u>	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
White	190	51.91	180	63.83
African American	93	25.41	66	23.40
Hispanic	70	19.13	31	11.00
Asian	11	3.01	2	.71
American Indian	1	.27	—	—
Unreported/ Missing	6	.27	3	1.06
Total	371	100	282	100

Table 3-3

Frequencies and Percentages of Assistant Principals and Principals by Age Range

Age Range (Years)	<u>Assistant Principals</u>		<u>Principals</u>	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
< 30 years	21	5.66	2	0.71
31-37 years	112	30.19	32	11.43
38-45 years	103	27.76	79	28.21
46-55 years	92	24.80	106	37.86
56-62 years	36	9.70	54	19.29
> 63 years	5	1.35	7	2.50
Unreported/Missing	2	.54	16	-----
Total	371	100	282	100

Table 3-4

Highest Degree Earned by Assistant Principals and Principals

Degree	<u>Assistant Principals</u>		<u>Principals</u>	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Bachelor	14	3.78	5	1.78
Master	344	92.72	254	90.39
Doctorate	13	3.50	22	7.83
Unreported/Missing	—	—	1	.35
Total	371	100.00	282	100.00

Table 3-5

Years of Service in Current Position by Assistant Principals

Service Range (Years)	<u>Assistant Principals</u>	
	<i>f</i>	%
0-5 years	236	63.61
6-10 years	90	24.26
11-15 years	26	7.01
> 16 years	11	2.96
Unreported/Missing	8	2.16
Total	371	100.00

Note. Robinson (2009) and Begum (2008) chose to report the years of service age brackets slightly differently for the category relating to “years of experience/service in the current position.” Since the researcher will not be conducting any new treatment on the data, it must remain faithful to the original findings. Returning to the original data set may change the interpretation of the data as it corresponds to the responses and was not the stated methodology.

Table 3-6

Years of Experience in Current Position by Principals

Service Range (Years)	<u>Principals</u>	
	<i>f</i>	%
0-3 years	62	21.99
4-7 years	95	33.69
8-15 years	82	29.08
> 16 years	38	13.48
Unreported/Missing	5	1.76
Total	282	100.00

Table 3-7

School Characteristic by School Location

School Location	<u>Assistant Principals</u>		<u>Principals</u>	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Rural	12	3.23	21	7.45
Suburban	156	42.05	134	47.52
Urban	191	51.49	126	44.67
Unreported/Missing	12	3.23	1	.36
Total	371	100.00	282	100.00

Table 3-8

School Characteristic by Texas Accountability Rating

Accountability Rating	<u>Assistant Principals</u>		<u>Principals</u>	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Exemplary	35	9.43	28	10.14
Recognized	102	27.49	98	35.51
Acceptable	189	50.94	144	52.18
Low	16	4.31	6	2.17
Unreported/Missing	29	7.81	639	
Total	371	100.00	276	100.00

Table 3-9

School Characteristic by Grade Level

Grade Level	<u>Assistant Principals</u>		<u>Principals</u>	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Elementary	168	45.28	147	52.13
Middle/Intermediate	90	24.26	65	23.05
High School	101	27.23	70	24.82
Unreported/Missing	12	3.23	--	--
Total	371	100.00	282	100.00

Procedures

According to Robinson (2009) and Begum (2008), due to the typical low return rate expected from mailed surveys and the limited response potential, the researchers chose to complete the survey in person through a cognitive interview survey instrument. This face-to-face technique is designed to encourage more reflective and elaborate responses. The designers used this protocol so that the assistant principals and principals had a personal interaction and were more likely to spend time giving thoughtful responses. The cognitive interview style provides an opportunity for the interviewer to ask follow-up questions and provides an opportunity for the interviewee to elaborate (Desimonte & LeFloch, 2004). The benefit of this style of interview is that it provides a deeper understanding when compared to a written survey. The responses can then be coded and analyzed. This form of administering the survey takes more time, but the results are more authentic.

In a 1986 study of the effectiveness of the cognitive interview technique with regard to eyewitness responses to misleading and leading questions, using a total of 147 undergraduates, results indicated that the “cognitive interview is a reliable and legally acceptable investigative tool” (Geiselman et al., p. 1.). Additionally, the answers given during a cognitive interview are more in-depth answers (Desimonte & LeFloch, 2004). Graduate students in the master’s degree program in education administered the survey. These students were trained in the cognitive interview techniques before scheduling their appointments with participants. Students were free to choose who they wanted to interview, and most chose a principal in the school district where they worked as an employee.

The cognitive interview technique reviewed by Caspar, Lessler, and Willis (1999) can be an effective technique method when well implemented. They found that this technique is free from bias, as the interviewer does not inject himself into the question. Specific targeted populations of people with certain characteristics are used to study a specific subject, such as the elderly, those who smoke, or in this case, school principals and assistant principals (Caspar, Lessler, & Willis, 1999). This technique allows for the subjects to ask clarifying questions if they do not fully understand the interview question.

Some students chose the same principal, so duplicate surveys were discarded. There were 310 principals and 371 assistant principals interviewed by the graduate students. Of the 310 principals who responded to the survey, 28 lead private and charter schools and were eliminated from the study, thus reducing the number of respondents from 310 to 282 (Robinson, 2009). Reliability of the principals' responses over multiple administrations of a 20% sample revealed a high overall agreement of 91.54% when the four questions' reliability percentage was averaged together (Robinson, 2009). One risk is the association with coding the responses because each researcher has their own biases. Another potential reliability concern was that the sample used was a convenience sample. Each interviewer chose participants from their own connections. However, the interviewers and their participants represented a diverse group. Also, the university is a large commuter college in a large metropolitan area.

In each of the previous studies by Begum (2008) and Robinson (2009), the data were analyzed, categorized, and grouped by emerging themes. These themes were disaggregated by significant demographic data. In this new study, building on Begum's and Robinson's results, themes were compared and contrasted by assistant principal and

principal responses. The researcher determined if a departure in the philosophical framework of the two roles existed and noted the similarities.

Variables

In both studies (Begum, 2008; Robinson, 2009), the independent variables were assistant principal and principal age; gender; years of experience in education; years of experience in current role; assistant principal and principals' highest degree earned; ethnicity; and campus accountability rating. The dependent variables in each study were the principal's and assistant principal's responses to the four open-ended questions regarding teacher supervision practices in Section D of the survey.

Instrument

The survey questionnaire was created by university professors at a doctoral granting university in a large area in the Gulf Coast Region of the United States (MacNeil, Waxman, & Lee, 2006). The survey had 14 sections. For this study, only sections A and D were utilized by the researcher. Section A included a demographic inventory of each principal interviewee, as well as the campus they served. Section D focused on principals' and assistant principals' beliefs, attitudes, values, and practices. The qualitative data that resulted from Section D were analyzed by Begum (2008) and Robinson (2009). No new statistic treatment was conducted for this study, and the researcher analyzed the existing results. The results from Begum's and Robinson's studies were used to answer the research questions by descriptive analysis. The original survey instrument is in Appendix F.

Research Questions

- 1) Do principals and assistant principals differ in their perceptions regarding the purpose of teacher evaluation?
- 2) Do principals and assistant principals differ in their perception that PDAS is effective in achieving its intended outcomes?
- 3) Do principals and assistant principals differ in their perceptions about who is the best person to conduct teacher supervision?
- 4) When reporting on teachers' performance, do principals differ in their practices from assistant principals regarding the inclusion of only those behaviors that they observe, or do they include other factors?

Data Analysis

Two data sources were utilized to conduct a descriptive comparative analysis: Robinson's 2009 analysis of principals' perceptions of the PDAS system and Begum's 2008 analysis of assistant principals' perceptions of teacher supervision. The sources were based on the data set from sections A and D of the survey. No new statistical treatment was applied to the survey results. The prominent themes identified in the participants' responses by Robinson and Begum were compared and contrasted. In addition, the researcher searched for common themes, as well as contrasting responses that reflected a departure in the philosophical framework of the two roles.

For this comparison study, the researcher used two data sources. Both studies used the same set of cognitive survey questions to obtain their responses. The first source was the complete analysis of the assistant principal subset conducted by researcher, Begum. Second, in order to conduct a descriptive comparison study, the analysis

conducted by Robinson was used to glean information in order to compare and contrast responses. Then, emerging similarities and variances were noted in the administrators' philosophical frameworks to determine what, if any, changes should be suggested for principal training, implementation of teacher appraisals, and school leadership.

Robinson (2009) identified, categorized, and coded themes that emerged from the data set of responses from campus principals. He then grouped the responses according to their similarities and gleaned insight into the principals' perceptions about the PDAS system. Robinson created categories based on the responses. He attempted to capture the main theme from each of their statements, so that each response fit into one category. In addition, he also desegregated the categories with demographic data. Robinson selected quotes to represent and explain each category in order for the reader and other researchers to have a full understanding of how the coding was determined. For this comparative study, the researcher analyzed noteworthy commonalities and differences in the two data sets in search of relationships that will improve leadership training. In this comparative study, the researcher used a descriptive model to compare and contrast the data and made inferences. The researcher also determined if the emerging themes in the data correlated with the research.

Limitations of the Study

There were several limitations to this study. Robinson's (2009) and Begum's (2008) studies were very similar, but they were not perfectly aligned for a perfect one-to-one comparison. Some researcher interpretation was needed. Since the two sources of information and the two researchers were different, the themes and categories which emerged were not identical. For example, in the "years of service in current position"

category, the researchers chose to break down the brackets slightly differently. Also, there were many students involved in the data collection for the surveys. Due to the variety of interviewers, there may have been differences in their recording of information. Additionally, the sample of 282 principals and 371 assistant principals, although a large sample, may not have been representative of all schools in the area. The predominant themes were assigned by other researchers. There is a possibility that a different researcher may have obtained themes that were not a perfect match for those presented here.

Chapter 4

Results

The purpose of this paper was to compare and contrast assistant principals' and principals' perceptions about the purpose and practice of the PDAS process. In this comparative study, the researcher uses a descriptive model to compare and contrast the data to make inferences. No new treatment was conducted. The two researchers presented the relevant data using the raw data from four questions in the original survey from a larger study by Waxman, MacNeil, and Lee (2006). The studies used to compare the data were *Assistant Principals and Teacher Supervision: Roles, Responsibilities, and Regulations* (Begum, 2008) and *Principals' Perceptions Regarding the Role of the Professional Development and Appraisal System in Texas* (Robinson, 2009).

Research Question One: Do principals and assistant principals differ in their perceptions regarding the purpose of teacher evaluation?

Research Question One inquired about what principals and assistant principals perceived as the purpose of teacher supervision. The responses were grouped "according to commonalities" (Begum, 2008, p. 61). The four questions were open-ended to allow the respondent to elaborate on their answers.

Begum's coding of assistant principals' responses to question one regarding the purpose of teacher supervision produced these categories (2008):

- Teacher and student learning;
- School safety and climate;
- State accountability; and
- Teacher accountability.

Robinson (2009) categorized the principals' responses to question one regarding the purpose of teacher supervision into these categories:

- Ensure quality teaching;
- Ensure curriculum is taught;
- Provide professional development or support; and
- Document poor teaching.

Table 4-1

Principals' Perceptions of the Purpose of Teacher Supervision

Principal's Responses	<i>f</i>	%
Ensure quality teaching	109	38.79
Ensure curriculum is taught	67	23.84
Professional development/support	102	36.30
Document poor teaching	3	1.07
Total	281*	100.00

Note. N = 281.

* Indicates total does not sum to 100% due to missing data. Missing cases = 1 (0.35%).
Based on data from Robinson, 2009.

Table 4-2

Assistant Principals' Perceptions of the Purpose of Teacher Supervision

Assistant Principals' Responses	<i>f</i>	%
Teacher and student learning	226	60.9
School safety and climate	7	1.90
State accountability	11	3.00
Teacher accountability	123	33.2
Total	367*	100.00

Note. N = 367.

* Indicates total does not sum to 100% due to 4 missing cases.

Based on data from Begum, 2008.

This study sought to compare the responses of the 282 principals and the 371 assistant principals interviewed. The emerging categories that each researcher found had some similarities and some disparities. The categories were distinct and not directly comparable. However, the similarities noted are between Begum's category of "teacher and student learning" and Robinson's "professional development and support" and "ensure quality teaching." Those categories contained elements of utilizing professional development to support and improve teaching, as well as learner-centered themes. Each of the categories referenced PDAS as a means to develop teachers. Another similarity in the stated categories was Robinson's category of "document poor teaching" and Begum's category of "teacher accountability," although they were not identical. Both of these categories implied that teacher supervision was "to make sure the teacher is doing his/her job" (Begum, 2008, p. 62) and "reflects an attitude towards inspection and monitoring"

(Robinson, 2009, p. 67). Robinson's category of "ensure curriculum is taught" referred to compliance, which was similar to Begum's accountability categories. The assistant principals group had a category of "school safety and climate," which was not indicated in the principals' responses.

