Indiana State University

Sycamore Scholars

All-Inclusive List of Electronic Theses and Dissertations

2012

An analysis of indiana schools implementing alternative teacher evaluation systems.

Corey Wade Austin
Indiana State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholars.indianastate.edu/etds

VITA

Corey Wade Austin

EDUCATION

2012	Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana Ph.D., Educational Administration

2007	Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana Ed.S., Educational Administration

2000	Oakland City University, Oakland City, Indiana M.A.T., Education Administration and Teaching

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

2008 – present	Southeast Fountain School Corporation, Veedersburg, Indiana Superintendent

2005 – 2008	North Vermillion Community School Corporation, Cayuga, Indiana High School Principal

2002 – 2005	North West Hendricks School Corporation, Lizton, Indiana High School Principal

2000 – 2002	South Vermillion Community School Corporation, Clinton, Indiana Assistant High School Principal

AN ANALYSIS OF INDIANA SCHOOLS IMPLEMENTING

ALTERNATIVE TEACHER EVALUATION SYSTEMS

_____

A Dissertation

Presented to

The College of Graduate and Professional Studies

Department of Educational Leadership

Indiana State University

Terre Haute, Indiana

_____

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

_____

by

Corey Wade Austin

May 2012

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Committee Chair: Terry McDaniel, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor of Educational Leadership

Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana

Committee Member: Will Barratt, Ph.D.

Professor of Educational Leadership

Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana

Committee Member: Shannon Barton-Bellessa, Ph.D.

Associate Professor of Criminology and Criminal Justice

Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this content analysis research project was to determine if there were predictive qualities of the demographic groupings; student population, free and reduced percentage, and geographic setting on the teacher evaluation tools that are an alternative to the Indiana RISE model. This study surveyed Indiana superintendents regarding their anticipated 2012-13 evaluation tool. The schools that designated they would be using an alternative teacher evaluation tool were then asked to make available their research of their document for comparison to a research-based template. The research-based template is a derivative of the work of Danielson (2007), Marshall (2005), and Marzano (2004). It contains 12 elements that were commonalities among the researchers with emphasis on instruction. The alternative evaluation tools were scored and then multiple regression analysis was performed in the three predictor areas of demographics.

The research indicated there were some elements from the demographics that did significantly influence the dependent variables. Some of the influence was positive where some of the influence was negative. This research can be used to explore the differences among variables and assist education programs in understanding which areas to pursue because of the positive influence and which areas to reduce because of its negative influence on the criterion variables.

The predictor of free and reduced percentage was the demographic that had the influence on four of the elements (criterion variables). Free and reduced percentage had a positive

significance with the elements of application. The three elements that were also significant, but negative, were connections/questions, clarity, and homework/feedback. The remaining eight elements showed no significant value. .

v

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study is a culmination of not only my efforts but the efforts of several professional colleagues and personal friends. I believe this process has required me to open my mind and allow my perspective to be expanded and my critical thinking skills evolve into a more resourceful tool in the future. The first person I need to thank is Dr. Terry McDaniel. Dr. McDaniel has been a very patient mentor that I appreciate greatly. His guidance as my committee chairperson has been valuable and encouraging.

I would also like to thank my committee members: Dr. Will Barratt for his enthusiasm and ability to envision multiple directions for my research and future topics; Dr. Shannon Barton-Bellessa has been willing to take on this extra duty and for being a calming influence when there were some tense moments. Piece of mind is an important ingredient. I also must share my gratitude with Dr. Gruenert, Dr. Boyd, Dr. Hampton, and Dr. McQueen for their efforts on my behalf in class as well as in private conversation.

A special thank you goes to the members of Cohort 22. Several of us in our cohort had trials and obstacles that were in our way. "Life happens." The support and following through with the discussions and professional relationships are as valuable as anything that I can take from this experience. "Culture always wins." Thank you for the culture we developed throughout this process.

Finally, this experience doesn't happen without the support of my wife, Lora, and my daughters, Courtney and Abigail. Many times I asked if this was selfish to pursue, you always

were with me to encourage and to support my decisions to continue. Thank you. I pray that this accomplishment is an example to my children the value of education and demonstrates the importance of hard work. Nobody can take either away.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The Problem

The evaluation process for public educators is an evolving system. Currently, this process

is being redefined to better fit the purpose of improving student achievement on standardized

testing (Bruce, 2010). Over the past few years the educational landscape has changed

significantly: schools are now under greater pressure than ever to achieve results with their

students; everyone, from policymakers to practitioners, recognizes the pivotal importance of

good teaching in achieving this goal (Danielson, 2007). The ability, however, to empirically

identify good teaching using an evaluation tool has neither been well-defined nor precise. At this

time, a teacher's effectiveness is not measured, recorded, or used to inform decision-making in

any meaningful way (Weisberg, Sexton, Mulhern, & Keeling, 2009).

To date, teachers throughout the United States are evaluated using one of two types of

tools:(a) summative evaluation tools, or (b) formative evaluation tools. Summative evaluation

tools are one time appraisal instruments designed to assess and express a final determination of

the teacher utilizing previously initiated formative assessment tools and artifacts. These tools or

instruments oftentimes have been used for punitive or disciplinary actions against the educator

rather than to accurately identify areas in need of improvement or to reward good teaching. This

one-time evaluation, therefore, does not have the desired effect for student learning and

improvement (Donaldson, 2010). More recently, research suggests that educators themselves find the summative evaluation process less than beneficial. For example, a survey of approximately 900 teachers in Denver found that "fewer than 40% agreed their evaluations were either accurate or helpful" (Mitchell, 2009, para. 16). Furthermore, Superintendent Patricia Johnson, of the Five Town CSD and Maine School Administrative District #28 in Camden and Rockport, reviewed summative evaluations and found that many were full of vague, meaningless praise–and largely devoid of constructive criticism or concrete feedback. These results suggest the need to strengthen the culture and structures of supporting teacher evaluation in district schools (Donaldson, 2010).

Unlike summative evaluations, formative evaluations are designed to assist the teachers with their observed deficiencies by encouraging professional development and best practices to overcome the evaluators' concerns (Halik, Peterson, & Kern, 2010). Formative evaluations occur several times throughout a semester to take multiple *snapshots* of the teacher's methods and practices. The formative evaluation process is a non-punitive tool to assist in the growth of the educator, which will in turn enable the learning environment of the classroom to be more conducive to positive student achievements and outcomes. Following each formative evaluation, the teacher and evaluator meet to review what needs to be improved upon for immediate feedback and opportunity to improve instruction (Barrett, 1986). Many states, including Indiana, have witnessed teacher evaluations not serving the desired purpose, which is immediate and appropriate feedback for improving classroom instruction.

Eliminating the threat of punitive actions against the teacher would appear to lend itself to a more collegial position between educator and evaluator. Creating this partnership within the learning community strengthens the autonomy each would have for the results of the end product

(Pink, 2009). Teachers serving as peer coaches and providing input has been valuable to the classroom education change process. To overhaul teacher evaluation suggests policymakers could turn to teachers themselves to have the best shot of weeding out poor performers and helping weak teachers improve (Forte, 2010). One example of this process was found in the Chicago area where teachers implemented the Charlotte Danielson four domain driven model that gave evaluators a clear criteria for what excellent or superior meant. It appears this process provided a more effective approach to teacher evaluations. Researchers have yet to examine whether high ratings on the framework correlate with higher student test scores (Forte, 2010).

Revising teacher evaluation systems has the support of not only the local and state levels of government but also the federal levels as well. A performance-based component in the teacher evaluations will be a portion of a teachers overall effectiveness ranking (Bennett, 2010). U.S. Department of Education Secretary Arne Duncan encouraged schools to use this kind of data to evaluate teachers. The president of the American Federation of Teachers, Randi Weingarten, said these types of assessments are unfair. Advocates object to performance-based evaluations that judge teacher effectiveness solely on the basis of end-of-the-year test scores, without regard to where the students started at the beginning of the year.

