

# An Analysis of Kentucky Principal Perceptions towards the State's New Teacher Evaluation System

## Introduction

Since 2009, over thirty U.S. states have overhauled their teacher evaluation instruments (Ruffini, Makkonen, Tejwani, and Diaz, 2014), many doing so in order to meet federal guidelines trying to attain some of President Obama's \$5 billion Race To the Top money. Of these states over 20 have either adopted entirely or created a modified version of educator consultant Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching as their teacher evaluation system (The Danielson Group, 2013).

Danielson has teamed up with Teachscape, a company who delivers web-based learning content, to provide the teaching evaluation methods and instruments in her teacher evaluation system (Teachscape, 2011). Framework for Teaching has been described as "research-based set of components of instruction, grounded in a constructivist view of learning and teaching" (Illinois Education Association, 2012).

By 2012, fourteen states have required measures of student growth and learning for all teachers (National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality, 2012). The type and specificity of regulations encompassing the use of student growth in teacher evaluation has varied widely in states.

Across the country, teachers are retiring, quitting, or getting fired in many in states where their new teacher evaluation instrument includes student test scores. In Baltimore County, Maryland alone, over 700 teachers decided to either retire or resign in 2014, about 100 more than two years earlier (Bowie, 2014). In New Haven, Connecticut, 28 teachers were fired because of low student test scores in just their second year of teaching, largely because of low student test

scores (Bailey, New Haven, 2012).

Prior to the implementation of the new evaluation system in Nevada, teachers and principals were skeptical of the new system and how it would affect their careers. In their new teacher evaluation system, known as the Nevada Educators Performance Framework, teachers and school-level administrators earn one of four designations, from ineffective to highly effective, based on their score. The scoring system is divided into two equally weighted parts. The first half relies almost entirely on an administrator's observations of that teacher under five standards. The second half relies exclusively on student scores from state tests (Nevada Dept. of Education, 2014). Principals were reported to be "sticker shocked" when told they must observe teachers in the classroom up to three times a year under the new policy (Milliard, 2013). A spokesperson for a Nevada teachers union said there was lots of fear among teachers over using school-wide scores for individual evaluations. Then, in August, 2014 after the first year of implementation, over 200 teachers in the Clark County School District decided to retire and the number of retirees was expected to grow by about 20 teachers per week (Johnson, 2014).

Neighboring New Mexico is a state which modified Danielson's Framework for Teaching, renaming it the NMTEACH Educator Effectiveness System. Fifty percent of a teacher evaluation is based on student achievement, which includes standardized test scores (NMPED, 2015). Over 400 New Mexico teachers were reported leaving education, either retiring or quitting (many halfway through the school year) during just the second year of implementation of the teacher evaluation system (Nielson, 2013). Many teachers cited either the new curriculum or student test scores as being part of their teacher evaluations as reasons why they are leaving.

### Significance of Study

Including high stakes testing as part of teachers' evaluations clearly is driving many out of

the profession. Is the same true for administrators? While administrators themselves are not subject to evaluations based on student test scores, they do face two different type of testing hurdles. The first is that when students test scores are low then the administrators themselves don't look effective and may be held accountable. For example, in 2012 Jefferson Parish in Louisiana, 15 public school principals were fired because of low student test scores (Waller, 2012).

The second hurdle is the one addressed in this study. Administrators in some states face an additional high stakes testing challenge that comes before they can even evaluate any of their teachers.

In 2009, Kentucky legislatures passed Senate Bill 1, which allowed the state to adopt a comprehensive system of educational reform. With this came the adoption of a teacher evaluation system that all public school districts must use. Kentucky then became one of those states that adapted Danielson's Framework for Teaching with the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) calling its version of Danielson's model the Teachers Professional Growth and Effectiveness System, or TPGES. By the end of the 2015 school year, all Kentucky public school districts must be using the Danielson model as the way to evaluate their teachers unless they have another evaluation instrument that is approved by the state. According to a member of the state committee that adapted TPGES, only one school district in the state, Kenton County School District, has gained approval to use their own evaluation tool other than Danielson's Framework for Teaching (M. McMillen, personal communication, March 23, 2015).

The Framework for Teaching model includes four teaching domains – Planning and Preparation, Classroom Environment, Instruction, and Professional Responsibilities. A fifth domain – Student Growth – was considered by the state, but in 2014 it was eliminated as one of

the domains that Kentucky teachers would be evaluated on. However, parts of it, particularly test scores students attain, are still an integral part in teacher evaluations, namely through student growth goals and with it student growth percentiles (Kentucky Department of Education, 2014).