Starting with question one, Begum's "teacher and student learning" referred to any response that the purpose of supervision was to develop the teacher in order to improve student learning. "Safety and climate" referred to any response that the purpose of teacher supervision was related school climate or safety. "State accountability" was the category for any response that stated the purpose of teacher supervision was to be in compliance with state regulations, and "teacher accountability" referred to any response that indicated the purpose of teacher supervision was "to make sure the teacher is doing his job" (Begum, 2008, p. 62). Teacher accountability also implied that supervision should be used to ensure the teacher is in compliance.

For question one, "ensure quality teaching" in Robinson's 2009 study included any answer that referred to observing "classroom teaching for adequate preparation, learner centered instruction, and the strength, impact, variety, and alignment" (p. 66) aspects of PDAS. "Ensuring curriculum is taught" referred to using the appraisal process to ensure that the curriculum was being followed, the lessons were in compliance, and the lessons were based on the state's objectives and instructional standards. "Provide instructional development or support" contained the responses that mentioned using PDAS as a means to improve teacher's practice and improve student learning. "Document poor teaching" referred to "monitoring for the main purpose of accumulating

documentation to be used to support adverse employment decisions” (Robinson, 2009, p. 67).

According to Robinson’s 2009 study, 36.30% of principals believed that the purpose of PDAS was to be used in professional development and support, and 38.79% of principals believed the purpose was to ensure quality teaching. Due to the similarities in these two categories, Robinson combined the two categories together, which resulted in 75.09% of the principals’ responses. Robinson noted that the two categories were in alignment with the stated purpose of PDAS which was “to improve student performance through the professional development of teachers (PDAS Teacher Manual, 2005, p. 6). In third place for principals was the belief that the goal of PDAS was to “ensure the curriculum was taught.” Lastly, only three principals responded that “documenting poor teaching” was the purpose.

For principals, “ensure quality teaching” was the primary response at 38.79%. When examining some of the sample responses in this category, the researcher noted that this category was closely related to the category of “professional development and support” that emerged in Begum’s 2008 data. For example, some principal’s responses were:

- “To ensure that students receive the best education possible. This may include everything from encouraging teachers to take risks, to grow professionally, to share with others, to simply continue their great work, to rethink their current practice, or to change behaviors completely” (Robinson, 2009, p. 68).

- “To ensure that the students are receiving the maximum learning instruction and the best teaching practices” (Robinson, 2009, p. 68).

The next highest category reported was “provide professional development or support” at 36.30%. For example:

- “Teacher supervision is to support and make things better” (Robinson, 2009, p. 69).
- “To help them (teachers) be the best they can be” (Robinson, 2009, p. 69).
- “The purpose of teacher supervision is to note strengths and weaknesses of teacher instructional practices so that all teachers can continually improve and learn from one another” (Robinson, 2009, p. 69).
- The purpose of teacher supervision is to note the strengths and weaknesses of teacher instructional practices so that all teachers can continually improve and learn from each other” (Robinson, 2009, p. 69).

The response that 23.84% of the principals gave was that the purpose of teacher supervision was to “ensure the curriculum was being taught” or compliance.

Assistant principals had a variety of responses to the question concerning the goal of teacher supervision. Nearly 61% believed that the purpose was “teacher and student learning,” which Begum (2008) noted, correlated with the PDAS stated goal. This category was similar to Robinson’s principal categories, “provide professional development or support” (36.30%) and “ensure quality teaching (38.79%). For assistant principals 33.51% believed that the purpose was “teacher accountability” or “making sure the teacher is doing his/her job” (Begum, 2008, p. 62). Seven assistant principals responded that the purpose was “school safety and climate,” while 11 assistant principals

responded that they believed the purpose was “state accountability.” This suggested that 39.10% of the assistant principals’ beliefs were not in alignment with the PDAS designers’ intended goal when the three categories were totaled together (School Safety and Climate, State Accountability and Teacher Accountability).

From the survey’s original raw data (Waxman, MacNeil, & Lee, 2006) concerning the purpose of teacher supervision, some assistant principals’ responses regarding the purpose of teacher supervision, which correlated with “teacher support,” were:

- “To help teachers grow so that they can help children grow. Your job as a principal is to support teachers.”
- “To be an instructional leader; to help teachers grow.”
- “To aid teachers and give them feedback where necessary.”
- “Teacher development results from correct supervision.”
- “Individual teachers have different needs and must be supervised accordingly to permit growth and development.”
- “Provide objective feedback, help teachers develop skills; it should be reflective.”

Begum noted some desegregated responses were relevant that Robinson did not note for principals. As assistant principal increased in age, they were more likely to cite “improved teacher and student learning” as the purpose of teacher supervision (Begum, 2008). Additionally, it was noted that the fewer years assistant principals served in education, the less likely they were to cite “improved student learning” as the purpose of teacher supervision (Begum, 2008). Assistant principals who serve in exemplary schools

were most likely to believe “improved student learning” was the purpose of teacher supervision (Begum, 2008).

Robinson noted that “highest degree earned” had a relevant impact on the principals’ responses. Principal data, when disaggregated by highest degree earned, demonstrated again that principals consistently responded with answers consistent with the PDAS designers’ intended goal. Those with master’s degrees responded with 39.13%, stating that “ensuring quality teaching” was the purpose, 37.15% stating that the purpose was “professional development support,” 22.92% for “ensuring curriculum is taught,” and .79% to “identify and document poor teaching” (Robinson, 2009). Of principals holding doctoral degrees, none believed that teacher supervision was to “identify and document poor teaching.” Due to the certification requirements to serve in the role of principal in the state of Texas, only five principals (1.79%) did not possess advanced degrees; therefore, this data was not relevant to Robinson’s study (2009). Begum did not note any relevant findings in the desegregation by degree category (2008).

Research Question Two: Do principals and assistant principals differ in their perception that PDAS is effective in achieving its intended outcomes?

Question two asked whether or not the principals and assistant principals perceived the PDAS instrument as an effective tool. The responses to question three were coded as “Qualified Yes,” “Unqualified Yes,” “Unqualified No,” or “Unqualified Yes” based on the researchers’ interpretation of the administrators’ verbal responses to the open-ended questions.

Of the assistant principals, 36.40% responded “Unqualified Yes,” 28.00% responded “Qualified Yes,” and 34.00% responded “No.” Of the principals, 31.56%

responded “Unqualified Yes,” 34.04% responded “Qualified Yes,” and 31.21% responded “No.” Slightly more principals than assistant principals believed that PDAS was effective with its intended goal, at 1.20% more when “Qualified Yes” and “Unqualified Yes” were totaled and compared with each other.

Table 4-3

Principals’ and Assistant Principals’ Perceptions of the Effectiveness of PDAS in Achieving its Intended Outcome

Responses	<i>f</i>	Principals (%)	<i>f</i>	Assistant Principals (%)
Unqualified yes	89	31.56	135	36.40
Qualified yes	96	34.04	104	28.00
No	88	31.21	126	34.00

Note. Principals have no missing cases; principal total = 282.

Principals who do not use PDAS were included in Robinson’s data and accounted for 3.19% or *f* = 9.

Assistant Principals* Sums do not total 100% due to missing data (six unreported cases).

Assistant Principal Total = 365.

For principals, the dominant response was that PDAS worked in a conditional way to fulfill the purpose of teacher supervision. Slightly over 34% (34.04%) of the principals responded a “Qualified Yes” and 31.56% of them responded with an “Unqualified Yes.” Some examples of the principals’ responses were:

- The way the individual administrators choose to use PDAS really makes or breaks the success of the tool to really determine what good teaching is.

The teacher's self-report is another valuable tool that is meant to add a dimension of self-reflection. Several walk-throughs and the actual observation should give the administrator a good indicator of good teaching. (Robinson, 2009, p. 76)

- “A good tool for reflective feedback. I take a look at staff development and I do several walk-throughs during the school year” (Robinson, 2009, p. 76).
- “It depends how PDAS is used. There is some good and some bad to PDAS, but it is not maximized. Because of the evaluative nature, teachers don't see it as an instrument for growth” (Robinson, 2009, p. 76).
- “To a degree PDAS works-how the supervisor uses it and it's not used as a punitive thing” (Robinson, 2009, p. 76).
- “It's a good tool, but it depends on the people using it. It should be used more for support and encouragement rather than breaking down teachers. Always look for the good things they are doing in the classroom” (Robinson, 2009, p. 76).
- “The process does help better performance” (Robinson, 2009, p.78).

In the assistant principals' raw data from question number two in the original survey from a larger study by Waxman, MacNeil, and Lee (2006), some examples of assistant principal responses were:

- “The thought is what counts. I make sure the teacher gains from the supervision. I talk to them after each time and make sure it really does

help, not just there to spy on them and then leave, some gain from it and others are surely thinking they know what they are doing by now.”

- “Yes if done right, need to be honest and open about them, I do them often and many ask me to do them often as well, very complimenting.”
- “It works if you follow the guidelines provided. You must have the best interest of students at heart.”
- “The intended outcome of PDAS is to help teachers improve instruction so student performance improves. It is also a way for administrators to observe and acknowledge the hard work teachers do. I believe the system works.”
- “To some extent they are useful, but the brevity of the assessments and the context in which they are performed lends itself to biases and inconsistencies.”
- “No, I believe the teachers do not fully appreciate the reflection process and view the forms as just another piece of paperwork they have to fill out.”
- “I do not think so. They have become more of a routine instead of the tool they were designed to be. As an instructional leader it is essential that supervision is tailored to meet the individual needs of the teacher.”
- “The requirements of PDAS are not enough. It must make more visits = frequency is key! The formal observations are for me to see what you can do. Walkthroughs are to see what is happening daily.”
- “No, I don’t feel they fairly reflect a teacher’s potential.”

- “The PDAS instrument can work if it is used correctly. It does not achieve the intended outcomes to assist teachers with instruction.”
- “No. The outcome is teachers feel they got a pat on the back or a slap on the wrist.”

Begum (2008) further sought to determine which assistant principals were “most likely to cite improved teacher and student learning as the reason for respondents who felt that the PDAS instrument is an effective assessment tool under some circumstances” (2008, p. 63). Assistant principals with “Unqualified No” responses felt that under no circumstances was the PDAS instrument an effective tool. Of the assistant principals that believed the purpose of teacher supervision was to improve teacher and student learning, slightly over a third believed that the current practices are achieving the objective, at 36.60% “Yes,” 29.00% “Qualified Yes,” and 34.40% “No.” Robinson (2009) did not disaggregate his principals’ responses in this way.

Community type demographic disaggregation of principal perceptions.

Robinson (2009) noted relevance in the differences of principals’ responses in suburban and urban districts. They had opposite beliefs about the effectiveness of PDAS. The majority of suburban principals (60.23%) believed that PDAS worked without condition, while principals in urban communities reported the opposite, 61.36% reported that it did not work (Robinson, 2009). However, 31.82% of suburban principals reported that PDAS does not work, while the same percentage of urban principals (31.82%) reported an “Unqualified Yes,” that PDAS does work. Begum (2008) did not find noteworthy differences in assistant principals’ responses by community type.

State accountability rating of campus demographic disaggregation of principals' responses. Principals “report that PDAS does not work as the campus’ state accountability rating declines” (Robinson, 2009, p. 82). Starting from the highest accountability rating (Exemplary) to the lowest (Low Performing), principals reported that PDAS did not work, respectively at 17.88% for Exemplary; 24.49% for Recognized; 36.11% for Acceptable; and 83.33% for Low Performing (Robinson, 2009). In other words, those in high performing schools had more confidence in the system.

Research Question Three: Do principals and assistant principals differ in their perceptions about who is the best person to conduct teacher supervision?

For research question three, principals and assistant principals were asked if they believed they were the best person to carry out teacher supervision. Responses by both researchers were coded as “Yes,” “No,” or “Among Qualified Others.”

Table 4-4

Principals’ and Assistant Principals’ Perceptions of Who is Best to Conduct Teacher Supervision

Response	<u>Principal</u>		<u>Assistant Principal</u>	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
I am the best.	189	67.02	210	56.60
Among qualified others	78	27.66	91	24.50
I’m not the best.	15	5.32	62	16.70
Total	282	100	363	97.80*

Note. Total principals = 282. No missing cases.

Total assistant principals = 363.

*Sums do not total 100% due to missing data (eight unreported cases).

Robinson (2009) found that the most dominant response (67.02%) from principals was the belief that they felt they were the best person to conduct teacher supervision. Likewise, the assistant principals' dominant response (56.60%) was that they were the best person to conduct teacher supervision (Begum, 2008). "Among Qualified Others" was the next dominant response reported, at 24.50 for assistant principals and 27.66% for principals (Begum, 2008; Robinson, 2009).