To combat the misapplication of data, the recent emphasis suggests that student growth data is actually where curricular programming should pay specific attention. The Indiana Growth Model founded in conjunction with the Learning Connection, the Indiana Department of Education clearinghouse, provided educators with the data that the Indiana State Teachers Association (ISTA) and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) reference as growth of a student (Schlegel, 2011). This is considered a value-added measure. Accurate determination of where the student starts is measured against where the student ends during a one-year period.

The practice of pre-testing and post-testing meets the criteria for establishing growth data. Their growth is the value of this measurement rather than a non-determined score represented as a percentage (Schlegel, 2011). Given teachers' effect on student learning and achievement, practitioners, policymakers, and researchers have all called for boosting the rigor and quality of teacher evaluation (Bennett, 2010).

Statement of the Problem

Current teacher evaluations do not identify the best teachers based on data driven by multiple measures (Bennett, 2010). Except for word-of-mouth from other parents, no one can tell you the answer. Not only can the most effective teacher not be identified, but neither can the least effective or mediocre be identified (The New Teacher Project, 2009). This question and similar questions have been asked over several decades of educational progress. The New Teacher Project (2009) made reference to an article that appeared in 1936 in the *New York Times* as saying,

> There are at least "several hundred" incompetents now in the school system (says the superintendent). Other observers think there are several thousands, while still others insist that "several" would be nearer the mark. Whether these incompetents were unfit to teach at any time, or have been rendered unfit by the passing years, is a matter of opinion. The question is, why are they allowed to remain? (para. 4)

Weisberg et al. (2009) addressed this question in their research. The fact remains that the schools are asked to provide students with quality education yet they cannot accurately tell if the students have a quality teacher. The teacher's effectiveness—the most important factor for schools in improving student achievement—is not measured, recorded, or used to inform decision-making. There is no distinguishing great teaching from good, good from fair, and fair

from poor (Weisberg et.al., 2009). The federal government has recognized this deficiency in teacher evaluation and in 2010, under Secretary of Education Arne Duncan, the U.S. government unveiled an incentive program for all public schools, Race to the Top (RttT, Bennett, 2010). RttT encouraged public schools across the country to re-evaluate their current evaluation processes for classroom teachers. States were required to gather consensus from the school districts that they encompass and to apply at the federal level for the RttT funding. This was a competitive process and very few of the states were granted any funding under this umbrella.

The primary outcome of this competitive process between the states was forcing the state education departments to take a critical look at how they provided public education to the students in their districts and to evaluate current practices. What they started was a public school revolution that gave the states the autonomy to evaluate and determine what they were going to accept as a *great* teaching model. Historically, the state of Indiana has not adopted a centralized mechanism for evaluating teaching. Previous attempts to evaluate teacher success have typically been summative by design and not used as a mechanism to either improve teaching or for increasing student achievement. More recently, Senate Enrolled Act (SEA) 1 requires school corporations to develop annual educator evaluations based on multiple measures including student performance (Bennett, 2010). The legislation also expanded the criteria for awarding teachers pay raises by adding students' needs, teachers' leadership roles, and student performance data to a list that previously included only years of performance and degrees held.

Recognizing the importance and difficulty in assessing teacher effectiveness, the state of Indiana has developed an empirically based formative teacher evaluation model named RISE Evaluation and Development System (see Appendix A for an overview of the RISE model). The

state of Indiana announced their new teacher effectiveness rubric or RISE Evaluation and Development System.

During the fall 2011 academic year, under the direction of the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE), the RISE model was implemented as a pilot project in three schools in Indiana (Bennett, 2010). Results from this project will be used to improve the evaluation tool and implemented on a statewide basis beginning with the 2012-13 school year.

Corporations may choose to adopt RISE entirely, draw on components from the model, or create their own system for implementation in school year 2012-2013. Though corporations are encouraged to choose or adapt the evaluation system that best meets the needs of their local schools and teachers, in order to maintain consistency, only corporations that adopt the RISE system wholesale or make only minor changes may use the RISE label and are thus considered by the Indiana Department of Education to be using a version of RISE. The 2011-2012 Indiana Teacher Effectiveness Pilot has been established to create a helpful blueprint for school leaders and teachers across the state seeking to take advantage of new opportunities created by Indiana's *Putting Students First* education reforms (IDOE, 2011). A determining factor for the Indiana model was the commitment to establish yearly evaluations. These school corporations were selected based on their commitment and readiness to successfully implement annual evaluations that incorporate student growth data. All districts demonstrated strong school leadership and a unique collaborative working relationship at every level. In each community, local teachers expressed support for participation in the program and excitement to work with IDOE and school leadership.

The RISE model is in draft form currently and will be solidified after the pilot programs, which include a limited number of public schools in Indiana, concluding January 31, 2012. The

three main purposes of the Indiana teacher effectiveness rubric are to identify great teaching. The rubric is designed to assist principals and teachers in their efforts to increase teacher effectiveness and ensure differentiated distribution of great teachers across the state. It was also designed to provide clear expectations for teachers. The rubric defines and prioritizes the actions that effective teachers use to achieve gains in student achievement. The last purpose was to support fair and transparent evaluation of effectiveness. The state rubric provides a foundation for accurately assessing teacher effectiveness along four discrete ratings, in addition to growth data. The four discrete rating are *highly effective, effective, improvement necessary*, and *ineffective.* The rubric is divided into four domains. Domain 1, planning—teachers use Indiana content area standards to develop a rigorous curriculum relevant for all students, building meaningful units of study, continuous assessments and a system for tracking student progress as well as plans for accommodations and changes in response to a lack of student progress. Domain 2, effective instruction—teachers facilitate student academic practice so that all students are participating and have the opportunity to gain mastery of the objectives in a classroom environment that fosters a climate of urgency and expectation around achievement, excellence, and respect. Domain 3, teacher leadership—teachers develop and sustain the intense energy and leadership within their school community to ensure the achievement of all students. Domain 4, professionalism—indicators represent the minimum competencies expected in any profession. These are separate from the other sections in the rubric because they have little to do with teaching and learning and more with basic employment practice. Teachers are expected to meet these standards. If they do not, it will affect their overall rating negatively (IDOE, 2011).

In Indiana public school districts were allowed to participate in the RISE pilot program or choose to create their own local assessments that incorporated the four domains illustrated in the

RISE system. A four-tier rating system is required and additional or local items are allowed at

the districts discretion. The timeline for alternative model planning and implementation starts

the design phase in the school year 2011-2012. Training of the new system will take place in the

spring/summer of 2012. Implementation of the alternative model will take place during the

2012-2013 school year. More specifically, Indiana SEA 1 requires statewide implementation of

new or modified evaluation systems compliant with the law by school year 2012-2013.

Reflection and refinement will be held during the summer of 2013 (IDOE, 2011).

This research focused primarily on whether or not alternative teacher evaluation models

contain the same research-based elements as the established best practices model demonstrated

by current practitioners in the field. It also focused on how demographics play a part on which

evaluation tool is implemented at the school district. Current teacher evaluation tools do not

accurately represent the types of student growth, the amount of student growth, nor do they have

the ability to predict future student success in the areas of math and English/language arts. The

current Indiana standardized testing emphasizes development in math and English/language arts

in all schools in the state. Do the alternative evaluation tools accurately measure student learning

in these two identified areas and convey the method of what is needed for the teachers to ensure

student improvement? Do teachers who are measured with appropriate evaluation tools score

highly effective for instruction by their evaluators? Current evaluation tools do not depict a

unified information system that can be used for improved classroom teacher development

(Thompson, 2011). Research has established the importance of good teachers for student

learning (Hanushek, Kain, & Rivkin, 1998). The quality of a teacher is the single most important

factor in making a difference for students (Halik et al., 2010). The factors that create good

teachers are adequate preparation, instructional know-how, solid curriculum, ongoing

professional development, positive support from colleagues and supervisors, and a collective effort by the school, families, and community to make school a successful experience for every child (Scherer, 2010).