According to KDE (2013), evaluators (or evaluator observers, as the state calls them) must complete the Teachscape Proficiency Observation Training. The system, KDE explains, “allows observers to develop a deep understanding of how the first four domains of the Kentucky Framework for Teaching are applied in observation” (p. 7). According to KDE, there are three sections of the proficiency system and supervisor observers must complete each section and pass the final proficiency assessment in order to evaluate their staffs.

The Kentucky Teachscape evaluator/observer’s proficiency test is divided into two stages. If they do not pass a stage on the first attempt, they must wait 24 hours before they can retake it. Participants have two opportunities to pass the test in one license year. As KDE explains, “given that high-stakes personnel decisions will be made using the data from the observations, the standards required are quite challenging” (p. 7). Observers must be “accurate and consistent in applying the rubric and be able to demonstrate this at a high level,” KDE adds (p. 7).

Anecdotal evidence suggests that some Kentucky principals are retiring earlier than normal because of the stress of passing the proficiency test and the increased number of evaluations required using TPGES.

In Illinois, administrators use a similar evaluator proficiency test as Kentucky, and principals and/or evaluators are allowed two attempts to complete the testing. If an evaluator does not successfully complete the test on the first round, the state department of Education offers face-to-face remediation to help them prepare for the second round. “This is hard and if a

principal doesn't pass, it can impact their pride and confidence. They have to tell their superintendent and school that they haven't passed and can't evaluate in their school. So it's both high stakes and very personal," one principal said (Illinois Education Association, 2012). The Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) said that it believes that even though there has been some concerns about the number of people passing (the test), ISBE believes it's important to keep the process stringent.

### Research Questions

Recognizing that performing and completing proper teacher evaluations is essential for the success of schools, this study examines how Kentucky principals perceive their new teaching evaluation system.

This research addresses the following questions:

1. What perceptions do Kentucky principals have towards the way the state department of education trained them to perform teacher evaluations based on the Framework For Teaching system?
2. What perceptions do Kentucky principals have towards the way the state department of education trained them for the Teachscape proficiency exam?
3. What perceptions do Kentucky principals have towards the way their university or college in their principal preparation programs trained them to perform teacher evaluations based on the Framework For Teaching system?
4. What changes, if any, can be made to improve the Framework for Teaching system?
5. What changes, if any, can be made to improve the Teachscape proficiency exam?
6. Is there a relationship between Kentucky principals quitting or retiring earlier than expected and the implementation of TPGES?

## Methodology

Working school principals across Kentucky received an email letter with an electronic link to a questionnaire on Survey Monkey. The survey was first directly e-mailed to each superintendent of school districts in the state, requesting that they forward the survey to all of their principals. The survey was then directly e-mailed to all Kentucky public school principals whose email address could be obtained. An introduction letter to the principal accompanied the survey link (see Appendix A). The survey used a Likert-scale attitude measure, as well as forced choice (yes/no) and open-ended questions. Questions examined principal perceptions of the TPGES teacher evaluation system, known as Framework for Teaching, as well as the Teachescape proficiency test each administrator must pass in order to evaluate teachers (see Appendix B).

## Results

There were 305 responses out of an estimated 1,100 principals, yielding a response rate of 28%. This highly surpasses the average external on-line response rate of 10 to 15% (SurveyGizmo, 2010; PeoplePulse, 2013).

### Respondent's Demographics

Of the 305 responses, all said they worked in public schools, with one each in a public magnet school and charter school. 54% were elementary principals and the next highest numbers were nearly the same with both middle/junior high and secondary principals at almost 26% each. Sixty-five percent of the respondents were new or relatively new principals with nearly 37% having been a principal for less than 4 years and a 28% having been a principal for less than 8 years. There were slightly more females than males that took the survey and over half were either between the ages of 41 and 45 or 46 to 50. Over half (53%) of the respondents were principals in rural school settings, and most have a masters degree, plus 15 hours of coursework.

In sum, the average respondent was a female, between the ages of 41 and 45, a principal in a rural, elementary public school, who has at least a master, plus 15 hours. Table 1 shows the demographics of the respondents (see Table 1).