Some of the principals' responses were:

- "Yes, we are looking at techniques, climate, student involvement"
(Robinson, 2009, p. 85).
- "Yes, a supervisor isn't there to watch the teacher. They are there to see what kinds of interactions are taking place between teacher and students"
(Robinson, 2009, p. 85).

The second most frequent response (27.66%) was that the principal was "Among Qualified Others" to conduct teacher appraisals. Some of the statements from that category were:

- "The administrative team is best; I can't do it alone" (Robinson, 2009, p. 86).
- "I also support peer observation." (Robinson, 2009, p. 86)
- "Anyone can look for classroom management, best practices, etc. Others could be trained to do supervision as well" (Robinson, 2009, p. 86).
- "PDAS is not about content, but more so the process in which the teacher relays the information to the students. The supervisor is looking at learner engagement and teacher interaction" (Robinson, 2009, p. 86).

From the original raw assistant principal survey data on Research Question Three, some assistant principal responses were:

- “I think that the best person is the school leader who has a strong trusting relationship with the teacher.”
- “Good teaching is still good teaching. I can still observe the students and see if they are learning.”
- “No. Teacher assessment is best performed by that teacher themselves, other teachers, the principal, and students.”
- “PDAS—subjective—depends on the assessor—it varies from assessor to assessor.”
- “It depends on the situation. I believe teachers should be supervising other teachers. The AP should be able to facilitate this in a non-threatening mode and allow accountable faculty members to be part of this process.”
- “Yes, because an administrator should be a curriculum leader; must have strong knowledge of quality teaching techniques and curriculum to be an effective leader.”
- “No. The principal is the only one who should supervise. Surely one needs to be knowledgeable about supervisory processes. Good teaching is evident not in what the teacher or supervisor sees in the teaching, but in the success of the students being taught.”
- “I think that the principal and AP are the best two people for supervision.”

- “The assistant principal is one set of eyes in the process. It should be broad based including the principal, department heads and peers.”
- “Possible, but not ideal. Middle school and high school evaluations should be done by one with same specialization, but elementary can usually be evaluated by principals and assistant principals.”
- “Yes. If an assessor looks for student learning, then they can go into any classroom.”
- “I believe that it should be a team effort with department chairs and mentoring teachers, who are able to give better content input.”

Research Question Four: When reporting on teachers’ performance, do principals differ in their practices from assistant principals regarding the inclusion of only those behaviors that they observe, or do they include other factors?

The fourth research question asked if administrators limited their feedback and documentation to only behaviors observed or if they included other factors. Although the first two domains of the PDAS are “Active, Successful Student Participation in the Learning Process” and “Learner-Centered” instruction which are observable, the other domains include “Evaluation and Feedback on Student Progress,” “Management of Student Discipline, Instructional Strategies, Time and Materials,” and “Professional Communication” with students, parents, staff, community members, and other professionals (PDAS Teacher Manuel, 2006, pp. 7-11). Not all those elements are observable during a classroom visit. The administrator responses were then coded into two categories, “Observation Only” and “Other Factors Included.”

When comparing the two sets of data, Begum (2008) found that more than half of the assistant principals surveyed responded that they included other factors, in addition to the observed factors (62.50%), when writing reports on teachers. Principals indicated that they used other factors (64.89%) (Robinson, 2009).

Table 4-5

Assistant Principals' and Principals' Documentation of Teacher Performance Appraisals

	<u>Principal</u>		<u>Assistant Principal</u>	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Classroom observation factors only	99	35.11	129	34.80
Other factors included	183	64.89	232	62.50
Total	282	100.00	361	97.30*

Note. Principal N = 282 (Robinson, 2009).

Assistant principal N = 361 (Begum, 2008).

*Sum does not total 100% due to missing data (10 unreported cases).

Principals' beliefs were reflected in their elaborated answers:

- “You must consider other factors: professional conduct, follow policy, directives, etc.”(Robinson, 2009, p. 93).
- “Definitely consider many other factors. It’s like a snapshot versus a full video tape. Lots of other information comes into play” (Robinson, 2009, p. 93).

- “I consider many factors. I consider all the times I have observed the teacher in walk-throughs and other activities” (Robinson, 2009, p. 93).
- “I try to focus on the positives that I see. I also try to limit the areas of improvement so the teacher can focus more” (Robinson, 2009, p. 93).
- “I consider portfolios, things they do in the community, extra-curricular activities. They tell me what they’re doing” (Robinson, 2009, p. 93).

From the raw data, some of the assistant principal’s responses were:

- “You must also consider other factors.”
- “I meet with the teachers and discuss it with them.”
- “Both, however I always meet to discuss results so that I get the whole story.”
- “We consider all factors within the observation, such as how much the individual participates with school functions after school, what conferences they have attended, etc.”
- “I report on what I have observed.”

Each researcher found different disaggregations to be relevant for their respective groups. Robinson (2009) found that the only demographic data disaggregation of relevant significance was the gender demographic disaggregation. Within this group, the males indicated that they were more likely to include other factors, in addition to classroom observations, when documenting teacher appraisals. He found that males reported this, at 74.11%, versus females, at 58.82%. Approximately 26% (25.89%) of males reported that they used only observation data, compared to 41.18% of females that reported they used only observation data.

When asked what factors that they included in teacher reports, Begum (2008) found that assistant principals in the oldest age bracket (56+) were the most likely to include other factors when writing teacher appraisal reports. For assistant principals in the 56+ year-old age bracket, the probability of using other factors was 81.58, as compared to the probability of 63.08 in the 37 year-old and under age bracket, a 61.17 probability in the 38-45 year-old age bracket, and 62.50 in the 46-55 year-old age bracket. Additionally, Begum (2008) found that assistant principals with the “most years as assistant principal were drastically more likely to take into consideration other factors when writing reports on teachers” (p. 75).

Summary

The studies used to compare the data were *Assistant Principals and Teacher Supervision: Roles, Responsibilities, and Regulations* (Begum, 2008) and *Principals’ Perceptions Regarding the Role of the Professional Development and Appraisal System in Texas* (Robinson, 2009). This chapter is the resulting data from the two studies being compared with each other. No new treatment was conducted by the researcher. Robinson (2009) and Begum (2008) presented the relevant data using the raw data from the four questions on the original survey from a larger study by Waxman, MacNeil, and Lee (2006). The most noteworthy desegregated data was found by the researchers. Sample quotes were given to increase the understanding about the respondents’ answers. In this chapter, results were reported without additional comment, explanation, or recommendation, which will be given in the following chapter.

Chapter 5

Conclusions and Recommendations

The purpose of this study was to compare and contrast principals' and assistant principals' perceptions regarding the purpose, effectiveness, and practices of the PDAS. This was a comparative, descriptive study building on the work in two existing studies based on an identical survey, one exploring the responses of assistant principals (Begum, 2008) and the other focusing on principals (Robinson, 2009). The studies used to compare the data were *Assistant Principals and Teacher Supervision: Roles, Responsibilities, and Regulations* (Begum, 2008) and *Principals' Perceptions Regarding the Role of the Professional Development and Appraisal System in Texas* (Robinson, 2009).

The importance of the school principal is clearly documented in the research. Having an effective principal leading every school is critical to ensure that schools are effective (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2003). Instructional leadership is crucial in determining that students have a positive learning experience and reach high academic achievement (Leithwood et al., 2004).

In addition, it is well documented that there is a misalignment between assistant principal training and their future role as a principal (Bartlett, 2011; Fields, 2002; Goodson, 2000; Hartzell, 1993; Koru, 1993; Madden, 2008; Marshall, 1992; Mertz, 2000). Pre-service training, induction, and on-the-job instructional leadership training is lacking. Results from this study will help better prepare administrators for these tasks, particularly instructional leadership, and will encourage principals to involve their assistants in all aspects of leading the school.

This study sought to examine how assistant principals' perceptions differed or coincided with principals' perceptions regarding the state-mandated PDAS.

The research questions were:

1. Do principals and assistant principals differ in their perceptions regarding the purpose of teacher evaluation?
2. Do principals and assistant principals differ in their perception that PDAS is effective in achieving its intended outcomes?
3. Do principals and assistant principals differ in their perceptions about who is the best person to conduct teacher supervision?
4. When reporting on teachers' performance, do principals differ in their practices from assistant principals regarding the inclusion of only those behaviors that they observe, or do they include other factors?

Research Question One: Do principals and assistant principals differ in their perceptions regarding the purpose of teacher evaluation?

Research Question One sought to compare assistant principals' and principals' perceptions concerning the purpose of teacher supervision. The emerging categories that each researcher found had some similarities and some disparities. The categories were distinct and not directly comparable; however, the similarities noted are between Begum's (2008) category of "Teacher and Student Learning" and Robinson's (2009) "Professional Development and Support" and "Ensure Quality Teaching," both categories contained elements of utilizing professional development to support and improve teaching, as well as learner-centered themes. Each of the categories referenced PDAS as a means to develop teachers. Another similarity in the stated categories is Robinson's

(2009) category of “Document Poor Teaching” and Begum’s (2008) category of “Teacher Accountability.” Although not exactly equal in content, both of these categories implied that teacher supervision is “to make sure the teacher is doing his/her job” (Begum, 2008, p. 62) and “reflects and attitude towards inspection and monitoring” (Robinson, 2009, p. 67). Robinson’s (2009) category of “Ensure Curriculum is Taught” referred to compliance, which was similar to Begum’s (2008) accountability categories. The assistant principal group had a category of “School Safety and Climate,” which was not indicated in the principals’ responses.

For Research Question One, regarding the purpose of teacher supervision, assistant principals chose answers relating to managerial tasks 39.10% of the time, whereas principals chose responses indicating answers other than developing teachers, just 25% of the time. Principals’ responses correlated with the PDAS designers’ intended purpose 14.19% more than the assistant principals’ responses. This discrepancy correlates with the notion that assistant principals’ experience is oriented towards management tasks, such as discipline and monitoring, rather than oriented towards visionary instructional leadership (Hartzell, Williams, & Nelson, 1995). Additionally, this finding related to the concept in the literature that training for assistant principals to take on the role of the principal is lacking in some areas (Madden, 2008).

It was also interesting to note that the PDAS developers stated goal is, “...to improve student performance through the professional development of teachers” (PDAS Teachers Manual, 2005, p. 6). There was a distinct contrast when analyzing the assistant principals’ views in contrast with the principals’ views on the purpose of PDAS.

Each researcher analyzed the responses based on how they correlated with the stated purpose of PDAS. Comparing assistant principals' and principals' responses revealed that 14.1% more of the principals' responses correlated with the stated PDAS goal than the assistant principals' responses. Assistant principals responded that the purpose of teacher supervision was "improved teacher and student learning" 60.90% of the time, while principals' responses relating to "professional development and quality teaching" totaled 75.09% of the responses. This result suggested that 25% of principals and 40% of assistant principals are conducting teacher development and assessment with practices that the developers did not intend.

Although the Robinson's 2009 interpretation excluded the principals' response of "ensure curriculum is taught" from the number and percentage included in the responses that aligned with the intended purpose of PDAS, one could interpret that those responses also belong in that category that agrees with the PDAS goal. The "ensure curriculum is taught" category aligns with the statement in the PDAS Teacher Manual (2005), "Curriculum, instruction and assessment aligned with TEKS & district objectives" (p. 14) in the section explaining the "S.I.V.A." expectations of "strength, impact, variety and alignment." With those responses included, the principals' percentage of responses correlating with the PDAS designers' intended goal would be 98.93%. Including the "ensure curriculum is taught" causes the disparity between assistant principals' and principals' perceptions to increase from 14.19% to 38.03% of principals articulating responses that agreed with the intended goal of improving "student performance through the professional development of teachers" (PDAS Teacher Manual, 2005, p. 6).

The lack of understanding regarding the purpose of PDAS was consistent with the literature that some administrators are looking for compliance rather than rigor (Wagner & Kegan, 2006) and that some administrators lack the skill and will to effectively utilize the instrument (Donaldson, 2010; Scriven, 1981; Weisburg et al., 2009; Yariv, 2009). Also consistent with the literature was the discovery that assistant principals' role may not effectively prepare them for the role of instructional leader (Austin & Brown, 1970; Bartlett, 2011; Bloom & Krovetz, 2001; Celikten, 2001; Erlandson, 1994; Harvey, 1994; Koru, 1993; Marshall, 1985; Mertz, 2006; Weller & Weller, 2002).

Unfortunately, assistant principals are often delegated tasks with a constricted view, and final decision making is the principal's job; therefore, assistant principals typically do not have the opportunity to share leadership responsibilities. Assistant principals can get caught up in the minutiae and lose sight of the big picture. Empowering others is critical to the principal's success (Bates & Shank, 1983; Kaplan & Owings, 1999). Johnson-Taylor and Martin (2007) suggested that principals should share power and "involve assistant principals in all aspects of running the school" as well as "provide professional development" (p. 24).