Change will be constant and considered the new status quo (Bennett, 2010). For educators, this means identifying more efficient and effective approaches to helping all students learn. Americans think that the most important national programs are those that improve the quality of our teachers. To receive the letter grade of "A," public schools must improve the quality of teaching, implement challenging curriculum, and help students be more successful (Bushaw & Lopez, 2010).

The fate of public education is in the hands of the elected politicians and they are calling for a review and improvement in instruction and teacher preparation (Bennett, 2010). The beneficiaries of these efforts are the students. The results of these efforts are higher student success levels and better preparation for higher education. Identifying a tool that provides constructive feedback will enable teachers to improve their craft and more productively ensure student success. If schools were truly student-focused, educators would first decide what the students should be expected to do, and what circumstances would make them more willing and able to do what is expected, before making decisions about how time, people, space, information, and knowledge (that is, curriculum) should be organized and distributed (Schlechty, 2001).

Evaluation tools and practices must be defined with a purpose. The purpose must be shared with all shareholders. The goal of creating excellent learning environments can be achieved when all involved take ownership in the process of overall student success. Creating autonomy among the learning community develops strength in purpose and allows for the local expertise to contribute to the greater community through education (Pink, 2009). The effective

superintendent continually monitors district progress toward achievement and instructional goals

to ensure that these goals remain the driving force behind the district's actions (Marzano &

Waters, 2009)

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine if there is a relationship between the research-

based elements of alternative teacher evaluation tools and the school district demographics?

There are three models that the template utilizes for the comparison process. Work from

Danielson (2007), Marshall (2005), and Marzano (2004) has been cross-referenced in the area of

instruction to determine the key concepts in that domain that generate the most concrete research

based platform to create the template for this study. Danielson split her elements into 18 specific

items for the domain of instruction. After comparison, much of her work is comparable to the

definitions used for similar elements that Marzano and Marshall explained in their domain of

instruction. A teacher-level factor that affects student achievement is *instructional strategies.* It

is perhaps self-evident that more effective teachers use more effective instructional strategies. It

is probably also true that effective teachers have more instructional strategies at their disposal

(Marzano, 2004). Respondents that have declared use of an alternative model were asked to

supply a copy of their model for comparison with the evaluation best-practices template.

Research Question

1. The research question that guided this study was, In Indiana school districts using

   alternative teacher evaluation models, is there a relationship between the research-

   based elements of alternative teacher evaluation tools and the school district

   demographics?

Definition of Terms

Growth model is the tool used by the IDOE to illustrate the overall academic growth of students for a one-year time frame.

High growth is academic performance located at 66% and above on the Indiana Growth Model.

ISTEP is the Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress used to assess minimum student achievement in grades 3-8.

Low growth is growth indicated from 1% -35% on the Indiana Growth Model.

Measures are the components that make up a teacher's evaluation.

Median growth is the amount of educational growth located at the 50% level, indicating one full year of typical growth.

Teacher effectiveness rubric is the state evaluation tool to give educators an in-depth look at the basic components of what an evaluation tool may look like.

Typical growth is located from 36%-65% on the Indiana Growth Model.

Significance of the Study

This study identified the relation of the alternative teacher evaluation tool and how research based criteria may be determined by demographics. This study utilized Danielson's (2007) educational domain of instruction as the model for the best practices template. Evaluation tools and practices must be defined with a purpose. The purpose must be shared with all stakeholders. The goal of creating excellent learning environments can be achieved when all involved take ownership in the process. Pink (2009) stated that creating autonomy among the learning community develops strength in purpose and allows for the local expertise to contribute to the greater community through education. This study additionally determined if there are

indictors shared by both groups that enable the professional learning community to establish evaluation tools that accurately predict student success on high stakes achievement tests.

Limitations

The unintentional incorrect response by a respondent on the initial survey or inaccurately following instructions of the survey may render the response useless. Another possibility creating an unusable response is the differing or alternative interpretation of terms from the respondents.

Delimitations

Only data from the 2012-13 school year was used. Although standardized testing has been utilized for several years in Indiana, there are several standardized tests available to Indiana public schools. This research took into account the comparison of alternative teacher evaluation tools and how they compared to established best practices and how demographics may play a part in that evaluation selection process.

Public schools have several grade configurations. This research considered all school districts regardless of grade configuration. This research started prior to the implementation of the IDOE's mandate to incorporate the prescribed state measures in the local teacher evaluation tools. If a school did not have the required state elements administrators were directed to implement the state prescribed elements following the 2012-13 school year. This study did not take into account ethnicity or learning modalities.

Summary and Organization of the Study

The study is divided into five chapters. Chapter 1 provides the problem, the statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research question, definition of terms used within the document, significance of the study, limitations, and delimitations. Chapter 2 presents a review

of the related literature and is subdivided into planning and preparation, classroom management, instruction, and professional responsibility. Chapter 3 presents information about the methodology used during this study including purpose of the study, research question, description of the sample, data sources, data collection procedures, and the method of analysis. Chapter 4 presents findings through the quantitative analyses. Chapter 5 presents a summary of the findings, conclusions, implications, and recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This review of the literature examines related research that was been conducted in teacher evaluation practices. Danielson's (1996) framework for teaching and the four domains of teaching responsibility guided the organization of this research. The state of Indiana teacher evaluation framework uses several research sources; primarily the material of Danielson's framework for teaching is most prevalent. Her framework for teaching describes those aspects of teachers' responsibilities that have been documented through empirical studies and theoretical research as promoting improved student learning (Danielson, 2007).

This framework organizes 22 components into four domains of teaching responsibility: Domain 1, planning and preparation; Domain 2, classroom environment; Domain 3, instruction; and Domain 4: professional responsibility. Domain 3, instruction, is the heart of the framework for teaching. It describes the interactive works that teachers undertake when they bring complex content to life for their students. The emphasis of Domain 3 is engaging the students in learning. It is engagement that ensures learning (Danielson, 2007).

Domain 3 consists of 18 elements that are rated as *unsatisfactory, basic, proficient*, or *distinguished*. Domain 3a concentrates on the first four elements that are centered around communicating with students. The first four elements are expectations for learning, followed by directions and procedures, then explanations and content, and finally use of oral and written

language. To be considered in the highest rating—*distinguished*, for these four elements—the teacher must make the purpose of the lesson or unit clear, including where it is situated within the broader learning, linking that purpose to student interests. The teacher's directions and procedures must be clear to students and anticipate possible student misunderstanding. The teacher's explanation of the content is imaginative and connects with students' knowledge and experience. Students contribute to explaining concepts to their peers. The teacher's written and spoken language is correct and conforms to standard English. It also is expressive, with well-chosen vocabulary that enriches the lesson. The teacher finds opportunities to extend students' vocabularies (Danielson, 2007).

The next three elements are considered under component 3b: using questioning and discussion techniques. The elements in this level are quality of question, discussion techniques, and student participation. To receive the *distinguished* designation teachers must accomplish these tasks. The teacher's questions are of uniformly high quality, with adequate time for students to respond. Students formulate many questions. Students will also assume considerable responsibility for the success of the discussion, initiating topics and making unsolicited contributions. The students will also ensure that all voices are heard in the discussion (Danielson, 2007).

Component 3c involves engaging students in learning. The elements that are characterized in this area are activities and assignment, grouping of students, instructional materials and resources, and structure and pacing. To receive a *distinguished* designation, all students are cognitively engaged in the activities and assignments in their exploration of content. Students initiate or adapt activities and projects to enhance their understanding. Instructional groups are productive and fully appropriate to the student or to the instructional purpose of the

lesson. Students take the initiative to influence the formation or adjustment of instructional groups. Instructional materials and resources are suitable to the instructional purposes and engage students mentally. Students initiate the choice, adaptation, or creation of materials to enhance the learning. The lesson's structure is highly coherent for reflection and closure. Pacing of the lesson is appropriate for all students (Danielson, 2007).