Table 1

*Participant Demographics*

<i>N</i> = 305		Percentage of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents	
Gender			Highest level of Ed.	
	Female	50.5	Masters degree + 15	86.2
	Male	49.5	Masters degree	8.2
			Doctoral degree	5.3
Age in years			Years as a principal	
	41 - 45	26.9	0 - 4	37.4
	46 - 50	25.7	5 - 8	27.6
	51 - 55	18.1	9 - 12	15.4
	31 - 35	7.9	13 - 16	14.1
School setting/location			Type of school	
	Rural	52.9	Public	99.4
	Town	17.2	Charter	0.3
	Suburban	15.2	Magnet	0.3
	Urban	15.9		
Instructional level				
	Elementary	54.3		
	Secondary	25.8		
	Middle/Junior High	25.5		
	(Pre)K-12	3.3		

Over 90% of respondents completed their principal preparation program (PPP) in Kentucky. Principals also trained in Indiana, Tennessee, Florida, Georgia, Massachusetts, Nebraska, Ohio, and South Carolina. The largest group of respondents attended Western Kentucky University, followed by Murray State University, and Eastern Kentucky University.

Other Kentucky institutions included (in descending order of attendance rate): Morehead State University, University of Louisville, Union College, University of Cumberlands, University of Kentucky, Northern Kentucky University, and Bellarmine University. Out-of-state institutions included: Indiana University-Southeast, Xavier, Lincoln Memorial University, University of Tennessee, Harvard University, University of Dayton, University of North Florida at Jacksonville, East Tennessee State University, University of West Georgia, Marshall University, University of South Florida, Austin Peay State University, University of Nebraska at Omaha, Florida Gulf Coast University, Indiana University, and Clemson University.

Table 2

*Respondents' Principal Preparation Programs (PPPs)*

<b>N = 305</b>		<b>Percentage of Respondents</b>		<b>Percentage of Respondents</b>	
PPP State		PPP School			
	Kentucky	90.7	Western Kentucky U.	20.9	
	Indiana	0.04	Murray State U.	17.4	
	Other states	0.06	Eastern Kentucky U.	16.4	

Results showed that nearly two out of three respondents (66%) agreed that using the new evaluation system has improved their school's instructional program, and that the new instrument is a better teacher evaluation instrument than their old teacher evaluation instrument (over 70%). However, the large majority of respondents (72%) said that their principal preparation program they completed did not prepare them well for the implementation of the evaluation system, and over half (56%) said the state department did not provide adequate training to them for the implementation of the new instrument. Nearly 3 out of 4 principals (73%) said that the state department also has not provided adequate training for teachers on how they will be evaluated

under the new evaluation system. Results also show that a large majority of respondents (81%) said the new evaluation instrument has increased the number of teacher evaluations they have to do during the school year.

Results showed that over half of the principals (54%) might leave their job earlier than planned because of having to implement the new evaluation instrument. Over four out of five principals (84%) said they have heard of administrators who plan to leave their jobs because of the new TPGES evaluation instrument. A little more than half (52%) also said they might leave earlier than planned because of the increased number of teacher evaluations they have to perform as part of TPGES, and nearly half (49%) said they might leave earlier than planned because of the increased emphasis on test scores in teachers' evaluations.

#### TPGES Evaluation Instrument

There were 550 responses to recommended changes for the TPGES evaluation instrument. The most common responses (over 90) centered around the required database all evaluators must use to enter their teachers evaluations, known as CIITS (Continuous Instructional Improvement Technology System). All responses were negative and wanted CIITS either removed as a requirement or fixed and made easier for principals to input their evaluations. Examples included: "Get rid of CIITS;" "CIITS is terrible & ruins TPGES;" "Please make CIITS more reliable;" "CIITS is terrible. You can't fly a plane until it is built;" "CIITS doesn't work... fix it;" and "[Use] a more user friendly format (CIITS is NOT good!"

The next most common theme of responses (over 55) revolved around the inclusion of student growth goals, including test scores, in teacher evaluations. All responses were negative wanting the elimination of student growth goals, including test scores, as part of the evaluation process for teachers. Examples included: "Ditch student growth goals;" "Less emphasis on test

scores.” “Student growth element needs to be removed;” and “Look at student growth but do not tie it directly to school or teacher performance;” and “Get rid of student growth goal – data not available for deadlines, should be discussion points only.” In addition, there were several responses calling for the elimination or revision of the “student voice” section of the teacher evaluation system. This is a section where teachers’ students rate their teacher’s performance in surveys. Comments included: “Eliminate Student Voice as accountable data;” “Student voice is not a good measure;” “Some kind of student voice survey, student test score data needs to be added for all levels not just grades 3-12 and all contents;” and “The Student Voice Survey questions need to be revised and more closely aligned to Teachscape components.”