Mentoring of an assistant principal is important for several reasons. A principal cannot accomplish the daunting task of guiding instructional leadership on their own. An assistant principal tends to "perpetuate the organization *as it is*" (Mertz, 2006, p. 7). Once joining an administrative team on a campus, the assistant principal assimilates to the existing culture and practices. Therefore, whether or not the assistant principal desires to become a principal, it is crucial that they receive mentoring and development in alignment with the instructional mission of that campus. The notion that the assistant

principal will repeat what is modeled by the principal demonstrates that how the principal perceives the professional appraisal process will affect how the assistant principal implements the PDAS tool. Additionally, opportunities to learn and experience full leadership should be a planned part of the assistant principal's experience, rather than a random occurrence. "Principals must model the way to lead people" (Johnson-Taylor & Martin, 2007, p. 25). The responses principals gave regarding the purpose of the PDAS were overwhelmingly in agreement with the purpose of utilizing professional development of teachers to improve student achievement and may show their ability to instruct others to use effective PDAS practices.

The results of Research Question One also implied that principals may have a better "balcony," visionary view of leadership, rather than a constricted, managerial view typical of the assistant principal's role (Erlandson, 1994; Koru, 1993). According to the expected principal competencies in Texas, in competency number one, the principal "knows how to shape campus culture by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community" (TExES Principal Preparation Manual, 2012, p. 5). Competency four expects that principals know how to strategically plan to "enhance teaching and learning" and "ensure alignment of curriculum and instruction" (TExES Principal Preparation Manual, 2012, p. 8). Finally, competency five states that the "principal knows how to advocate, nurture, and sustain an instructional program and a campus culture that are conducive to student learning and staff professional growth" (TExes Principal Preparation Manual, 2012, p. 16).

The results from the first research question indicated that, although the assistant principal certification training presented these theoretical expectations, more experiential practice is needed to prepare for the leadership responsibilities of serving as a campus instructional leader. Improved training may help shift the assistant principals' practices from a managerial to transformational leadership style. Over a third of the assistant principals responded that "accountability" was the purpose of teacher supervision, which may be due to the current No Child Left Behind Act, as well as competitive grants such as the Race to the Top competition. However, the stated goal of PDAS is to improve student learning through professional development of teachers. Rather than managing instruction with the inspection and monitoring style, the shift should be towards a collaborative, transformative style of leadership that is viewed as an ongoing process (Burns, 1978). Burns (1978) defined transactional leaders as those who lead based on the common values and high ideals of the group members. This goal coincides with the expectation that the principal will collaborate with the staff to set the mission and vision of the school.

Finally, Research Question One revealed that some administrators in each group would benefit from additional staff development on the implementation of PDAS; both assistant principals and principals (over 25% in each group) did not list "professional development of teachers" as the purpose of the appraisal process. The efficacy and value of the process is largely dependent on the diligence of the appraiser (Toch, 2008).

Further evidence from research suggested that administrators must have proper capacity and desire to utilize the appraisal tool, as it was intended for it to have the highest level of validity and success (Donaldson, 2010; Milanowski, 2004). There were

principal and assistant principal responses that did not correlate with the state-mandated PDAS intended goal. This demonstrated that there may have been insufficient staff development on the implementation of PDAS for administrators in both roles.

Research Question Two: Do principals and assistant principals differ in their perception that PDAS is effective in achieving its intended outcomes?

The results from this question yielded very similar results for both groups. Of the assistant principals, 36.40% responded “Unqualified Yes” that the PDAS process was effective at achieving the outcome of utilizing professional development to improve student learning, and 31.56% of the principals responded “Unqualified Yes.” Assistant principals responded with a “Qualified Yes” at 28.00% and principals at 34.04% with a “Qualified Yes” regarding the effectiveness of the appraisal process. When those two groups were totaled together and compared, the principal group answered affirmatively at just 1.2% more than the assistant principal group. Principal responded “No” 31.21% and assistant principals responded “No” at 34.00%; therefore, only 2.79% more of the assistant principals responded “No” more than principals.

As one of the respondents stated, “The way the individual administrators choose to use PDAS really makes or breaks the success of the tool” (Robinson, 2009, p. 76). Sixty-eight percent of the assistant principals and 65.6% of principals responded with confidence that the tool achieved its intended goal, when the “Unqualified Yes” and “Qualified Yes” categories were totaled together. Although one may interpret only the “Unqualified Yes” as an affirmative response to the question of effectiveness, a “Qualified Yes” response demonstrated an understanding that the success of the

instrument depended on the diligence of the person using it, as well as other factors, such as teacher buy-in.

The ILD training and PDAS training are less than a week in length. The initial training is rigorous. The appraiser must observe several practice videos and successfully complete a certification assessment before commencing to the role of appraiser. The TAC 150.1006 states that “periodic recertification and training shall be required” (PDAS Teacher Manual, p. 27). However, the re-certification training requirement is not specific. Many appraisers have scant follow-up training after they are initially certified. Therefore, after years in the field, one may lose sight of the original purpose and need retraining. Any of the instruments, if not well-implemented by a diligent appraiser, will become ineffective. The human element is also what makes it challenging to ensure that administrators are calibrated to attempt consistency in teacher development and appraisal. The appraiser is the common denominator.

On follow-up analysis of the principals’ responses, it was noted that years of experience impacted the responses (Robinson, 2009). Those with 7-15 years of experience were more likely to indicate that they believed PDAS worked as it is intended (Robinson, 2009). This may indicate that they were well-versed in managing their limited time and still served as successful instructional leaders who promoted the process of continual professional development and feedback. Additionally, at this point in their careers, one would suspect that principals know how to “give people a sense of being connected to a higher purpose” and lead according to the theories of transformational leadership” (Burns, 1978, p. 1).

The effective use of PDAS also demonstrates Texas Principal Competency number five that expects the principals knows how to “facilitate the development of a campus learning organization that supports instructional improvement and change through the ongoing study of relevant research and best practice” (TExES Principal Preparation Manual, 2012, p. 16). The PDAS system is intended to promote teacher growth and improvement. Although not all the administrators’ responses agreed that the PDAS instrument was effective at achieving its intended goal, it was expected that there would be dissonance among some administrators, as that naturally reflects the current teacher evaluation debate occurring in society outside the field of education. However, while PDAS may not be perceived by all as the perfect appraisal tool, a perfect system is unlikely to exist. “All evaluation is subjective. However, there is good subjectivity and bad subjectivity. Good subjectivity is based on the best evidence available, controlled for individual biased, involves all interested audiences and employs some public logic along with expert wisdom” (Peterson, 2012, p. 1). Additionally, Peterson (2012) asserted that the instrument itself does not guaranty good appraisals, but rather builds an “understanding of good teaching” (p. 1).

Research Question Three: Do principals and assistant principals differ in their perceptions about who is the best person to conduct teacher supervision?

Principals responded 67.02% of the time that they were the best person to conduct teacher supervision, compared to the assistant principal at 56.60%. The principals were 10.42% more likely to believe that they were the best to conduct the appraisal. Only 5.32% of the principals believed that they were not the best. This may mean principals are more confident, or that assistant principals are more willing to share the

responsibility. In the “Principal is Among Qualified Others” category, principals were 3.16% more likely to choose that response. One interesting note in the principal group was that Hispanic principals were more likely to respond, “Principal is Among Qualified Others” (Robinson, 2009).

Assistant principals at lower performing schools were much more likely to feel that they were not the right person to conduct appraisals (Begum, 2008). This may be due to their lack of opportunity to experience instructional leadership, as low performing schools typically have many other challenges that the assistant principal must attend to, such as discipline. The job description of an assistant principal includes, “Provide support and assistance to individual teachers when discipline problems arise in the classroom or any other time students are under school supervision” and “Supervise all student activities, and assist in supervision of the lunch periods each day” (Appendix C). Drake and Roe (1986) discovered that while administrators want to develop programs and staff, they spend most of their time on school management and administrative detail. According to Glantz (1994), the assistant principal’s role is full of constant and continuous reactive problem solving (e.g., handling disruptive students, dealing with parent and teacher complaints) along with administrative duties such as lunch duty, textbook inventory, etc. At a lower performing school, many of these disruptions occur more frequently, leaving the assistant principal less time to dedicate to instructional leadership.

Research Question Four: When reporting on teachers’ performance, do principals differ in their practices from assistant principals regarding the inclusion of only those behaviors that they observe, or do they include other factors?

When comparing assistant principal responses to principal responses regarding what each included in their appraisal reports, the percentage of responses indicated both groups of administrators were more likely to include other factors, in addition to the observation. For principals, 64.89% responded that they included other factors, and 62.50% of assistant principals included other factors. These responses were in alignment with PDAS. “Assistant principals in the oldest age bracket were the most likely to include other factors” (Begum, 2008, p. 84). Assistant principals with the most experience were also more likely to include other factors. It is possible that the study’s assistant principals viewed the global perspective of instructional leadership as listed in the TExES Principal competencies.

Including other factors also adds credibility to the appraisal, beyond the required 45-minute observation and walk-throughs. The other factors were not defined in these results. They may have referred to pre-conference and post conference, parent and student communication, and other documentation. However, additional documentation typically fosters the integrity of the appraisal. It may also allow for input from the teacher.

Summary

The significant gap between the number of assistant principals’ responses (39.10% choosing answers not correlating with the intended PDAS goal) compared to the number of principals’ responses (24.91% choosing responses not correlating with the PDAS goal) regarding the purpose of PDAS demonstrates that more assistant principals than principals are not clear on the purpose of PDAS. These responses were consistent with the literature that some administrators are looking for compliance rather than rigor

(Wagner & Kegan, 2006). Moreover, some administrators lack the skill and will to effectively utilize the instrument (Donaldson, 2010; Scriven, 1981; Weisburg et al., 2009; Yariv, 2009). Also consistent with the literature was the discovery that the role of assistant principals may not effectively prepare them for the role of instructional leader (Austin & Brown, 1970; Bartlett, 2011; Bloom & Krovetz, 2001; Celikten, 2001; Erlandson, 1994; Harvey, 1994; Koru, 1993; Marshall, 1985; Mertz, 2006; Weller & Weller, 2002).

It was also interesting to note the contrast between assistant principals' and principals' views regarding the purpose of PDAS. The study also revealed a misalignment with the training received by assistant principals and a contrast from the expectations of PDAS's designers. PDAS was designed to be an effective tool for teacher appraisal and supervision. Fuller and Young (2009) indicated that a new campus leader is often inexperienced and has not had the opportunity to develop the required skills. Bloom and Krovets (2001) asserted that serving as an assistant principal does not guarantee that one is prepared for the role of campus leader. The role and job description of an assistant principal is still quite nebulous and is dependent upon the principal's choice of which responsibilities to delegate. Another finding was that PDAS, on its own, is an inadequate form of appraising a teacher. A school leader must be mindful of the relational aspect of leading a school and develop relationships with teachers. Leaders should continually be aware of the events in the lives of the teachers to maintain rapport, which will enhance their ability to lead (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2003). Building rapport helps promote the cohesion and cooperation of the team.

The two goals included in PDAS require a positive relationship, cooperation, and a level of trust between the appraiser and teacher (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2011). One goal is for the teacher to develop professionally and apply the new learning into classroom practice. The other goal is to evaluate the teacher with a summative appraisal rating. Unfortunately, this has eroded teachers' trust in the system and increased administrative micromanagement. Under the evaluative system, teachers are less likely to share areas of weakness that need assistance and improvement. Combining the two elements decreases the chance for open communication and collaboration (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2011). The teacher and appraiser must know the goals of the appraisal system and be aware that it is a process to help the teacher continually increase capacity (Hogland, 2012). Frequent, proper communication, conferences, feedback, data-analysis, and collaboration will increase teacher efficacy, trust, and student learning (Dufour & Marzano, 2009; Jackson, 2009). Bridging the inadequacies of PDAS requires leadership skills, such as ensuring open lines of communication, recognizing accomplishments of teachers, addressing failures, and creating a sense of community and cooperation (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2003).

Recommendations

There are several ways to increase the effectiveness and credibility of the appraisal process. Frequent calibration of appraisers ensures that the appraiser is more likely to use the tool as intended and is in alignment with the vision of the school and district (Donaldson, 2009; Marzano & Toth, 2012; Milanowski, 2004). Appraisers should meet with their colleagues at the district and campus level to ensure that they are using the tool to meet the vision and mission of the school and district, assuring that they

are “on the same page.” The PDAS system requires only one appraiser; however, using multiple appraisers increases the credibility of the evaluation and is critical to successful practices. More than one appraiser should participate in evaluating teacher quality, as well as multiple observations (Milanowski, 2004; Peterson, 2000; Stronge & Tucker, 2003). Additionally, an amalgamation of measures of teacher effectiveness, such as portfolios; peer appraisals; observations by the principal; student work; and student assessment data, should be used to assess and develop teachers.