Component 3d emphasizes using assessment in instruction. The key elements for this component are assessment criteria, monitoring of student learning, feedback to students, student self-assessment, and monitoring of progress. The *distinguished* level of achievement will witness students who are fully aware of the criteria and performance standards by which their work will be evaluated and have contributed to the development of the criteria. Teachers actively and systematically elicit diagnostic information from the individual students regarding their understanding and monitor the progress of individual students. Teachers' feedback to students is timely and consistently high in quality, and students make use of the feedback in their learning. Students not only frequently assess and monitor the quality of their work against the assessment criteria and performance standards but also make active use of that information in their learning (Danielson, 2007).

The final component, 3e, demonstrates flexibility and responsiveness. The elements included here include lesson adjustment, response to students and persistence. The distinguished teacher will make a major adjustment to a lesson when needed. The teacher seizes a major opportunity to enhance learning, building on student interests or a spontaneous event. The teacher persists in seeking effective approaches for students who need help, using an extensive repertoire of strategies and soliciting additional resources from the school (Danielson, 2007).

Value-added measures, which show students' growth from one year to the next, have

demonstrated the ability to address concerns with teacher evaluation. Washington, DC,

Chancellor, Michelle Rhee, revamped how the city administers, compensates, and removes

teachers from their jobs (Bruce, 2010). DC has become permanently linked in the growing

movement to evaluate teachers based on student achievement. This is also receiving support

from Secretary Duncan (Bruce, 2010). Much like Washington, DC, and Denver, the Department

of Education in Idaho has statewide standards for grading the performance of teachers that could

be implemented in public schools soon. Idaho now requires school districts to evaluate teachers

each year, but the Department of Education says the process varies among schools and districts

and lacks consistency.

In September of 2010, the IDOE unveiled a new rating summary (RISE) with four

categories for teacher and leader quality. They are: Highly Effective = superior, Effective =

solid performance, Improvement Necessary = fair, and Ineffective = poor (Schlegel, 2011). In

2010, Indiana has also determined that all educators must receive annual evaluations regardless

of their teaching experience or degrees earned. Their evaluation will be tied to student

achievement as well. Only 33% of the educators evaluation will be allowed to influence their

overall evaluation. This is a paradigm shift for the IDOE. State recommended evaluation tools

are estimated to be established by the end of January 2012 (Schlegel, 2011). Local reaction has

been positive from the schools selected to participate in the inaugural pilot program, RISE.

Planning and Preparation

Planning is a deliberate process that results in teachers being well prepared prior to

walking through the classroom door for the day (Wharton-McDonald, Pressley, & Hampston,

1998). Research of planning and preparation is abundant. Many of the research models used for

this study have planning and preparation listed as their first component. Well-thought planning sets the stage for good teaching, which in turn fosters optimal learning. Beyond planning and preparation of materials, effective organizing for instruction also involves the development of a conscious orientation toward teaching and learning as the central focus of classroom activity (Stronge, 2007). Teachers who know how to plan know precisely what they want to accomplish as well as what they want their students to accomplish. Poor planning results in nobody, including the teacher, having a clear understanding of what is to be accomplished. Effective instruction starts with an organized instructional plan (Skowrow, 2001). Shulman (1987) identified planning and preparation by supporting knowledge of content and pedagogy.

> The key to distinguishing the knowledge base of teaching lies in the intersection of content and pedagogy, in the capacity of a teacher to transform the content knowledge he or she possesses into forms that are pedagogically powerful and adaptive to the variations in ability and background presented by the students. (Shulman, 1987, p. 15)

The importance of becoming familiar with and building on students' knowledge and skills is also a focus of planning and preparation. The work of Sykes and Bird (1992) strongly demonstrates that prior conceptions exert a powerful hold and are difficult to alter. This concept lends itself to the belief that teachers are best positioned to help students engage in meaningful learning or dispel misconceptions when they understand and recognize the value of their students' knowledge and strive to add to it (Danielson, 1996). This belief is also supported by the teachings of Marzano. Marzano (2004) believes that the number of experiences that students encounter in school will directly add to their knowledge of content. Encouraging and understanding the resource of student experiences is an immediate channel toward least restrictive learning. This comment is supported by Jackson and Davis (2000). Jackson and

Davis advised teachers to "meet students where they are, since people learn best by connecting new information to old. This innate construct is best served when allowed to grow" (p. 83). Many researchers assert that when teachers recognize and honor the human impulse to construct new understandings, they create unlimited possibilities for students (Brooks & Brooks, 1993). Also consistent with these findings, McCombs (1992) defined learning as constructing meaning from information and experience from each individual's perceptions, thoughts, and feelings.

The importance of setting clear instructional outcomes is well documented in the research literature. Many studies have demonstrated the link between effective teaching and learning and the teacher's formulation of learning goals that are appropriate to the students (Jones, 1992). How are classroom goals established? Schmoker (1999) studied the importance of goals relative to schools. He stated, "School success depends upon how effectively we select, define, and measure progress and how well we adjust effort toward goals" (p. 25).

The need to design coherent instruction is also highly supported by research literature. For example, Jackson and Davis (2000) made recommendations for organizing instruction. They believe that content should be organized around concepts because the brain searches for meaningful patterns as it connects parts to wholes. Another suggestion that they offered centers on selecting pertinent experiences: Connect what happens in the classroom to the students, either directly or by helping them discover links to the world beyond the classroom, since people learn best when what they are learning has relevance to themselves or their society (Jackson & Davis, 2000). Designing coherent instruction includes knowing what instructional materials may be used. Jackson and Davis also addressed the need for teachers to use resources available through collaboration. Through collaboration large patterns across curricular lines may be utilized to connect the learning experiences. Jackson and Davis discussed how special education teachers

and other colleagues can be excellent resources when planning instruction. This style of learner sometimes lends itself more to establishing relevant patterns to the instructional strategy. Additionally, Jackson and Davis highlighted the link between instruction and assessment and assert that assessment should be directly connected to instruction and designed to provide ongoing, useful feedback, to both students and teachers, on what students have learned. Meaningful feedback is relative to the desired outcomes. Teachers are designers. An essential act of this profession is the design of curriculum and learning experiences to meet specified purposes.

> Teachers are also designers of assessments to diagnose student needs, to guide their teaching and to enable them, the students, and others (parents and administrators) to determine whether established goals have been achieved; that is, did the students learn and understand the desired knowledge?" (Wiggins & McTighe, 1998, p. 7)

Research indicates that instructional planning for effective teaching includes these elements: (a) identifying clear lesson and learning objectives while carefully linking activities to them, which is essential for effectiveness (Cotton, 2000; Wang, Haertel, & Walberg, 1993/94; Wharton-McDonald et al., 1998); (b) creating quality assignments, which is positively associated with quality instruction and quality student work (Clare, 2000); (c) planning lessons that have clear goals, are logically structured, and progress through the content step-by-step (Rosenshine, 1986; Zahorik, Halbach, Ehrle, & Molnar, 2003); (d) planning the instructional strategies to be deployed in the classroom and the timing of these strategies (Cotton, 2000; Johnson, 1997); (e) using advance organizers, graphic organizers, and outlines to plan for effective instructional delivery (Marzano, Norford, Paynter, Pickering, & Gaddy, 2001; Wang et al., 1993/94); (f) considering students attention spans and learning styles when designing lessons (Bain & Jacobs,

1990); and (g) systematically developing objectives, questions, and activities that reflect higher-level and lower-level cognitive skills as appropriate for the content and the students (Brophy & Good, 1986; Porter & Brophy, 1988).