The next two most common themes of responses (over 50 each) were focused around the amount of paperwork that is need to complete their teacher evaluations and the amount of time needed to complete the evaluations. Comments included: “Not so much tediousness;” “Way too labor intensive;” “Too lengthy;” “Shorten the form;” “Paperwork is mind-blowing; it is excessive;” “[Have] fewer required observations;” “Amount of time for administrators is extreme;” “Less time consuming;” “Record/data keeping are excessive when a school has a high number of teachers in building;” “Takes too long;” and “The instrument isn’t the problem. It’s the time it takes to implement the system.”

In addition, there were nearly 50 responses that centered around the specific Danielson domains for teaching and rating teachers. Under the Kentucky’s Frame work for Teaching model, teachers are rated by evaluators in four teaching domains as either Exemplary (highest), Accomplished (next to highest), Developing, and Ineffective (lowest). Using CIITS, Exemplary was scored as a 4, Accomplished a 3, Developing a 2, and Ineffective a 1. Comments included: “More guidance on evidences for Domains 1 &4;” “Take the score off! Eval system narratives

are ok but telling a teacher she/he is developing or a two is not effective coaching;” “There should be an area between 2-3 and 3-4. Much of the evidence overlaps and makes it difficult to know just where to rate a teacher;” “Remove Domain 1;” “Increased focus on Domains 2 (The Classroom Environment) and 3 (Instruction);” and “[I] feel like I am looking to check boxes rather than assessing the quality of the teacher.”

The next most common theme of responses (nearly 40) centered around the number of observations that evaluators have to make. All responses called for less evaluations to be done throughout the school year. Comments included: “Reduce number of observations-eliminate peer observations;” “3 observations per year for all non-tenure is too many. This is more demanding than KTIP!” and “Stop requiring the mini observations to be documented so that we don’t have to do all of the typing, watching CIITS sit there and spin, etc., and I will be freed to visit ALL of the classrooms in my building more often.”

Nearly 20 respondents called for more training done on the new evaluation system, especially for teachers. Comments included: “Better teacher training resources;” “Provide more training, guidance to teachers and administrators;” “Have the state provide user friendly resources to teachers to help them reference and understand the new evaluation system better;” and “Better direction and professional development from the state.”

There were over 20 responses wanting the TPGES evaluation instrument removed altogether. Many responses also revealed the amount of stress administrators are feeling as a result of having to implement a new evaluation along with their other duties. Comments included: “The amount of meetings I had to have with teachers kept me from doing my complete job;” “The work load is really tough;” “The number required is too much to effectively do my job as principal;” “The process is overwhelming and the time put into all the pieces is unreasonable;”

“I spend over 5 hours per evaluation. The time spent is extremely taxing on me, my job availability, and my family;” “I feel my job has now become a desk job from the amount of meetings and paperwork;” and “The overall magnitude of TPGES is too much. Needs to be totally reworked.”

It is important to note that of the 550 responses concerning the new teacher evaluation system, only 14 were positive comments. Comments included: “I like the new evaluation instrument – I would just give it more time and allow it to work!” “Great system! I truly believe it will improve administrator’s evaluators of teachers;” “Easy to understand instructions;” It is a great opportunity to become more effective teachers;” “Framework for Teaching is excellent!” and “No changes [need to be made], we just need more resources. Difficult to be instructional leader and manage the campus, work data, oversee assessments, work ball games.”

### Proficiency Exam

Nearly everyone (over 99%) has taken the proficiency test and 88% passed it the first time, while 12% did not pass it the first time. Nearly everyone (over 94%) of the respondents said that the proficiency exam was very difficult or somewhat difficult to pass, and a majority (56%) said the exam was not fair and should be changed.