Collaboration emerges frequently as best practice in teacher appraisal and school leadership. Considering Knowles’s (1980, 1984) adult learning theories, teachers should also be given the opportunity to have input and engage collaboratively in the professional learning process. Knowles’s (1980, 1984) theories suggested that an adult is innately motivated and can set goals and monitor progress. His theories also implied that internal motivations, such as a sense of competence, are powerful motivators for adults (Knowles, 1980, 1984). “People will make the best use of experiences if they are part of an intentional plan for development” (Boyatzis, Cowen, & Kolb, 1995, p. 76). McEwan (2003) asserted that the vision statement should include ideas from everyone that will build a consensus of the school community’s direction. Sergiovanni (2001) suggested that a bonded staff with shared ideas needs a principal to strengthen the efforts through connections and collaboration. Dufour (1991) highlighted the importance of the principal as the staff developer, as well as connecting the staff development to teacher supervision.

The use of professional collaboration to meet student needs also promotes a collegial atmosphere. MacNeil and Maclin (2005) believed that the “principals must gear the students, faculty, and staff in a common direction and provide sets of norms that

describe what they should accomplish” (p. 1). Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2003) emphasized the importance of focus, relationships, communication, and culture.

Newman and Wehlage (1995) observed that successful schools are those in which the staff are working as professional communities and take responsibility for the students’ achievements. Shifting from managerial task-masters to promoters of a collaborative, accountable teaching force with a common purpose should be the goal of the administrative team. Improved pre-service training can increase the likelihood that an assistant principal is ready to take on the role of leading a school professional community.

There are several ways to address the constricted view of leadership among assistant principals and better prepare them to take on the role of campus principal. Improved training designed to address the misalignment between assistant principals’ instructional leadership and their future as principals can be developed to include practical leadership capacity building that is more practice than theory and is job-embedded. In-box activities based on true instructional dilemmas are one example of realistic learning opportunities. Since the responsibilities often delegated to the assistant principal contribute to a constricted view of campus leadership, principals could benefit from training on the best mentoring and grooming practices to empower their assistants (Bartlett, 2011). Opportunities for assistant principals to build leadership capacity should be intentional and part of a school district’s strategic human resources plan rather than left to chance.

Additionally, assistant principals should self-advocate and seek out leadership opportunities. Continually seeking out professional development and participating in

district, state, and university associations and trainings may help assistant principals to distinguish themselves from others who lack those experiences. Properly managing time in order to efficiently use time on campus will increase one's ability to spend time on instructional leadership and improve student achievement. Improving student achievement and ensuring that all students learn is the primary goal of public education.

Teacher appraisal is a relevant and controversial topic across the United States. Parents and legislators demand an effective appraisal system to gauge the effectiveness of teachers. Teachers want an effective system that is equitable, fair, and accurate. The recent strike in Chicago during the fall of 2012 represents the challenge and controversy represented by teacher evaluations. Teacher appraisal involves all stakeholders and affects everyone. Teacher evaluation involves two elements that affect most of the population: children and money. Legislators and policy makers feel the pressure to answer the call for educational improvement and support minimal standards. Numerous research studies reported on the importance of an effective teacher. There are several systems used nationally to determine teacher effectiveness. Although many state and federal mandates are implemented in a top-down fashion, when the rubber hits the road, it is the individual campus administrators who implement the appraisal process.

In this study, the responses revealed more about the responder than they did about the appraisal instrument. Regardless of the quality of the appraisal tool, even the best tool will be ineffective when used by an appraiser who has not been well trained in the implementation of process and how to conduct proper appraisal practices. The manner with which administrators implement the appraisal process in their daily practice affects how instructional practice and professional development is conducted at the “weeds” or

detail level, as well as at the “balcony view” or global level, of leading the campus. As research has suggested, there is a strong correlation between school leadership and student learning (Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003). Having an effective principal leading every school is critical in ensuring schools’ effectiveness, so it is vital that the instructional leader is conducting their duty to lead with the best practices possible (Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003). Despite the limitations of this comparative study, it provides valuable insight into the gaps that exist between training and practice. These findings have important consequences for the broader domain of instructional leadership. Ultimately, student learning is at stake.

Implication for Further Research

1. A follow-up study to determine what skills and knowledge are necessary to master before one assumes the role of principal would be beneficial and assist in developing improved pre-service, university, and on-the-job training.
2. A large-scale study on school districts’ long-term human resources plan for grooming future school leaders and comparing mentoring strategies for effective leadership capacity-building would benefit all stakeholders.
3. A comparative, comprehensive study of effective appraisal practices in several states and countries would highlight multiple sources of data that may be used to enhance current practices.
4. A follow-up study comparing assistant principal certification training and internships to training, induction, and internships in other fields (e.g., veterinary science, dentistry, law, and medicine) in order to enhance and improve principal instructional leadership preparation.

References

- Anderson, J. (2012, February 19). States try to fix quirks in teacher evaluations. *New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/20/education/states-address-problems-with-teacher-evaluations>
- Anderson, L., & Pellicer, L. (2001). *Teacher peer assistance and review*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Armstrong, L. (2004). *The secondary assistant principal in the state of Texas: Duties and job satisfaction*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Houston.
- Austin, B. D., & Brown, H. L. (1970). *Report of the assistant principalship. Vol. 3: The study of the assistant principalship*. Washington DC: National Association of Secondary Principals.
- Attinello, J., Lare, D., & Waters, F. (2006). The value of teacher portfolios for evaluation and professional growth. *NASSP Bulletin*, 90(2), 132-152.
- Barth, R. (1990). Managing for improved school effectiveness: An international survey. *School Organization*, 10(2), 167-178.
- Bartlett, C. (2011). *Principal succession: Trends and impacts*. Unpublished dissertation. University of Houston, Houston, TX.
- Bates, R. C., & Shank, J. G. (1983). The associate principalship, a better, more effective way to manage schools, *NASSP Bulletin*, 67(463), 111-114.
- Begum, F. (2008). *Assistant principals and teacher supervision: Roles, responsibilities, and regulations*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Houston, Houston, TX.

- Bird, T. (1990). The schoolteacher's portfolio: An essay on possibilities. In J. Millman & L. Darling-Hammons (Eds.), *The new handbook of teacher evaluation: Assessing elementary and secondary teachers* (pp. 241-256). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Bloom, G. (2007). Classroom visitations done well. *Leadership*, 36, 40-42.
- Bloom, G., & Kovetz, M. (2001). A step into the principalship. *Leadership*, 30, 12-13.
- Boyatzis, R., Cowen, S., & Kolb, D. (1995). *Innovations in professional education: Steps on a journey from teaching to learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bracey, G. (2006, December 17). *Believing the worst about schools: A lack of logic from Sputnik to tough choices*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/gerald-bracey/believing-the-worst-about_b_36562.html
- Bridges, E. (1986). *The incompetent teacher: The challenge and response*. London: Farmer Press.
- Bridges, E. (1992). *The incompetent teacher: Managerial responses*. London: Farmer Press.
- Brighton, C. (2009). Embarking on action research. *ASCD*, 66, 40-44.
- Buchanan, L. (2012, June). *13 ways of looking at a leader*. Retrieved from <http://www.inc.com/magazine/2012061/leigh-buchanan/>
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Burns' transformational leadership theory*. Retrieved from http://changingminds.org/disciplines/leadership/theories/burns_transformational.htm
- Calabrese, R. L., Short, G., & Zepeda, S. (1996). *Hands-on leadership tools for principals*. Princeton, NJ: Eye on Education.

- Calabrese, R. L. & Tucker-Ladd, P. R. (1991). The principal and assistant principal: A mentoring relationship. *NAASP Bulletin*, 75(533), 67-74.
- Caspar, R., Lessler, T., & Willis, G. (1999). *Reducing survey error through research on the cognitive and decision processes in surveys*. Short course presented at the Meeting of the American Statistical Association.
- Chicago Tribune*. (2005, December 9). *Protecting mediocre teachers*. Retrieved from <http://www.chicagotribune.com/business/content/education/chi-0512090288dec09,1,2900839.story?coll=chi-education-hed>
- City, E., Elmore, R., Flareman, S., & Teitel, L. (2009). *Instructional rounds in education: A network approach to improving teaching and learning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Center for Public Education. (2011). *Building a better evaluation system: At a glance*. Retrieved from <http://www.centerforpubliceducation.org>
- Celikten, M. (2001). The instructional leadership tasks of high school assistant principals. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 39(1), 67-75.
- Covey, S. R. (1991). *Principle-centered leadership*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Cranston, N., Tromans, C., & Reugebrink, M. (2002). *Forgotten leaders? The role and workload of the deputy principals in Queensland government secondary schools*. Paper prepared for the Australian Association for Research in Education (AARE) Conference, University of Queensland, December, 2002. Retrieved from <http://www.aare.eud.au/02pap/cra02433.htm>
- Danielson, C. (2002). How good is good? Rigorous and fair evaluation and teaching rests on principles, criteria and training. *The Register*. 4(3).

- Danielson, C., & McGreal, T. L. (2000). *Teacher evaluation to enhance professional practice*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Daresh, D., & Playko, M. (1992). *The professional development of school administrators*. Toronto: Allyn and Bacon.
- Darling-Hammond. (2007). Building a system for powerful teaching and learning. In R. Whehling (Ed.), *Building a 21st century U.S. education system*, (pp. 65-77). Washington DC: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.
- Davis, S., Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., Meyerson, D. (2005). *School leadership study: Developing successful principals* (Review of Research). Stanford, CA: Stanford University, Stanford Educational Leadership Institute.
- Denmark, V. M., & Davis, D. R. (2000). *The assistant principal's role: A training ground for becoming a transformational leader?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Regional Council for Educational Administration, Nashville, TN.
- Desimonte, L. M., & Lefloch, K. C. (2004). Are we asking the right questions? Using cognitive interviews to improve surveys in educational research. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 26, 1-22.
- Donaldson, M. L., & Peske, H. (2010). *Supporting effective teaching through teacher evaluation: A study of teacher evaluation in five charter schools*. Washington DC, Center for American Progress. Retrieved from http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2010/03/teacher_evaluation.html

- Donaldson, M. L. (2009). *So long, Lake Wobegon? Using teacher evaluation to raise teacher quality*. Washington DC: Center for American Progress. Retrieved from http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2009/06/teacher_evaluation.html
- Donaldson, M. L. (2010). No more valentines. *Educational Leadership*, 67, 54-58.
- Dauber, S. L., & Epstein, J. L. (1993). Parents' attitude and practices of involvement in inner-city elementary and middle schools. In N. Chavkin (Ed.) *Families in pluralistic society* (pp. 53-71). Albany, NY: SUNY press.
- Downey, C. (2006, August). *Why the Downey three-minute walk-through with reflective conversation? We must change the traditional supervisory process: It's not working!* Paper presented at the 60th Annual Summer Conference of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA), Lexington, KY.
- Dufour, R. (1991). *The principal as staff developer*. Bloomington, IN: National Education Service.
- Dufour, R., & Eaker, R. (1998). *Professional learning communities at work: Best practices for enhancing student achievement*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Dufour, R., & Marzano, R. (2009). High leverage strategies for principal leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 66(5), 62-68.
- Drake, T., & Rowe, W. (1986). *The principalship*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Ebmeir, H., & Nicklaus, J. (1999). The impact of peer and principal collaborative supervision on teachers' trust, commitment, desire for collaboration and efficacy. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 14, 351-378.

- Ellis, D. (2011). *Principal's perspectives on PAR (Peer Assistance and Review) as an effective tool for improving teachers' instructional practices*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of La Verne, CA.
- Elmore, R. (2006). *School reform from the inside out: Policy, practice, and performance*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Press.
- Empowering effective teachers: Readiness for reform*. (2010, February). Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. Issue Brief.
- Erlandson, D. A. (1994). Building a career: Fulfilling the lifetime professional needs of principals. Fairfax, VA: National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (ERIC document Reproduction Services No. ED385920).
- Erlandson, D. A., Stark, P. L., & Ward, S. M. (1996). *Organizational oversight: Planning and scheduling for effectiveness*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.
- Educational Service Center (ESC) Catalog. (2012). ILD and PDAS Courses. Retrieved from www.escweb.net/tx-esc_esc_041/catalog/sessionid/=902162
- Evans, R. (1996). *The human side of school change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Fields, L. J. (2002). *The effects of a professional development cadre on new assistant principals*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.
- Fink, S. (2009, November). Fishing blindly for quality teaching. *The School Administrator*. 44-45.
- Fédération Equestre Internationale (FEI). (2001, January). *Dressage and para-equestrian dressage classification rules*. Retrieved from <http://www.fei.org/disciplines/dressage/rules>

- Fédération Equestre Internationale (FEI). (2012, November 7). *About dressage*. Retrieved from [www.fei.org/disciplines/about dressage](http://www.fei.org/disciplines/about%20dressage)
- Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Fullan, M., Hill, P., & Crevola, C. (2006). *Breakthrough*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Fullan, M., & Hargreaves, A. (1991). *What's worth fighting for: Working together for your school*. Toronto: Ontario Public School Teachers' Federation.
- Fuller, E., & Young, M. (2009). Tenure and retention of newly hired principals in Texas. Texas High School Project. 1-19.
- Geiselman, R. E., Fisher, R. P., Cohen, G., Holland, H. et al. (1986, March). Eyewitness responses to leading and misleading questions under the cognitive interview. *Journal of Police Science & Administration*, 14(1), 31-39.
- Gerke, W. (2004). More than a disciplinarian. *Principal Leadership*, 51(3), 39-41.
- Glanz, J. (1994). Redefining the roles and responsibilities of assistant principals. *The Clearing House*, 67(5), 283-287.
- Golanda, E. L. (1991). Preparing tomorrow's educational leaders: An inquiry regarding the wisdom of utilizing the position of assistant principal as internship or apprenticeship to prepare future principals. *Journal of School Leadership*, 1(3), 266-283.
- Goldsberry, L. F. (1998). Teacher involvement in supervision. In G. R. Firth & E. F. Pajak (Ed.), *Handbook on research of school supervision* (pp. 428-462). New York: Simon & Shuster MacMillan.