Rutherford (2005) outlined a system for lesson planning, which incorporates multiple ideas that the educator wishes to try along with best practices to note or even suggestions. This is followed by reflections and questions to illustrate the effectiveness of the process. This is outlined in the ASK (Attitudes, Skill, and Knowledge) framework. When planning instruction the framework includes

- Use the district and state standards to plan for the year, the unit, and the lesson.

- Use the standards-based planning process to plan and pace for the year.

- Identify the essential understandings, key concepts, and big ideas of the content that are being taught.

- Design summative assessments prior to planning units or lessons. This lends itself to the UbD philosophy garnered by Wiggins and McTighe.

- Design learning experiences that give the students practices and rehearsals at the same level of understanding as the level to which standards/outcomes are written.

- Be clear about how any given lesson/learning experience is directly related to the standards/outcomes.

- Clearly state the standards in the lesson plans.

- Analyze instructional materials.

- Identify supplemental materials and design learning experiences to fill any gaps in standard materials.

- Include the knowledge of the student readiness levels, interests, and learning styles.

- Build pauses for student processing.

- Plan and write the key questions to ask during each lesson.

- Teach students to use graphic organizers to represent the thinking process used by the author and to capture the key information of the text.

- Align assignments to include homework with standards and assessments and be purposeful about examining homework results for evidence of learning.

- Eliminate lessons and learning exercises that so not move students toward meeting the standards.

- Collaborate/ consult with support staff.

- Have knowledge of medical conditions and medications and their possible effects on student learning and behavior.

- Use knowledge of educational giftedness or disability and their effects on student learning needs to individualize instruction. (Rutherford, 2005, p. 83)

When following the ASK framework, asking reflective questions is a primary component to demonstrate teacher planning. Some reflections and questions from the ASK framework include

- Describe your efforts in mastering the state and district standards in your field or grade level.

- How have you used your knowledge of the expectations in your planning, implementation, and evaluation of your instructional program?

- Describe the factors you consider when formulating lesson objectives.

- How do you combine personal experiences with research to make instructional decisions?

- What are your systems for ensuring that instruction focuses on what students need to achieve with standards instead of what is fun to teach or is readily available in the textbook?

- What is you process to identify essential understandings and then use those understandings to plan instruction and assess learning?

- What has the greatest influence on your planning decisions around instruction, assessment, and the environment?

- How do you ensure that you present different points of view and a variety of cultural perspectives?

- How do you use student prior knowledge in the planning process?

- What variables do you consider when planning for differentiation of instruction?

- How do you think about what you plan in relation to both the entire school year and the K-12 experiences of learners? (Rutherford, 2005, p. 85)

Marzano et al. (2001) utilized nine categories in instructional planning. Knowledge of these nine categories has influenced the way educators plan for instruction. The categories he made reference to are identifying similarities and differences, summarizing and note taking, reinforcing effort and providing recognition, homework and practices, nonlinguistic representations, cooperative learning, setting objectives and providing feedback, generating and testing hypothesis, questions, cues, and advanced organizers. When identifying similarities and differences, the educator focuses on four related activities: comparing, classifying, creating metaphors and creating analogies. Each of these processes involves identifying how items, events, processes, or concepts are similar and different (Marzano et al., 2001).

The second category of instructional planning is summarizing and note taking. Summarizing and note taking require students to distill information. To summarize information, what is important must be decided, what is trivial, and what is repetitive. Students must delete some information, reword some ideas, and reorganize information. With note-taking, they must synthesize material, prioritize pieces of data, restate some information, and organize concepts, topics, and details (Marzano et al., 2001). The third category in this model is reinforcing effort and providing recognition. Reinforcing effort and providing recognition focuses on student motivation. Simply teaching students that added effort pays off in terms of enhanced achievement actually increases student achievement (Marzano et al., 2001).

The next instructional planning category is homework and practice. Homework and practice are staples of the K-12 classroom. Both homework and practice give students opportunities to deepen their understanding and proficiency with content they are learning. Homework is a time for students to practice their skills. Students need time to shape and adapt their new found skills so they can use them effectively (Marzano et al., 2001). The more nonlinguistic representations are used while learning, the better it is to think about and recall knowledge. This is relevant to the classroom because teachers primarily present new knowledge to students linguistically. They typically either talk to students or have them read about the new content (Flanders, 1970). Engaging students in the creation of nonlinguistic representations actually stimulates and increases activity in the brain (Gerlic & Jausovec, 1999). Cooperative learning may be the most popular instructional innovation in U.S. education. Cooperative learning involves more than simply placing students in groups and asking them to work cooperatively. Students must learn and master certain skills for working in groups (Marzano et al., 2001).

The next category in this plan is setting objectives and providing feedback. Setting objectives and providing feedback engage the metacognitive thinking of students. Objectives and feedback give students direction and help them think about their learning. Educators should set flexible goals and encourage students to personalize them (Marzano et al., 2001).

The Classroom Environment

One of the hallmarks of effective teachers is that they create a positive atmosphere in their classroom and schools (Whitaker, 2004). Teachers know from experience that most classrooms unfortunately are designed, constructed, and furnished in ways that make it difficult for students to stay motivated and involved in the learning process; when students are distracted and bothered by the classroom environment, many of their coping mechanisms turn into behaviors unacceptable to teachers and interfere with the learning process (Gordon & Burch, 2003). Tomlinson (1999) also addressed how teachers can create a healthy classroom environment. She believed that each teacher must appreciate each child as an individual. Brooks and Brooks (1993) suggested that effective teachers encourage student inquiry by asking thoughtful open-ended questions and encouraging students to ask questions of each other. This method of self-inquiry allows for more open communication and potential learning outcomes that create student-centered topics that are adapted from their learning experiences.

Rutherford (2005) emphasized in a positive learning-centered environment, the instructor's knowledge of current interests of the students will benefit the students and teacher for potentially positive learning outcomes. Other items mentioned by Rutherford (2005) include

- Use student names in examples.

- Learn student names and information early in the year.

- Teach students how to set and work toward learning goals.

- Encourage students to ask for and get help from one another.

- Practice equity and explain the difference between equity (get what you need when you need it) and equality (all get the same thing at the same time). (p. 111)

Also mentioned by Kohn (1998) and related to the above-mentioned environment by Rutherford,

Educators eager to have children think about how they want their classrooms to be, educators who do not feel threatened at the prospect of inviting children to share some of the responsibility for creating norms and determining goals—need to think in terms of five broad categories: what they believe, what they say, what they do, how they relate to students, and how they encourage students to relate to one another. (p. 236)

What educators believe—teachers' assumptions about a child's intellectual potential—can affect that child's performance. Write off a student as destructive or disruptive, and he or she is likely to "live down" to these expectations. However, what is assumed about a given student is also colored by assumptions regarding human nature itself. An educator who thinks that self-interest motivates everything will be suspicious of individual instances of generosity.

Educators say children are more likely to follow a rule if its rationale has been explained to them. In general, discipline is based on reason and is more effective than the totalitarian approach. From preschool to high school, children should learn why, not merely be told that, helping others is good. How such explanations are framed also counts. First, the level of discourse should be fitted to the child's ability to understand. Second, an emotional charge in the message should be included to emphasize to demonstrate that it matters. The likelihood of children's donating increased both when they were praised and when they were led to believe of

themselves as helpful people. But in a follow-up experiment, it was the latter group who turned out to be more generous than those who had received verbal reinforcement (Kohn, 1998).

What educators do—children of all ages learn what they see. Children who watched, even briefly, as someone donated to charity were themselves likely to donate more than other children, even if months elapsed since their exposure to the model. How educators relate to children whose parents are interested in and supportive of them usually distinguishes themselves as socially competent and psychologically healthy on a range of measures. There is no reason to think that the teacher-student relationship is any different. Warm caring empathetic adults do several things at once. They provide the child with a benevolent, safe place in which to act. In meeting a child's emotional needs, he or she is given the emotional freedom to meet the needs of others (Kohn, 1998).