There were 365 responses to recommended changes for the Teachscape proficiency exam. all administrators in the state must pass in order to evaluate their staff. The most common responses (over 100) centered around the quality of the videos and sound used for test takers to view the various lessons they had to observe in order to evaluate the teacher. All of the comments about the videos and sound used were negative. Comments included: “Some of the videos were EXTREMELY hard to watch;” “Videos and audios are very poor quality;” “Videos are very unclear and hard to hear and see;” “Improve quality of sound and

picture on videos;” “Change the DAMN videos and make it more real-time and life-like. We should not be held accountable for videos when we cannot hear side conversations, etc.,” “Videos are hard to understand...can’t get a feel of the classroom;” and “It is nearly impossible to hear and see everything in the videos, yet we are expected to rate as is we can.”

The next most common theme (over 60 responses) revolved around the time needed to train for the test and then to take the test. According to an official at Kentucky Association of School Administrators (KASA), required initial evaluation training takes 12 hours and it is offered through KASA over a two day period (K. Murphy, personal communication, April 9, 2015). The proficiency test then takes six hours to complete. It covers Danielson’s Domain 2 (The Classroom Environment) and Domain 3 (Instruction) only. All responses were negative and they wanted changes done. Comments included: “Shorten the training. It took too long to complete it;” “The amount of time dedicated to practice and exams is startling. While [it is] important to have conversations around consistency, fairness, and lack of bias, the training is simply too burdensome;” “It should be less demanding of time and training hours;” “Shorten it. It required twenty-five hours of time for me to pass;” “Reduce the length of the exam. It takes too long to take;” “Time needed to study should be less;” “Takes way too much time. Shorten it!” “Too lengthy. Two 3 hour tests is ridiculous;” and “The exam was far too lengthy.”

There were over 20 comments concerning the state requirement that evaluators must then pass a follow-up proficiency test during each of the following two years. Known as calibration, this is done after the administrator passes the initial proficiency test in order to be certified again. All responses were negative. Comments included: “If the proficiency exam is passed, I do not believe evaluators should be required to retake it or calibrate every year;” Recalibrating and recertifying is ridiculous. Just another way to make money;” “NOT HAVING TO GO

THROUGH THE ENTIRE PROCESS TO GET RECERTIFIED IS OVERKILL;” “Once an administrator has passed, they should not have to take exam again every three years and waste district money;” “Offer practice for continued calibration of observation skills;” “The recertification process needs to be re-evaluated so that you don’t have to do the complete 20 hours next time;” “Too much calibration;” “Not require principals to retake the exam every year;” and “Take it/pass it ONCE ONCE ONCE ONCE.”

Over 30 administrators responded that they felt the scoring of the test was too subjective. Comments included: “Too much subjectivity;” “Look fors are based on ‘experts’...even with rubrics [it is] still subjective at times;” “No matter what, subjectivity will exist;” “Too subjective still – interpretation of rubric versus what [is] observed;” “To me it is too subjective. Some videos are much easier than others so it is the luck of the draw;” “Some of the justifications provided are contradictory or dare I say ‘biased’; and “Very subjective material; should be objective.”

Over 15 principals called for the system to be eliminated completely. Many responses also revealed the amount of stress administrators are feeling as a result of having to pass the proficiency exam. Comments included: “Getting through the proficiency exam itself is enough to drive new principals over the edge;” and “Decrease the stress attached to passing the exam by offering more chances to pass.”

It is important to note that of the over 365 responses, only 5 were positive comments about the proficiency test that administrators must pass. The few comments included: “Good tool;” “I have no problems with framework instruments and testing to complete evals;” “I have no issues with the proficiency exam;” and “None suggested, I think it is rigorous, but rightfully so.”

To illustrate the stress many principals are feeling about having to pass the proficiency

exam and then to administer the evaluator system to their staff, a current administrator in the state emailed me after taking the survey and said, “I really appreciate you sending out this survey. I am fearful that unless there are significant changes in what is expected from principals and teachers, there will be a mass exodus. I have been a principal for 17 years and our school is proficient and in the top 10 percent for high progress—thanks to the hard work and commitment from all. We are expected to “fix” everything with little or no staff and funding is cut each year. I have in 27 years now and can retire, but I will stay a few more years or until I feel it is time to pass the “shell” to another dedicated person, I pray that someone will step up when it is time.”

### Conclusions

This study clearly shows that most Kentucky principals are not happy with the new teacher evaluation system and the proficiency test. As stated, over 900 responses were made by principals regarding changes they would make to either the evaluation system or the proficiency test. Of the over 900 responses, less than 20 were positive comments about the evaluation system or the proficiency test. However, the study also shows that almost all principals would rather use the new evaluation system than their old evaluation teacher system. In fact, only one response was made to bring back their old teacher evaluation system.