- Goodson, C. P. (2000). Assisting the assistant principal. *Principal*, 79, 56-57
- Gorton, D., & Kattman, R. (1985). The assistant principal: An underused asset. *Principal*, 65(2), 36, 39-40.
- Gregory, S. (2012). *What are the benefits of employee recognition programs?* Retrieved from http://ehow.com/info-7930873_benefits_employeeerecognition
- Hanson, M. (2001). Institutional theory and educational change. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37(5), 637-661.
- Hargreaves, A., & Fink, D. (2003). *The seven principles of sustainable leadership*. Retrieved from http://marylandpublicschools.org/NR/rdonlyres/F7D49A8D-E9D0-4C49-9DE6-3A878BC9F1F4/18748/seven_principles.pdf
- Hartzell, G. N. (1993). When you're not at the top. *High School Matters*, 1(2), 16-19.
- Hartzell, G. N. (1993). The assistant principal: Neglected actor in practitioner leadership literature. *The Journal of School Leadership*, 3(6), 707-723.
- Hartzell, G. N., Williams, R. C., & Nelson, K. T. (1995). *New voices in the field*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Harvey, M. J. (1994). The deputy principalship: Retrospect and prospect. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 8(3), 15-25.
- Hausman, C., Nebeker, A., McCreary, J., & Donaldson, G. (2001). The work life of the assistant principal. *Journal of Education Administration*, 40(2), 136-157.
- Hinchey, P. (2010). *Getting teacher assessment right: What policymakers can learn from research*. National Education Policy Center.

Hogue, T., Perkins, D., Clark, R., Bergstrum, A., Slinkskim, M., et al. (1995).

Collaboration framework: Addressing community capacity. Columbus, OH

National Network for Collaboration.

Hoglund, B. (2012). *Have we lost the real purpose of teacher evaluation?* Retrieved from

<http://www.funderstanding.com/educators/have-we-lost-the-real-purpose-of-teacher-evaluation/>

Hopkins-Thomas, P. A. (2000). Colleagues helping colleagues: Mentoring and coaching.

National Association of Secondary School Principals. *NASSP Bulletin*, 84(617), 29-36.

Hord, S., & Hirsch, S. (2009). The principal's role in supporting learning communities.

ACSD, 66, 22-23.

Institute for Educational Leadership. (2000, October). *Leadership for student learning:*

Reinventing the principalship. A report of the task force on the principalship.

Washington DC: Author.

International Center for Leadership in Education. (2012). *Daggett system for effective*

instruction. Retrieved from <http://leadered.com/dsei.html>

Jackson, D. (2011). Perception is reality: Your strengths matter. *Journal of Leadership*

Education, 10, 115-122.

Jackson, R. (2009). *Never work harder than your students and other principles of great*

teaching. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Johnson, S. (2004). Project on the next generation of teachers. *Finders and keepers:*

Helping new teachers survive and thrive in our schools. San Francisco, CA:

Jossey-Bass.

- Johnson-Taylor, C., & Martin, M. (2007). *Next in line*. Retrieved from www.nassp.org/portals/0/.../55407.pdf
- Kaiser, J. (1995). *The 21st century principal*. Mequon, WI: Stylex Publishing.
- Kane, T., Taylor, R., Tyler, J. H., & Wooten, A. L. (2010). *Identifying effective practices for using student achievement data*. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Kaplan, L.S., & Owens, W.A. (1999). Assistant principals: The case for shared instructional leadership. *NASSP Bulletin*, 83(605), 80-94.
- Kells, G. (1991). Principals' perceptions of factors affecting student achievement. *Education*, 113(4), 617-619.
- Kelly, G. (1987). The assistant principal as a training ground for the principalship. *NASSP Bulletin*, 71(501), 13-20.
- Knezevich, S. (1984). *Administration of public education: A sourcebook for the leadership and management of educational institutions*. New York, NY: Harper Row.
- Knowles, M. S. (1980). *The modern practice of adult education: from pedagogy to androgogy*. Chicago: Follet.
- Knowles, M. S. (1984). *Adragogy in action*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Koppich, J. E., & Showalter, C. (2008). *Strategic management of human capital: A cross-case analysis of five districts*. Madison, WI: Strategic Management of Human Capital.
- Koru, J. M. (1993). The assistant principal: Crisis manager, custodian, or visionary? *NASSP Bulletin*, 77(556), 67-71.

- Lah, K., & Botelho, G. (2012, September 17). *Judge holds off request to end Chicago teacher strike*. Retrieved from <http://www.cnn.com/2012/09/17/us/illinois-chicago-teachers-strike/index.html>
- Lee, J. (2010). *Speeding up the race to the top*. [The White House Blog]. Retrieved from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2010/01019/speeding-race-top>
- Leithwood, K. (1994). Leadership for school restructuring. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 30(4), 498-518.
- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Kopkins, D. (2008). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership. *School Leadership and Management*, 28(1), 27-42.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (1999). Transformational school leadership effects: A replication. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 10, 451-479.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2000). The effects of transformational leadership on organizational conditions and student engagement with school. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38, 112-129.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2005). A review of transformational school leader research: 1996-2005. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4, 177-199.
- Leithwood, K., Louis, K. S., Anderson, S., & Whalstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning*. doi:10.1080/1136031206007411474
- Leithwood, K., Seashore-Louis, K. S., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2010). *Investigating the links to student achievement* (Learning from leadership project executive summary). New York: Wallace Foundation.
- Lezotte, L., & Mckee, K. (2006). *Stepping up: Leading the charge to improve our schools*. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd.

- Little, J. (1987). Teachers as colleagues. In Richardson-Keohler, V., (Ed.) *Educator's Handbook*, (pp. 491-518). White Plains: Longman.
- Lunenburg, F. C. (2003). *Emerging perspectives: The usefulness of the construct of transformational leadership in educational organizations*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration. Sedona, AZ.
- MacNeil, A., & Maclin, V. (2005, July 24). *Building a learning community: The culture and climate of schools*. Retrieved from <http://cnx.org/content/m12922/1.2/>
- MacNeil, A., & Yelvington, M. (2005). *The principalship: Manager to leader*. Retrieved from <http://cnx.org/content/m12924/latest/>
- MacNeil, A. J., Prater, D. L., & Busch, S. (2009). The effects of school culture and climate on student achievement. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 12(1), 73-84.
- Madden, A. (2008). *Preparation for the assistant principal for the role of principal: An examination of real tasks as compared to the perceived ideal*. Educational Policy Studies Dissertation. Retrieved from http://digitalarchive.gsu.edu/eps_diss/20
- Mannat, R., & Benway, M. (1998). Teacher and administrator performance evaluation: Benefits of 360-degree feedback. *ERS Spectrum*, 16(2), 18-23.
- Marford, S. (2011). Principals' group weighs in on evaluations. *Education Week*. 30(24) 1-9.
- Marshall, C. (1985). Professional shock: The enculturation of the assistant principal. *Education and Urban Society*, 18(1), 28-58.

- Marshall, C. (1992). *The assistant principalship: Leadership choices and challenges*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- Marshall, C., & Greenfield, W. D. (1985). The socialization of the assistant principal: Implications for school leadership. *Education and Urban Society*, 18(1), 3-6.
- Marshall, C., & Mitchell, B. (1991). The assumptive worlds of fledgling administrators. *Education and Urban Society*. 23(4), 396-415.
- Martinez, J. (2011). Assistant principal frustrations, obstacles and recommended changes. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Houston, Houston, TX.
- 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.
- Marzano, R. J., & Toth, M. (2012, September 21). *The difference between measuring teachers and developing teachers: Can both be achieved in an evaluation system?* [Webinar] Webinar ID 595-013-778. Retrieved from www.MarzanoCenter.com
- Marzano, R., & Waters, T. (2009). *District leadership that works: Striking the right balance*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree and McREL.
- Marzano, R., Waters, T., McNulty, B. (2003). *Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement*. McREL.
- Marzano, R., Waters, T., McNulty, B. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA. ASCD.
- Marzano, R. J., Pickering, D., & Pollock, J. E. (2001). *Classroom instruction that works: Research-based strategies for increasing student achievement*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

- Maxwell, J. (1998). *The 21 irrefutable laws of leadership: Follow them and people will follow you*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.
- Mead, S. (2012, August). *The missing piece in the teacher evaluation laws: Empowering principals*. Retrieved from http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/sarameads_policy_notebook/2012/08/the_missing_piece
- McEwan, E. (2003). *7 steps to effective instructional leadership* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corin Press.
- McKinsey & Company. (2007). *How the world's best performing school systems come out on top*. New York: NY.
- McLaughlin, M. W. (1990). Embracing contraries: Implementing and sustaining teacher evaluation. As cited in J. Millman & L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.) *The new Handbook of teacher evaluation: Assessing elementary and secondary school teachers* (pp. 403-415). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- McREL (Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning). (2011). *Noteworthy perspectives: High reliability organizations in education*. Denver, CO: Network for Innovative Education.
- McREL. (2006, June 7). *Balanced leadership: School leadership that works*. Retrieved from www.createconference.org/documents/.../BalancedLeadership.ppt
- Mellon, E. (2011, November 27). Trainers' role: Assist or spy? *Houston Chronicle*, p. 1B.
- Mellon, E. (2012, November 15). *HISD may delay teacher evaluation plan*. Retrieved from <http://www.chron.com/news/houston-texas/houston/article/HISD-may-delay-teacher-evaluation-plan>

- Mertz, N. T. (2000). *Contextualizing the position of the assistant principal*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Albuquerque, NM.
- Mertz, N. T. (2006). The organizational socialization of assistant principals. *Journal of School Leadership*. 16(6), 644-675.
- Milanowski, A. (2004). The criterion-related validity of the performance assessment system in Cincinnati. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 79(4), 33-53.
- Milner, H. R. IV. (2010). *Review of teacher evaluation 2.0*. Retrieved from <http://nepc.colorado.edu/thinktank/review-teach-eval-TNTP>
- Moe, T. (2011). *Special interest: Teachers unions and America's public schools*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Myatt, M. (2012, August 7). *Leadership and perception*. Retrieved from <http://www.n2growth.com/blog/leadership-and-perception>
- National Staff Development Council Standards (NSDC). (2012). Retrieved from www.naepdc.org/Quality%20Framework/NSDC%20Standards.doc
- National Education Association. (2011). *Teacher evaluation: A resource guide for National Education Association Leaders and Staff*. Retrieved from <http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/teacherevalguide2011.pdf>
- No Child Left Behind Act (NCLBA). (2012, December 1). Retrieved from http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/n/no_child_left_behind_act/index.html

NJEA. (2011, March). *What does an effective teacher evaluation system look like?*

Retrieved from <http://m.njea.org/news-and-publications/njea-review/march-2011/the-research-vs-the-rhetoric>

O'Donnell, P. (2012, July 6). Principals will start seeing the same scrutiny as teachers when new evaluation system goes statewide next fall. *The Plain Dealer*.

Retrieved from http://www.cleveland.com/metro/index.ssf/2012/07/principals_will_start_seeing_t.html

OECD. (2009, December 1-2). *Teacher evaluation: A conceptual framework and examples of country practices*. Paper presented at the OECD-Mexico workshop, Mexico City, Mexico.

Oliver, R. (2005). Assistant principal professional development: A matter that cannot be left to chance. *Educational Leadership*, 17, 89-100.

Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD). (2009). *Teacher evaluation: A conceptual framework and examples of country practices*. Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/education/preschoolandschool/44568106.pdf>

Osborne, J. (2012). Everyone wins is a losing proposition. Retrieved from <http://shine.yahoo.com/parenting-guru-everyone-wins-losing-proposition-194400185.html>

Panyako, D., & Rorie, L. (1987). The changing role of the assistant principal. *NASSP Bulletin*, 71(501), 6-8.