How educators encourage students to relate to one another is at least as important as that between student and teacher or between student and curriculum. Students working in pairs or cooperative learning encourages pro-social behavior. Having children learn from one another creates powerful bonds between them and sends a message very different from that sent by a classroom in which each child is on his or her own. Involving children in planning and decision-making is a way of providing a framework for pro-social interactions that supports other such opportunities. Educators can provide students with opportunities to be responsible for one another so they will learn (pro-social values and skills) by doing. It is realistic and valuable to attend to what students learn in the classroom about getting along with their peers. Children can be raised to work with, care for, and help one another. And schools must begin to play an integral role in that process (Kohn, 1998).

Gordon and Burch (2003) discussed eight ways to make environmental changes:

- Enriching the environment - making available a multitude of stimulating alternatives, choices, or electives to reduce unacceptable behavior- increasing sensory input.

- Impoverishing the environment - Reduction of stimulation in the learning environment- sometimes there may be too much stimulation and it overwhelms the students and their ability to focus.

- Restricting the environment - only allow certain activities in certain areas of the room.

- Enlarging the environment - extend the learning area outside of the walls of the traditionally restricting classroom.

- Rearranging the environment - physically move the items in the classroom to encourage alternative travel routes or classroom patterns.

- Simplifying the environment - reduce complex rules, regulations, procedures, and rituals that create frustration.

- Systematizing the environment - create systems to accomplish tasks. Always remembering that achieving the task is what is the goal.

- Planning ahead for the environment - discussion and preparation with the students in the classroom ahead of time to help the students be prepared when they encounter unusual situations. (p. 160)

Ultimately, learning is a phenomenon that occurs as a result of the interactions between a teacher and a student. Teachers cannot be solely responsible for student learning because it is an internally controlled activity. However, teachers are expected to optimize the conditions for learning. It is their professional obligation (Tucker & Stronge, 2005).

Instruction

A focus on instruction assists not only the teacher's own planning and classroom

behavior, but also comes across clearly to students and represents the major element in a robust

learning environment (Schlechty, 2001). Although effective teachers believe that students must

be challenged, they also realize that students need to experience success. In the short run,

teachers and administrators must concentrate their attention on factors and conditions that

increase engagement, ensure persistence, and foster satisfaction (Schlechty, 2001). Skowrow

(2001) concluded the purpose of engagement is to involve students in developing important

concepts, skills, and processes. Engagement provides the condition in which concepts are made

meaningful. Ellett's (1990) work stated that student involvement is needed: In teaching students

to think, the teacher deliberately structures and uses teaching methods and learning tasks that

actively involve students in ample opportunities to develop concepts and skills in generating,

structuring, transferring, and restructuring knowledge. When students generate and test

hypotheses, they are applying knowledge (Marzano et al., 2001). Accessing what students

already know enhances their learning about new content. This process is commonly referred to

as *accessing prior knowledge*. Recalling experiences provides a context for when students are

reading or learning new material. This trait appears to allow students to compare and contrast

what is stated with what they already know (Marzano et al., 2001).

The National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (2004) recognized the

importance of teachers demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness. The concepts of lesson

adjustment, response to students, and persistence are reflected in one of the five assessment

principles used for national board certification. The concept of flexibility allows for the learning

experience to take direction from the expressed experiences of the group. Moore (2004)

suggested that teachers who use research in their teachings will be able to distinguish patterns of learning response. She continued, as one reflects on the patterns and making instructional changes based on authentic evidence, that assignments, performance, and observation of student work are a natural part of this process for teachers who are experienced teacher researchers.

Rutherford (2005) commented on the multi-faceted manners in which instruction can take form. Implementing instruction is reliant on numerous factors, but all instructional models incorporate some mode of thinking required for demonstration of skill mastery. Bloom's taxonomy purposefully forms questions and tasks at a variety of cognitive levels (Schlegel, 2011). Constructivist instruction encourages students to form ideas and test hypothesis for understanding. This model encourages student participation in the process of determining how and what was learned and the assessment to demonstrate that mastery. Other models of instruction include the cooperative learning model, in which directions are given that apply to all in the large group. It also encourages students to help each other answer questions and solve problems. Literacy instruction across the curriculum creates a text-rich environment. This allows students to locate, organize, and use information from various sources. Inclusive classroom instruction utilizes methods of thinking aloud, backward chaining, and breaking more complex tasks into simpler parts. The process of differentiated instruction provides sources of information at various levels and engages all students in meaningful tasks. Sheltered instruction is considered thoughtful and purposeful in the use of academic and school-related language. There is a high use of concrete objects, models, and demonstrations to support instruction.

Research and the *wisdom of practice* have highlighted and continued to illuminate the limitations of using standardized tests as the sole measures of achievement (Shulman, 1987). Torp and Sage (1998) provided details on how to effectively construct problem-based learning

experiences for students at all grade levels. They stressed the importance of helping students make strong connections in an authentic context using a standards-based approach in which students are accountable for their own learning, demonstrating proficiency when assessed. This approach models a standards-based approach to a more basic development of establishing the patterns based from life experiences.

Daggett (2010) explained that teachers need to have up-to-date skills and knowledge in the disciplines in which they teach, but they need to be teacher's first, experts second. They also need to incorporate teaching practices that promote the relevancy of what they are teaching. The 21st century learner is fundamentally different from those of the past. The instructional strategies and practices used will vary based upon how these students learn best (Daggett, 2010).

Research has also demonstrated that student achievement is higher in classes where instructional time is maximized. Students are unlikely to understand anything positive from tasks they do not do or assignments they do not complete. Students must be motivated to do work and engage in activity that will result in the learning (Schlechty, 2001). The effective teacher prioritizes instruction, a process that is accomplished partially through allocation of time. One illustration of how effective teachers best use the scarce commodity of time is in smoothly orchestrated classroom transitions; they remain involved with the student during the entire class period from start to finish, allowing for no idle or down time (Stronge, 2007).

<center>Professional Responsibilities</center>

A major part of school reform and restructuring involves the changing of the roles, responsibilities, and relationships between teachers and students and between teachers and administrators. Collaborative decision-making, participatory management, team building, consensus strategies, and school improvement teams are all practices demanding that educators

rethink traditional views of staff evaluation and staff development (Danielson & McGreal, 2000).

Few have found that the process, as implemented with them as teachers, had much impact on

their practice. Given that, when those same teachers move into administrative roles, they place

little to no emphasis or value on the process. Instead, most see it as something that has to be

completed as a contractual requirement. There are not many educational leaders who use the

supervision and evaluation process as a professional development opportunity. "Given their past

experiences with the process, this is not surprising" (Rutherford, 2005, p. 62).

Danielson (1996) explained that educators and researchers have gradually expanded the

definition of teaching to include not only classroom interactions between teachers and students,

but also the full range of responsibilities that constitute teaching. Three of the five key principles

from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards that are considered the foundation

for the assessment of accomplished teachers and the awarding of advanced certificates are

aligned with professional responsibilities. They are (a) teachers are committed to their learning,

(b) teachers think systematically about their practices and learn from experiences, and (c)

teachers are members of learning communities (Danielson, 1996). Teacher professionalism is an

evolving field. Much of the research is theoretical and grounded in logical and ethical rather

than empirical studies (Danielson, 1996). Professional learning communities lend themselves to

the logical and ethics theory.

Effective teachers are lifelong learners who take ownership for student learning and

continually reflect on their efforts to ensure that they are providing focused, quality instruction.

Such teachers engage in corrective problem solving approaches with failing students rather than

punishing them for their shortcomings (Danielson, 1996). The positive effects of this sense of

efficacy are demonstrated in such studies as Jones (1992), Pajares (1992), and Schunk (1991).