As the survey indicated, a majority of the respondents were principals in rural elementary schools. These schools tend to have smaller enrollments and, therefore, most only have one administrator who must conduct all of the teacher observations and evaluations. This would account for much of the stress that is out there.

Principals want the data software system, CIITS, either eliminated or fixed and they also want student growth goals, and with it, the student voice section, either restructured or removed

from the teacher evaluation system so that it does not count towards a teacher's performance. Principals also want better videos and sound for initial test takers and for calibration exams, and they want the state to require less mandatory training hours before taking the exams. They also want from the state department more training for their teachers and themselves on how to use the new evaluation instrument.

This study also clearly showed that the Kentucky department of education has not adequately trained Kentucky teachers and administrators about implementation of the new evaluation system, and although a few respondents remarked that they became principals before TPGES was implemented, state universities and colleges need to step up their training on the system for aspiring principals.

It is quite evident from the research that Kentucky principals wanted to voice their concerns about the evaluation system and the proficiency exam and the subsequent calibration exams they must take. A few respondents even emailed the researcher after taking the survey and thanked the researcher for the opportunity to take such a survey.

Research, such as this, which was conducted near the end of the first full year of implementation of TPGES in Kentucky public schools is vital in order to gauge the perceptions that Kentucky principals have about the new evaluation system, and to, hopefully, catch the ear of state department official who should be trying the system better.

It is not known whether implementation of the new TPGES in Kentucky public schools has resulted in more federal funding for education. The future will decide whether Kentucky teachers and principals stick around long enough to see if the quality of public education in the state has markedly improved as a result of the new evaluation system. Studies similar to this one

should be conducted in other states where either Danielson's Framework for Teaching or another new evaluation system can be adopted.

## Appendix A

Department of Educational Studies, Leadership and Counseling  
Murray State University  
3216 Alexander Hall, Murray, KY 42071  
(270) 809-3790; [rdodson1@murraystate.edu](mailto:rdodson1@murraystate.edu)

March 31, 2015

Dear Principal:

You are being invited to participate in a survey research study conducted through Murray State University. As such, I would like you to have an understanding of the following:

The purpose of this study is to gain a better understanding of how Kentucky principals perceive the new state teaching evaluation system. As a practicing principal, your perspective is vital to determining the importance of how the Framework for Teaching, TPGES, and the Teachscape proficiency exam are viewed by Kentucky administrators. Your assistance is appreciated and will be invaluable in this study.

Your participation is strictly voluntary and you are free to withdraw/stop participating at any time. All of your responses will remain anonymous. (No one will know which answers are yours.) Although your responses will remain anonymous, your data/answers may be combined with the data/answers of others and submitted for presentation at conventions or in publications in scholarly journals. You will not receive any direct benefits because you participated in this research study and there are no known or anticipated risks in this research study. A general benefit is that you will add to our knowledge about this subject.

*All survey responses that I receive will be treated confidentially and stored on a secure server. However, given that the surveys can be completed from any computer (e.g., personal, work, school), I am unable to guarantee the security of the computer on which you choose to enter your responses. As a participant in this study, you need to be aware that certain "keylogging" software programs exist that can be used to track or capture data that you enter and/or websites that you visit.*

If you would like to participate in this study, please complete and return the survey within the next ten days. Your completion of this questionnaire indicates that you voluntarily consent to participate in this study.

Thank you for your consideration. To access the survey, please click <http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/Y5CMR9L>. This survey will take approximately 10 to 15 minutes to complete.

Sincerely,

Dr. Richard Dodson, Assistant Professor  
Murray State University

THIS RESEARCH STUDY HAS BEEN REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY THE MURRAY STATE UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD (IRB) FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS. ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT THE CONDUCT OF THIS PROJECT SHOULD BE BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF DR. RICHARD DODSON IN THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL STUDIES, LEADERSHIP AND COUNSELING. ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR RIGHTS AS A RESEARCH PARTICIPANT SHOULD BE BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF THE IRB COORDINATOR AT (270) 809-2916, 328 WELLS HALL, MURRAY, KY 42071.

## Appendix B

### TPGES Survey

Please answer each question based on your personal experience regarding the TPGES teacher evaluation system.