PDAS Teacher Handbook. (2012). Retrieved from <http://www4.esc13.net/pdas/teacher-manual-and-training-materials>

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

Peterson, K. D. (2012). *The myths and truths of teacher evaluation*. Retrieved from <http://www.teacherevaluation.net/Essay/fivemyth.html>

Peterson, K. D., Stevens, D., & Ponzio, R. C. (1998). Variable sources of teacher evaluation. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 31(3), 123-132.

Pounder, D., & Crow, G. (2005). Sustaining the pipeline of school administrators. *Educational Leadership*, 62(8), 56-60.

Portrait of a Cypress-Fairbanks Administrator. Retrieved from <http://www.cfsd.net/humanres/portadm.htm>

Professional Development and Appraisal System Teacher Manual. Retrieved from <http://www5.esc13.net/pdas/>

Protecting Mediocre Teachers. (2005, December 9). *Chicago Tribune*. Retrieved from <http://www.chicagotribune.com/business/content/education/chi-0512090288dec09,1,2900839.story?coll=chi-education-hed>

National Center for Education Statistics. (1994). *Public elementary teacher's views on teacher performance evaluations*. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/frss/publications/94097/index.asp?sectionid=4>

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983, April 26). Retrieved from <http://www.scribd.com/doc/49151492/A-Nation-at-Risk>

NBC Olympics. (2012). *Scoring overview*. Retrieved from <http://www.nbcolympics.com/gymnastics/about-this-sport/scoring/news=scoring-overview.html>

Newman, F., & Wehlage, G. (1995). *Successful school restructuring: A report to the public and educators by the Center for Restructuring Schools*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Newman, F., & Wehlage, T. (1996). *Authentic achievement: Restructuring schools for intellectual quality*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

No Child Left Behind Act. (2001). Retrieved from http://en.Wikipedia.org/wiki/No_Child_Left_Behind_Act

Reeder, S. (2012). 'Diplomacy' undermines teacher evaluations. Retrieved from <http://thehiddencostoftenable.com/stories>

Reeder, S. (2012). *High cost of firing teachers deters action by schools*. Retrieved from <http://thehiddencostoftenable.com/stories>

Reeder, S. (2012). *Schools resort to secret buyouts to get rid of teachers*. Retrieved from <http://thehiddencostoftenable.com/stories>

Reeder, S. (2012). *Remediation falls short of '85 legislative intent*. Retrieved from <http://thehiddencostoftenable.com/stories>

Renihan, P., & Leonard, P. (2000). *Is the principalship for you? A primer on in-school leadership*. Retrieved from www.saskschoolboard.ca/old/ResearchAndDevelopment/ResearchReports/Leadership/00-05

Renihan, P. (1999). *In-school leadership for Saskatchewan schools: Issues and strategies*. Regina: Saskatchewan School Trustees Association.

Renihan, P. (1985). *The Saskatchewan school principalship*. Regina: SSTA.

Ribbons, P. (1997). Heads on deputy headship: Impossible roles for invisible role holders? *Educational Management and Administration*, 25(3), 295-308.

- Richard, A. (2000). Toughest job in education? *Education Week*, 19(31), 44- 46.
- Robinson, G. (2009). *Principals' perceptions regarding the role of the professional development and appraisal system in teacher supervision in Texas*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Houston, Houston, TX.
- Rosenholtz, S. (1989). *Teachers' workplace: The social organization of schools*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Ryan, T. (2010, August 29). Use Ohio's value-added data to assess teacher effectiveness. *The Plain Dealer*. Retrieved from http://www.cleveland.com/opinion/index.ssf/2010/08/use_ohios_value-added_data_to.html
- Sametz, D. (1996). *Determining effective leadership for effective schools*. Unpublished master's project. Saskatoon: University of Saskatchewan.
- Schmidt-Davis, J., & Bottoms, G. (2011). Who's next? Let's stop gambling on school performance and plan for principal succession. *SREB*, 1-52.
- Schriren, M. (1973). *Handbook for model training program in qualitative education evaluation*. Berkeley, CA. University of California Press.
- Schriren, M. (1981). Summative teacher evaluation. In J.Millman & L.Darling-Hammons (Eds.). *The new handbook of teacher evaluation: Assessing elementary and secondary teachers* (pp. 241-256). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Scoggins, A. J., & Bishop, H. L. (1993). *A review of literature regarding the roles and responsibilities of assistant principals*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline*. New York, NY: Doubleday.

- Sergiovanni, T. (1992). On rethinking leadership: A conversation with Tom Sergiovanni. *Educational Leadership*. 46-49, ASCD
- Sergiovanni, T. (1991). *The principalship: A reflective practice perspective* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1996). *Moral leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (2000). Leadership as stewardship. In *The Jossey-Bass Reader on Educational Leadership*. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (2001). *The principalship: A reflective practice perspective* (5th ed.). San Antonio, TX: Trinity Press
- Shoho, A. R., Barnett, B. G., & Tooms, A. K. (2011). Introduction. In A. R. Shoho, B. G. Barnett, & A. K. Tooms (Eds.), *Examining the Assistant Principalship: New Puzzles and Perennial Challenges for the 21st Century* (pp. TBD). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Short, R., & Greer, J. (1997). *Leadership for empowered schools*. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Simon, E., & Gold, E. (2005). *Reframing accountability for urban schools: Efforts from the ground up to improve public education*. Philadelphia, PA: Research for Action.
- Stiggins, R., & DuFour, R. (2009). Maximizing the power of formative assessments. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 90(9), 640-644.
- Strauss, S. (2007). *Ask an expert: Finding what motivates your employees*. Retrieved from http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/money/smallbusiness/columnist/strauss/2007-05-21-motivating-employees_N.htm

- Stodosky, S. S. (1984). Teacher evaluation: The limits of looking. *Educational Researcher*, 13(9), 11-18.
- Stronge, J., & Tucker, P. (2003). *Handbook on teacher evaluation: Assessing and improving performance*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education Publications.
- TASB HR Exchange (2009, Feb). *Building better teacher evaluation systems*. Retrieved from www.tasb.org/services/hr_services/hrexchange/2009/Feb09/building_better_teacher.aspx
- Texas Education Agency. (2011). *Beginning teacher induction and mentoring*. Retrieved from <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/btim.aspx>
- Texas Education Agency. (2012). *General inquiry: Teacher questions FAQ*. Retrieved from <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/page.aspx?id=3058>
- Texas Education Agency. (2012). *Waivers and exemptions*. Retrieved from http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index.aspx?id=6635&menu_id=932&menu_id2=788
- Texas Administrative Code (TAC). Retrieved from <http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/rules/tac/ch15otoc.html>
- TExES Principal Preparation Manual. (2012). Retrieved from http://www.texas.ets.org/assets/pdf/test_descriptions/te_facmanappendixc_fld068_r.pdf
- The New Teacher Project (TNTTP). (2010). *Teacher evaluation 2.0*. Retrieved from <http://www.tntp.org/files/Teacher-Evaluation-Oct10F.pdf>
- Toch, T. (2008). Fixing teacher evaluation. *Educational Leadership*, 66, 32-37.
- Tschannen-Moran, B., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2011, October). The coach and the evaluator. *Educational Leadership*, 69, 2. ASCD.

- USA Gymnastics (2005, May). *Judging women's artistic gymnastics*. Retrieved from <http://usagym.org/pages/women/pages/judging.html>
- USDE. (2012). *State and local implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act, Volume VIII—Teacher quality under NCLB: Final report*. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/teaching/nclb-final/index.html>
- Wagner, T., & Kegan, R. (2006). *Change leadership: A practical guide to transforming our schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Wantanabe, T., & Mishak, M. (2012, August 17). Bill to create statewide teacher evaluation system clears key hurdle. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from <http://articles.latimes.com/2012aug/17/local/la-me-teacher-eval-20120817>
- Waters, T., Marzano, R. J., & McNulty, B. (2003). *Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on pupil achievement. A working paper*. Denver, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL).
- Waxman, H. C., MacNeil, A., & Lee, Y. H. (2006, November). *Principals' perceptions of successful school leadership*. Paper presented at the annual convention of the University Council of Educational Administration, San Antonio, TX.
- Webber, S. (2011, February 11). *Our Sputnik moment: Then and now*. Retrieved from <http://www.pbs.org/wnet/need-to-know/the-daily-need/our-sputnik-moment-then-and-now/>
- Weller, L. D., & Weller, S. (2002). *The assistant principal: Essentials for effective school leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

- Wei, R., Andree, A., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2009). How nations invest in teachers. *ASCD*. 66, 28-33.
- Weisberg, D., Sexton, S., Mulhern, J., & Keeting, D. (2009). *The widget effect: Our national failure to acknowledge and act on differences in teacher effectiveness*. Brooklyn, NY: The New Teacher Project.
- Weiss, J. (2012, September 16). *Texas piloting two new teacher evaluation systems*. Retrieved from <http://www.dallasnews.com/news/education/headlines/20120916-texas-piloting-two-new-teacher-evaluation-systems.ece>
- Willis, G. (2005). *Cognitive interviewing as a tool for improving the informed consent process*. Retrieved from [http://www.emhr.net/uploads/2009_conference/related_articles/Willis%20%20Cognitive%20Interviewing\[1\].pdf](http://www.emhr.net/uploads/2009_conference/related_articles/Willis%20%20Cognitive%20Interviewing[1].pdf)
- Wise, A., & Darling-Hammons, L. (1985). Teacher evaluation and teacher professionalism. *Educational Leadership*, 42(4) 28-33.
- Woodcock, C. (2010). 'Everyone's a winner' attitude in sports is a big loser. Retrieved from http://www.torontosun.com/comment/columnists/connie_woodcock/2010/06/04/14271016.html
- Yariv, E. (2009). The appraisal of teachers' performance and its impact on the mutuality of principal-teacher emotions. *School Leadership and Management*, 29(5), 445-461.
- Zellner, L., Ward, S. M., McNamara, P., Gideon, B., Camancho, S., & Edgewood, S. D. (2002, February). *The loneliest job in town: Sculpting the recruitment and retention of the principal*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, Austin, TX.

Zepeda, S., & Ponticelli, J. (1998). At cross-purposes: What do teachers need, want and get from supervision? *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 14(1), 68-87.

APPENDIX A
UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE
IN CONFIDENTIAL RESEARCH

Appendix A
University of Houston Consent to Participate in Confidential Research

UNIVERSITY of **HOUSTON**
DIVISION OF RESEARCH

June 28, 2012

Karen Kulhanek-Rochin
c/o Dr. Steven Busch
Curriculum and Instruction

Dear Karen Kulhanek-Rochin,

Based upon your request for exempt status, an administrative review of your research proposal entitled "Analysis of School Administrator Perceptions of Professional Development and Appraisal System to Improve Leadership Capacity" was conducted on June 27, 2012.

In accordance with institutional guidelines, your project is exempt under **Category 4**, contingent upon the following:

- A letter of cooperation from Dr. Angus MacNeil Stating he will provide de-identified data to the principal investigator for analyses must be submitted to CPHS.

The required revisions to your application must be submitted online via the Research Administration Management Portal (RAMP), by July 27, 2012 or the Committee's sanction may be revoked. To expedite review; please highlight the changes made for all revised documents that will be uploaded.

As long as you continue using procedures described in this project, you do not have to reapply for review.
* Any modification of this approved protocol will require review and approval by the Committee.

If you have any questions, please contact Alicia Vargas at (713) 743-9215.

Sincerely yours,



Kirstin Rochford, MPH, CIP, CPIA
Director, Research Compliance

Protocol Number: 12522-EX

316 E. Cullen Building Houston, TX 77204-2015 (713) 743-9204 Fax: (713) 743-9577

COMMITTEES FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS

Appendix A (continued)
University of Houston Consent to Participate in Confidential Research

UNIVERSITY of HOUSTON
DIVISION OF RESEARCH

July 18, 2012

Karen Kulhanek-Rochin
c/o Dr. Steven Busch
Curriculum and Instruction

Dear Karen Kulhanek-Rochin,

Based upon your request for exempt status, an administrative review of your research proposal entitled "Analysis of School Administrator Perceptions of Professional Development and Appraisal System to Improve Leadership Capacity" was conducted on June 27, 2012.

At that time, your request for exemption under Category 4 was approved pending modification of your proposed procedures/documents.

The changes you have made adequately respond to the identified contingencies. As long as you continue using procedures described in this project, you do not have to reapply for review. * Any modification of this approved protocol will require review and further approval. Please contact me to ascertain the appropriate mechanism.

If you have any questions, please contact Alicia Vargas at (713) 743-9215.

Sincerely yours,



Kirstin Rochford, MPH, CIP, CPIA
Director, Research Compliance

*Approvals for exempt protocols will be valid for 5 years beyond the approval date. Approval for this project will expire **June 1, 2017**. If the project is completed prior to this date, a final report should be filed to close the protocol. If the project will continue after this date, you will need to reapply for approval if you wish to avoid an interruption of your data collection.