Tucker and Stronge (2005) studied successful teaching and found that qualities of effective teachers include collegiality, collaboration, a strong belief in efficacy, and contributions to the school and community. Memberships in professional communities and continuing education are encouraged. Gabriel (2005) promoted the idea of nurturing teacher leadership and efficacy in today's schools. Providing the tools for educator success and allowing discovery in methodology promotes ownership of programs and student outcomes.

For nearly a century, schools have functioned in the autocratic style of the line-staff model: principals are managers and teachers are their employees, often voiceless and powerless to influence their superiors' quest to improve student achievement. But with the growing emphasis on high-stakes testing and the advent of No Child Left Behind (2010), many school leaders are seeking more effective organizational behavior by drawing on the leadership potential of all stakeholders, especially teachers. Current professional development efforts are not enough. Fullan (2001) placed value on the growth efforts of the teachers and described the importance of program coherence as a means to combat fragmentation of multiple innovations; his research on progress also emphasized the role of the entire group in a school. For this reason, schools must focus on creating school-wide professional communities. DuFour and Eaker (1998) summarized a similar point when they suggested that the most promising strategy for school improvement is developing school personnel into professional learning communities.

Teachers who are most effective create a learning community, implement efficient systems to maintain accurate records, while empowering students to participate in monitoring and maintaining such records. Wormelli (2003) discussed the importance of keeping accurate classroom records, including those documenting grades, missed assignments, work habits, incidents of tardiness, and absences. He suggested that teachers give students the responsibility

for some of the record keeping in the classroom. Marshall (2005) argued that the theory of action behind supervision and evaluation is flawed and that the conventional process rarely changes what teachers do in their classrooms. The engine that drives high student achievement is a teacher team working collaboratively toward common curriculum expectations and using interim assessments to continuously improve teaching and attend to students who are successful. "If a school adopts this theory it must change the way teachers are supervised and evaluated. DuFour, Schmoker, Marzano, Reeves, Howard, Wiggins, McTighe and others believe that this approach is a critical element in high achievement" (Marshall, 2005, p. 728).

Iwanicki (2001) stated that teacher evaluations are most effective when they connect to student achievement and align with professional development and school improvement. Teacher evaluation should improve student learning in the classroom. It must analyze teaching on the basis of what students are learning as well as effectively integrate the teacher evaluation and staff development processes with school improvement. Schools that use teacher evaluation in these ways make good progress in their quest to meet high student learning standards. The concepts of self-renewing schools, schools as learning organizations, and transformational and distributed leadership clearly state the notion of teachers working together in teams to solve their schools' problems, making evaluations less threatening. As states make the transition from more individual to more school-oriented accountability models, schools, rather than individual teachers, are being held accountable for student learning (Iwanicki, 2001). This integrated approach lacks the traditional concepts and allows for team evaluation.

Why is it difficult for the educational communities to consider a distributed leadership model? Barker (1992) explained that it is a paradigm problem. Too many schools are so paralyzed by what teacher evaluation used to be that they resist promising new alternatives.

Leadership is crucial in changing the paradigm of teacher evaluation. Although teacher evaluation can take many forms, the process must focus on student learning (Barker, 1992). The shift in focus will require professional development for some teachers and administrators, potential changes in school culture, and a commitment to change the nature of the conversations and reports that currently characterize teacher evaluation (Barker, 1992).

The most important factor affecting student learning is the teacher (Halik et al., 2010). In addition, these results show wide variation in effectiveness among teachers. The immediate and clear implication of this finding is that seemingly more can be done to improve education by improving the effectiveness of teachers than by any other single factor. Effective teachers appear to be effective with students of all achievement levels, regardless of the level of heterogeneity in their classroom (Barker, 1992). Summarizing findings from this study, Mendro (1998) stated,

> Research has demonstrated the effects of teachers on student achievement. They [the researchers] show that there are large additional components in the longitudinal effects of teachers, that these effects are much larger than expected, and that the least effective teachers have a long-term influence on student achievement that is not fully remediated for up to three years later. (p. 256)

School reform efforts are taking a variety of forms, with two of the most prominent being a focus on higher teacher standards and improved student performance (Tucker & Stronge, 2005). Professional responsibility goes along with collegial collaboration and representation. Rutherford (2005) listed multiple expectations related to professional responsibilities. A few of those include

- Participate and contribute at staff, departmental, and team meetings

- Use clear concise and grammatically correct language in oral and written communication

- Seek out parents as a partner in their child's education

- Ensure that supportable facts are discussion points in conversations and conferences

- Serve as a catalyst for constructive change. (Rutherford, 2005, p. 122)

Measures

Integrating multiple teacher effectiveness measures affords the evaluator more confidence in the teachings of the educator so that a more comprehensive understanding of the teacher's ability is observed (IDOE, 2011). Because teaching is a complex endeavor, teacher evaluation systems should not rely on a single measure. Instead, multiple measures should be collected, rated individually and then combined to form an overall rating of a teacher's effectiveness (Thompson, 2011). Each type of measure provides an important, although somewhat restricted, indicator of a teacher's practice. Indiana introduced the measure described as the student growth model. Student growth is the measure of a single student compared to all the students in the state as far as the amount of growth he or she demonstrated in English/language arts and math based on his or her current Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress (ISTEP) results. School corporations are able to view their school corporation, grade level, and individual student growth percentage reported by the Indiana Growth Model provided by the IDOE (2011). This measure received a great deal of attention from public schools as a link to establishing teacher evaluation models and including growth model data to determine the component of teacher merit pay (Schlegel, 2011).

Indiana and Federal Efforts to Address Educational Evaluation Concern

TNTP conducted a study in the winter and spring of 2008-09 and partnered with the Indianapolis Public School (IPS) system. Several of the schools located within the IPS district were in danger of being taken over by the state due to low student performance. The analysis revealed that IPS's current personnel development and assessment policies failed to ensure that a teacher's impact on student learning is the primary factor in staffing decisions. One of the primary findings outlined was that 74% of teachers believed that additional factors should be considered when reduction in force is necessary. Support for this change cuts across teachers at all experiences levels, even the most senior. The additional factors that were recommended to be considered were teacher effectiveness, such as classroom management, teacher attendance, and instructional performance based upon an evaluation rating (TNTP, 2009).

A second finding addressed the inflated evaluations that ignore teachers' developmental needs. Only 21% of IPS teachers surveyed had areas identified as unsatisfactory or in need of improvement on their last three evaluations. And even less, six out of 587 teachers evaluated in 2008 were recommended for *non-renewal* due to poor performance. IPS recently instituted a new evaluation system but *significant room for improvement exists,* as only 40% of teachers believe the current process helps improve teacher performance (TNTP, 2009). To address these challenges and ensure that every IPS classroom is led by a highly effective teacher, TNTP identified two primary objectives for IPS: a) promote instructional quality through the IPS staffing process and b) improve IPS human capital infrastructure. To meet these goals, the report advised IPS and the Indianapolis Education Association to work together to implement a rigorous evaluation system that provides teachers with frequent constructive feedback and support, and evaluates them based on their ability to promote student learning (TNTP, 2009).

Recently, the U.S. government has expressed an interest to give states more flexibility from specific No Child Left Behind (2010) mandates that are stifling reform, but only if they are transforming students, teachers, and schools to a system aligned with college and career ready standards for all students, developing differentiated accountability systems, and undertaking reforms to support effective classroom instruction and school leadership. On September 23, 2011, President Obama stated,

> To help states, districts and schools that are ready to move forward with education reform, our administration will provide flexibility from the law in exchange for real commitment to undertake change. The purpose is not to give states and districts a reprieve from accountability, but rather to unleash energy to improve our schools at the local level. (as cited in Hefling, 2011, p. 1)

The release of this package comes nearly a decade after NCLB became law and four years after it was due to be rewritten by Congress. NCLB shined light on achievement gaps and increased accountability for high-need students, but it also encouraged states to lower standards and narrow curriculum, focused on absolute test scores instead of student growth and gains, and created one-size-fits-all federal mandates. Education Secretary Arne Duncan said,

> We want to get out of the way and give states and districts flexibility to develop locally-tailored solutions to their educational challenges while protecting children and holding schools accountable for better preparing young people for college and careers. (as cited in Hefling, 2011, p. 1)

States have taken the lead in pursuing reform and innovations, including widespread adoption of college and career ready standards, development of new assessments, and other reforms in areas

including teacher and principal evaluation and support, and turning around low-performing

schools (Office of the White House Press Secretary, 2011).