1. What university or college did you complete your principal preparation program?  
\_\_\_\_\_.
2. The principal preparation program I completed prepared me well for the implementation of the TPGES evaluation system.
  - A. Strongly agree
  - B. Somewhat agree
  - C. Somewhat disagree
  - D. Strongly disagree
3. Using TPGES has improved our school's instructional program.
  - A. Strongly agree
  - B. Somewhat agree
  - C. Somewhat disagree
  - D. Strongly disagree
4. TPGES is a better teacher evaluation instrument than our old teacher evaluation instrument.
  - A. Strongly agree
  - B. Somewhat agree
  - C. Somewhat disagree
  - D. Strongly disagree
5. Our state department of education has provided adequate training to our administrators on how to use TPGES.
  - A. Strongly agree

- B. Somewhat agree
  - C. Somewhat disagree
  - D. Strongly disagree
6. Our state department of education has provided adequate training to our teachers on how they will be evaluated.
- A. Strongly agree
  - B. Somewhat agree
  - C. Somewhat disagree
  - D. Strongly disagree
7. Implementing the TPGES has increased the number of teacher evaluations I do during the school year.
- A. \_\_\_\_\_ Yes
  - B. \_\_\_\_\_ No
8. I might leave my job earlier than planned because of having to implement the new TPGES evaluation instrument?
- A. Strongly agree
  - B. Somewhat agree
  - C. Somewhat disagree
  - D. Strongly disagree
9. I might leave my job earlier than planned because of the increased emphasis on test scores in teachers' evaluations.
- A. Strongly agree
  - B. Somewhat agree
  - C. Somewhat disagree
  - D. Strongly disagree
10. I might leave my job earlier than planned because of the increased number of teacher evaluations I have to perform as part of TPGES.
- A. Strongly agree
  - B. Somewhat agree
  - C. Somewhat disagree
  - D. Strongly disagree
11. I have heard of administrators who plan to leave their jobs because of the new TPGES evaluation instrument?
- A. Strongly agree
  - B. Somewhat agree
  - C. Somewhat disagree
  - D. Strongly disagree

12. What changes would you make to the TPGES evaluation instrument?
- A. \_\_\_\_\_.
- B. \_\_\_\_\_.
- C. \_\_\_\_\_.
- D. \_\_\_\_\_.
13. Have you taken the Teachscape proficiency exam?
- A. \_\_\_\_\_ Yes, I have taken the Teachscape proficiency exam.
- B. \_\_\_\_\_ No, I have not taken the Teachscape proficiency exam.
14. I have taken the Teachscape proficiency exam and passed it the first time.
- A. \_\_\_\_\_ Yes
- B. \_\_\_\_\_ No
15. How difficult is the Teachscape proficiency exam that administrators need to pass in order to evaluate their staff?
- A. Very difficult
- B. Somewhat difficult
- C. Somewhat easy
- D. Very easy
16. I believe that the Teachscape proficiency exam is fair and should be offered the way it is now.
- A. Strongly agree
- B. Somewhat agree
- C. Somewhat disagree
- D. Strongly disagree
17. What changes would you make to improve the Teachscape proficiency exam?
- a. \_\_\_\_\_.
- b. \_\_\_\_\_.
- c. \_\_\_\_\_.
- d. \_\_\_\_\_.

Please answer the following concerning your career and school.

**What is your current position at your school?** \_\_\_\_\_

**In what type of school are you employed?**

1. \_\_\_\_\_ Public 2. \_\_\_\_\_ Private 3. \_\_\_\_\_ Charter 4. \_\_\_\_\_ Magnet 5. \_\_\_\_\_ Other

**In what instructional level at the school are you employed? (Check all that apply.)**

1. \_\_\_\_ Elementary 2. \_\_\_\_ Middle/junior high 3. \_\_\_\_ Secondary 4. \_\_\_\_ (P)K-12

**How many years have you been a principal?**

1. \_\_\_\_ 0-4 years 2. \_\_\_\_ 5-8 years 3. \_\_\_\_ 9-12 years 4. \_\_\_\_ 13-16 years  
5. \_\_\_\_ 17-20 years 6. \_\_\_\_ 21-25 years 7. \_\_\_\_ 26+years \_\_\_\_\_