Protocol Number: 12522-EX

APPENDIX B

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON LETTER OF DATA DE-IDENTIFICATION

Appendix B
University of Houston Letter of Data De-Identification

U N I V E R S I T Y *of* H O U S T O N

College of Education
Department of Curriculum and Instruction



112 Farish Hall
713/743-5030

Kirstin Rochford

Date: July 13, 2012

Dear Ms. Rochford,

I am writing to you at this time to acknowledge that I **will provide de-identified data to the principal investigator for analyses for** Karen Kulhanek-Rochin.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Angus J. MacNeil'.

Angus J. MacNeil Ph.D.

Ph: 713-743-5038

E-mail: amacneil@uh.edu

APPENDIX C

ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL JOB DESCRIPTION

Appendix C

Assistant Principal Job Description

Position: Assistant Principal

Pay Grade: AP6

Duty Days: Depends on campus level – 215 to 235 days

Salary: Contract for 215 - 235 days (dependent on campus level). Salary will be adjusted for teaching and administrative experience in accordance with the staff compensation plan.

Qualifications:

- Certified as an administrator or be eligible for certification by July 1, 2011 by the State Board for Educator Certification.
- Minimum of two years as a classroom teacher or current or former administrator committed to aggressive leadership in the instructional program.

Duties include but are not limited to the following:

- Supervise all areas of the school buildings and campus.
- Provide support and assistance to individual teachers when discipline problems arise in the classroom, on the school campus, or any other time students are under school supervision.
- Supervise all student activities, and assist in supervision of the lunch periods each day.
- Responsible for inventory and distribution of textbooks.
- Supervise custodians and provide for the efficient maintenance of the campus and buildings.
- Responsible for establishing and maintaining the school pupil attendance program.
- Visit the classrooms and assist in teacher evaluations.
- Supervise the unloading or loading of buses each day and assist in the preparation of campus duty assignments.
- Perform all other duties assigned by the principal.
- Report to the principal.

Work Conditions:

- Maintain emotional control under stress.
- Occasional district wide and statewide travel.
- Frequent prolonged and irregular hours.

APPENDIX D

INTERMEDIATE ASSOCIATE PRINCIPAL JOB DESCRIPTION

Appendix D

Intermediate Associate Principal Job Description

Position: Associate Principal – Intermediate

Pay Grade: AP7

Duty Days: 207

Salary: Contract for 207 days. Salary will be adjusted for teaching and administrative experience in accordance with the staff compensation plan.

Qualifications:

- Certified as an administrator or be eligible for certification by June 1, 2011 by the State Board for Educator Certification.
- Current or former principal, associate principal, or assistant principal in a school(s) serving grades 9-12 and committed to aggressive leadership in the instructional program.

Duties include but are not limited to the following:

- Supervise all areas of the school buildings and campus.
- Provide support and assistance to individual teachers when discipline problems arise in the classroom, on the school campus, or any other time students are under school supervision.
- Supervise all student activities, and assist in supervision of the lunch periods each day.
- Responsible for inventory and distribution of textbooks.
- Supervise custodians and provide for the efficient maintenance of the campus and buildings.
- Responsible for establishing and maintaining the school pupil attendance program.
- Visit the classrooms and assist in teacher evaluations.
- Supervise the unloading or loading of buses each day and assist in the preparation of campus duty assignments.
- Perform all other duties assigned by the principal.
- Assist the principal in advising one or more assistant principals.
- Provide support to the principal in problem analysis and solutions in involving students, parents and staff.
- Report to the principal.

Work Conditions:

- Maintain emotional control under stress.
- Occasional district wide and statewide travel.
- Frequent prolonged and irregular hours.

APPENDIX E

INTERMEDIATE PRINCIPAL JOB DESCRIPTION

Appendix E

Intermediate Principal Job Description

Position: Intermediate School Principal

Pay Grade: AP8

Duty Days: 220

Salary: Contract for 220 days. Salary will be adjusted for teaching and administrative experience in accordance with the staff compensation plan.

Qualifications:

- Certified as an administrator or be eligible for certification by June 1, 2011 by the State Board for Educator Certification.
- Current or former principal, associate principal, or assistant principal committed to aggressive leadership in the instructional program.

Duties include but are not limited to the following:

- Act as the academic and administrative head of school building and grounds.
- Responsible for and have authority over the actions of students, professional and nonprofessional employees, visitors, and persons hired to perform special tasks according to the approved administrative organization.
- Responsible for the application process for perspective Vistas School students.
- Communicate with district high school principals regarding student and program progress on a consistent basis.
- Work with the administration in obtaining qualified teachers and recommend contact status and employment for all certified personnel in consultation with the appropriate staff personnel, and work with the director of school administration and other administrators when employing service personnel, and work with directors in this area to obtain the best working conditions and results. Recommend to the superintendent the termination or suspension of an employee assigned to the campus or the non-renewal of the term contract of an employee assigned to the campus.
- Supervise, direct, and evaluate the services of the teachers assigned to him, the general instructional program, and classroom management. Responsible for the placement of teachers and the assignment of duties subject to the approval of the superintendent.
- Responsible for keeping records required by the state and district, and for requiring teachers to keep accurate records.
- Responsible for the care and maintenance of the buildings, grounds, and other physical facilities in his charge; provide periodic inspection of his/her building to eliminate safety hazards of all kinds.
- Responsible for the coordinating and initiating of requisitions for the ordering of supplies and equipment.
- Assist the superintendent and his staff in formulating and implementing a wholesome public relations program, and to keep the director of school administration informed of activities in his building.
- Make all necessary reports for the athletic program to the administration and ascertain that all UIL reports are properly compiled and submitted as required.

- Perform any other duties prescribed by the Director of School Administration.
- Report to and be directly responsible to the Director of School Administration.

APPENDIX F

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Appendix F

University of Houston Survey Instrument



University of Houston  College of Education

COLLABORATION

FOR LEARNING & LEADING



Graduate Student's Name

Section A:

Demographic Information

The Principal's name

Age in Years: ☐ 30 and Under ☐ 31-37 ☐ 38-45 ☐ 46-55 ☐ 56-62 ☐ Over 63

Sex: ☐ Male ☐ Female

Years as a Principal

Years in Education

Degrees Held:

☐

Bachelors

☐

Masters

☐

Doctorate

Management Certification Year

Institution

Ethnicity: ☐ White/Non-Hispanic ☐ Black/Non-Hispanic ☐ Hispanic ☐ Asian/Pacific Islander

☐

American Indian/Alaskan Native

☐

Non-Resident/International

Major teaching field

Extra-curricular activities directed while a teacher

▲

▼

◀

▶

The School's name

Location: ☐ Rural ☐ Suburban ☐ Urban The Grades in the school

Number of: Teachers Students

Percentage of students: White/Non-Hispanic Black/Non-Hispanic Hispanic
 Asian/Pacific Islander American Indian/Alaskan Native
 Non-Resident/International

Other certificated personnel Non-certificated personnel

TAKS Rating: ☐ Exemplary ☐ Recognized ☐ Acceptable ☐ Low performing

Percentage of students receiving free and reduced Lunch

Name of School District

Section B:

In this section we are trying to establish how principals conceptualize their notions of what makes a school a "good" school as opposed to a "fair or poor" school.

Much of the current educational leadership literature focuses on effective schools and more currently how we develop our schools as community. The new nomenclature currently used is "good school." How would you describe a good school?

For our purposes school culture is described as "What the school values." How would you describe the culture of a good school?

Section C

We are trying to understand the importance of the relationship between the principal and the teachers.

Explain how the relationship between the principal and the teacher important for the school.

Describe what you think are the most critical feature for a successful working relationship between teacher and principal.

What do you do to create good relations with your teachers?

Do you look out for the personal welfare of your teachers? If so, how do you do it?

Section D

In this section we are trying to establish the attitudes beliefs and values that principals have with regard to teacher supervision.

What is the purpose of teacher supervision?

Do our assessment practices (TTAS, FDAS) really work? Do you believe that the process achieves the intended outcome? What do you believe are the outcomes?

Do you think that the principal is the best person in the school to do supervision? For example is there any value for a principal with no education or experience supervising a French language class.

When supervising teachers do you report on what you observe or do you consider other factors when writing your reports? Explain

Section E

We are trying to establish the understandings that principals have about leadership

Describe the difference between a "linear" leader contrasted to a critical thinker and systematic problem solver?

What do you believe are the most important characteristics of a good leader?

How would you describe yourself as a leader?

To what extent do you allow teachers to take risks to make the school better?

To what extent do you believe that teachers should be involved in leadership roles in your school?

Section F

We are trying to establish the understanding and value principals attach to the role of parental involvement in their student's education.

What do you believe is an appropriate and necessary level of parental involvement in the student's education? Explain.

What do you do to encourage and support parental involvement in their student's education?

When a parent asks you to change their student's teacher how do you react?
Check one category below

<input type="checkbox"/>	I do so willingly
<input type="checkbox"/>	I do so hesitatingly
<input type="checkbox"/>	I do so begrudgingly
<input type="checkbox"/>	I try my best to discourage it
<input type="checkbox"/>	I resist their efforts to have a change

Explain your answer here:

Section G

In this section we are trying to establish the obstacles frustrations and changes principals are most concerned with

On a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being most and 1 being least, rate the degree to which each of the following presents a feeling of frustration or being discouraged in being able to carry out your duties.

	1	2	3	4	5
Federal Bureaucracy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
State Bureaucracy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
School District Bureaucracy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lack of Money	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lack of other resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lack of parent involvement in the school	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Poor Preparation of Teachers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lack of Teacher Commitment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Poor instruction of teachers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lack of parental involvement at home	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lack of Student Motivation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Poor basic skills of students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

On a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being most and 1 being least rate the degree to which each of the following presents a genuine obstacle or restriction that cause you the most concern as you try to carry out your duties as principal.

	1	2	3	4	5
Federal Bureaucracy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
State Bureaucracy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
School District Bureaucracy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lack of Money	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lack of other resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lack of parent involvement in the school	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Poor Preparation of Teachers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lack of Teacher Commitment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Poor instruction of teachers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lack of parental involvement at home	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lack of Student Motivation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Poor basic skills of students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

On a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being most and 1 being least rate the following for the things that you would change to make you more enabled in your role as principal.

	1	2	3	4	5
Federal Bureaucracy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
State Bureaucracy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
School District Bureaucracy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lack of Money	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lack of other resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lack of parent involvement in the school	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Poor Preparation of Teachers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lack of Teacher Commitment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Poor instruction of teachers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lack of parental involvement at home	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lack of Student Motivation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Poor basic skills of students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Section H

On a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being most and 1 being least indicate the extent to which each of the following represents important knowledge you should have to be a successful principal.

	1	2	3	4	5
Knowledge of people	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Law	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fiscal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

On a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being most and 1 being least indicate the extent to which each of the following represents important skills you should have to be a successful principal.

	1	2	3	4	5
Interpersonal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Communication	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Leadership	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

On a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being most and 1 being least indicate the extent to which each of the following represents important attributes you should have to be a successful principal.

	1	2	3	4	5
Positive disposition	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visionary	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ethical Values	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Good Communicator	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Organizer	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Section I

We are trying to understand the importance of student behavior in the operation of the school

Do you think that schools should teach "virtues" or "character?" Why or why not?
Do you have any formal programs in your school that focus on character education?

Section J

There is probably a lot of advice you could give to someone preparing to become a school principal but if there was one single piece of advice you could give what would advise.

Section K

How has the influence of high-stakes testing influenced your role as a principal?
How is it influenced teachers, parents, and students?

Section L

To what extent is the achievement gap a problem in your school? What efforts have you made to reduce achievement differences in school?

Section M

To what extent has technology make a difference in your school? How has it influenced teachers, counselors, and students? How has it influenced your role as principal?

Section N

Can you think of an example of research-generated knowledge which you found useful in some aspect of your job as principal? If so please tell me about that knowledge.

All educators need access to new expert knowledge. What sources of information do you find most useful when looking for new professional ideas? On a scale of 1 to 10 (highest), how would you rate each of these types of information sources for the technical knowledge they provide:

- a. Professional meetings of state or national education associations
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 ☐ 10
- b. Workshops
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 ☐ 10
- c. Professional Journals concerned with education
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 ☐ 10
- d. Professional Books concerned with education
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 ☐ 10
- e. Professional Bulletins from regional or national information sources
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 ☐ 10
- f. Professional Bulletins from district or state authorities
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 ☐ 10
- g. Newsletters from professional organizations
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 ☐ 10
- h. University or college courses that you attended for certification or a advanced degree
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 ☐ 10

i. Internet

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 ☐ 10

j. Other sources (please explain)

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 ☐ 10

On a scale of 1 to 10 (highest), how would you rate the quality of the educational research that you've read over the last year?

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 ☐ 10

What would it take for you to rate it a 10?