**What is your gender? \_\_\_\_ Female \_\_\_\_ Male**

**What is your highest degree level?**

1. \_\_\_\_ Undergraduate degree 2. \_\_\_\_ Undergraduate degree + 15 hours 3. \_\_\_\_  
Masters degree 4. \_\_\_\_ Masters degree + 15 hours 5. \_\_\_\_ Doctoral degree

**What is your age?**

1. \_\_\_\_ 21-24 2. \_\_\_\_ 25-30 3. \_\_\_\_ 31-35 4. \_\_\_\_ 36-40  
5. \_\_\_\_ 41-45 6. \_\_\_\_ 46-50 7. \_\_\_\_ 51-55 8. \_\_\_\_ 56-60 9. \_\_\_\_ 60+

**In what setting/location is your school?**

1. \_\_\_\_ Urban 2. \_\_\_\_ Suburban 3. \_\_\_\_ Town 4. \_\_\_\_ Rural

THANK YOU!!!

## REFERENCES

1. Bailey, M. (2012). Teacher Evaluations In New Haven Ease Out Teachers in Second Year. *New Haven Independent*.
2. Bowie, L. (2014). Baltimore County teachers resigning in greater numbers this year. *The Baltimore Sun*.
3. The Danielson Group. danielsongroup.org. 2013. Retrieved from:  
<http://danielsongroup.org/charlotte-danielson/>
4. Illinois Education Association, 2012. Teacher, principal evaluator training hard but rewarding work. By IEA Communications. Growth Through Learning; Illinois Performance Evaluation. Retrieved from: <http://www.ieanea.org/2012/08/18/teacher-principal-evaluator-training-hard-but-rewarding-work/>
5. Johnson, S. (2014). Retiring teachers adding to CCSD teacher-shortage problem. Anchor/Reporter. Channel 8 CONNECT. Retrieved from:  
<http://www.8newsnow.com/story/26561788/retiring-teachers-adding-to-ccsd-teacher-shortage-proble>

6. Kentucky Department of Education, (2013). District Professional Growth and Effectiveness Plan. Model District Certified Evaluation Plan Version 2.0. Observer Certification. P. 7.
7. Kentucky Department of Education, (2014). District Professional Growth and Effectiveness Plan. TPGES Student Growth. Retrieved from:  
<http://education.ky.gov/teachers/PGES/TPGES/Pages/TPGES-Student-Growth-Page.aspx>
8. Milliard, T., (2013). Confusion, fear greet school system. *Las Vegas Review-Journal*. Retrieved from <http://www.reviewjournal.com/news/confusion-fear-greet-school-system>
9. National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality (2012). Database on State Teacher Evaluation Policies. Retrieved from:  
<http://resource.tqsource.org/stateevaldb/UserGuides/ExecutiveSummary.pdf>
10. Nielson, K. (2013). Teachers fleeing New Mexico Districts. The Chalk Face. Retrieved from:  
<http://atthechalkface.com/2013/12/12/teachers-fleeing-new-mexico-districts/>
11. Nevada Department of Education, (2014). Nevada Educators Performance Framework Statewide Evaluation System
12. New Mexico Public Education Department (2015) Evaluation Plan.  
Retrieved from: [http://www.ped.state.nm.us/ped/NMTeach\\_EvaluationPlan.html](http://www.ped.state.nm.us/ped/NMTeach_EvaluationPlan.html)
13. PeoplePulse. (2013). Quinttessential Marketing Consulting Pty Ltd. Retrieved from  
<http://www.peoplepulse.com.au/Survey-Response-Rates.htm>

14. Ruffini, S., Makkonen, R., Tejwani, J., Diaz, M (2014). IES National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance; Institute of Education Sciences. Principal and teacher perceptions of implementation of multiple-measure teacher evaluation systems in Arizona. Retrieved from: <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED548539.pdf>
15. SurveyGizmo.com. (2010) “*Best Practices.*” Retrieved from <http://www.surveygizmo.com/survey-blog/survey-response-rates>
16. Teachscape, 2011. PR Newswire; A UBM plc company. Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching Sees Record Growth as States and Districts Redefine Teacher Evaluation. /PRNewswire-USNewswire. Retrieved from: <http://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/charlotte-danielsons-framework-for-teaching-sees-record-growth-as-states-and-districts-redefine-teacher-evaluation-124646653.html>
17. Waller, M. (2012), 15 Jefferson Parish Public School Principals Ousted under academic performance policy. *The Times-Picayune.*