The IDOE is implementing a new evaluation process starting at the beginning of the

2012-13 school year. They are creating a state model, RISE, for school districts to use if they

choose not to create their own teacher evaluation tool (Schlegel, 2011). If school districts choose

an alternative evaluation tool, they have been provided the requirements from the state to meet

compliance. This study reviewed the sample size of schools utilizing alternative teacher

evaluation tools and compared them with the research elements that are shared among practicing

evaluation scholars Marshall, Danielson, and Marzano for the domain of instruction. The

previous literature has informed the study that teacher evaluations have been the topic of

discussion for some time and there is an understanding among education professionals that the

teacher is the most important ingredient in the classroom.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHOD

The multiple measures principle emphasized strongly by the IDOE starting in the 2010-11 calendar year was a catalyst for a review of teacher evaluation practices. A national catalyst for school review of evaluation practices started with a report from TNTP entitled *The Widget Effect*. This report, along with federal directives passed along by Secretary of Education Duncan, provoked the states into competing for funding from the federal government program, labeled *Race to the Top*. Based on the IDOE directive of teacher evaluation, all measures of a teacher's evaluation are combined to make up his or her final rating of one of the following: highly effective, effective, improvement necessary, or ineffective. These four categories stem from the teacher evaluation research of Danielson (1996) where the four evaluation rankings of teachers are distinguished, proficient, basic, and unsatisfactory.

Danielson's framework for teaching is based on the Praxis III criteria developed by the Education Testing Services (ETS, Dwyer, 1994). Much of her framework derives from her *Development of the Knowledge Base for the Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments Assessment Criteria* (Dwyer, 1994). The multiple measures model gave educators an in-depth look at the basic components of what an evaluation rubric might look like. The IDOE recruited educators from across the state and outside agencies to develop the multiple measures model to

support local school corporations in crafting the best possible evaluation rubric to meet the needs of both the student and the professionals in their building.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research was to determine whether there is a relationship between the research-based elements of alternative teacher evaluation tools and the school district demographics. The research identified Indiana schools that were not using the state-prescribed teacher evaluation tool, RISE, for their 2012-13 teacher evaluation tool. The RISE model is a research-based teacher evaluation instrument that was piloted by three schools in Indiana. Indiana Senate Enrolled Act 1 requires statewide implementation of new or modified evaluation systems compliant with the law by school year 2012-2013. To assist school corporations in creating evaluation models of their own, the state is piloting RISE in school year 2011-2012. All documents for RISE version 1.0 were released by January 2012; however, key learnings from the pilot drove model refinement, and the state will release the refined, revised model to all corporations by mid-summer 2012.

Corporations may choose to adopt RISE entirely, draw on components from the model, or create their own system for implementation in school year 2012-2013. Though corporations are encouraged to choose or adapt the evaluation system that best meet the needs of their local schools and teachers, in order to maintain consistency, only corporations that adopt the RISE system wholesale or make only minor changes may use the RISE label, and are thus considered by the IDOE to be using a version of RISE. The 2011-2012 Indiana Teacher Effectiveness Pilot has been established to create a helpful blueprint for school leaders and teachers across the state seeking to take advantage of new opportunities created by Indiana's *Putting Students First* education reforms (IDOE, 2011). A determining factor for the Indiana model was the

commitment to establish yearly evaluations. These school corporations were selected based on their commitment and readiness to successfully implement annual evaluations that incorporate student growth data. All districts demonstrated strong school leadership and a unique collaborative working relationship at every level. In each community, local teachers expressed support for participation in the program and excitement to work with IDOE and school leadership. SEA 1 requires school corporations to develop annual educator evaluations based on multiple measures including student performance. The legislation also expanded the criteria for awarding teachers pay raises by adding students' needs, teachers' leadership roles, and student performance data to a list that previously included only years of performance and degrees held.

The 2011-2012 Indiana Teacher Effectiveness Pilot will create a helpful blueprint for school leaders and teachers across the state seeking to take advantage of new opportunities created by Indiana's "Putting Students First" education reforms (Schlegel, 2011). Of the identified schools using alternative teacher evaluation models, the research determined if the alternative evaluation models had the same or similar research-based characteristics as identified in the research of Danielson (2007), Marzano (2004), and Marshall (2005). These school corporations were selected based on their commitment and readiness to successfully implement annual evaluations that incorporate student growth data. All districts demonstrated strong school leadership and a unique collaborative working relationship at every level. In each community, local teachers expressed support for participation in the program and excitement to work with IDOE and school leadership.

Their alternative evaluation tool was compared to a researched-based template to compare evaluation item similarities for best practices. A survey was given to those non-RISE schools to determine demographics such as poverty levels, geographic location, and size of

school based on student enrollment. The poverty level was determined through the percentage of free and reduced students the district serves. Geography was considered urban, suburban, or rural. Student enrollment was considered in five population categories: less than 500, 501-1,000, 1,001-3,000, 3,001-10,000, and over 10,001. The population categories were established to identify diversity and as broad a spectrum as possible of school districts without being too specific thus creating individualized data results. The research template determined if the alternative evaluation models contained elements that were research-based and contributed to the success of student achievement.

There were three models that the template utilized for the comparison process. Work from Danielson (2007), Marshall (2005), and Marzano (2004) was cross-referenced in the area of instruction to determine the key concepts in that domain that generated the most concrete research-based platform to create the template for this study. Danielson (2007) separated her elements into 18 specific items for the domain of instruction. After comparison, much of her work was combined to be comparable with the definitions used for similar elements that Marzano (2004) and Marshall (2005) explained in their domain of instruction. A teacher-level factor that affects student achievement is *instructional strategies*. It is perhaps self-evident that more effective teachers use more effective instructional strategies. It is probably also true that effective teachers have more instructional strategies at their disposal (Marzano, 2004).

With the assistance of Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents (IAPSS) executive director, John Ellis, all school corporation superintendents in the state of Indiana were contacted and asked to complete the initial 15-question survey. The IAPSS assures the availability of a quality education for all children; knowledgeable, ethical, effective leaders are

essential to achieving this educational excellence. The IAPSS was established with this premise in 1960 (Halik et al., 2010).

Those school superintendents who chose to participate and designated their 2012-13 teacher evaluation model as an alternative model to the state model RISE were asked to submit their evaluation instruments. They were then taken and individually compared to the evaluation item template that contains the research-based best practices for instruction from current teacher evaluation researchers. Following the analysis of comparison of the evaluation tools with the evaluation template, the generated data were compartmentalized in specific demographic categories based on poverty, population, and geographic region. The results are presented in Chapter 4, and final assumptions along with recommendations for additional studies are highlighted in Chapter 5.

Research Question

The research question that guided this study was "In Indiana school districts using alternative teacher evaluation models, is there a relationship between the research-based elements of alternative teacher evaluation tools and the school district demographics?"

Description of the Sample

All school districts from across the state of Indiana, public and private, were invited to participate in a 15-question survey that asked them to identify what teacher evaluation model they would be using for the 2012-13 school year (see Appendix B for a copy of the survey instrument). The additional questions focused on those school districts that chose to use an alternative teacher evaluation tool to the Indiana RISE. Forty-six Indiana schools from 11 school districts partnered with the IDOE to implement a nationally-recognized program, called TAP: The System for Teacher and Student Advancement. An alternative model may be a competing

company evaluation program, such as TAP, or it may be a locally determined evaluation tool that the local assessment committee developed and is founded on current recognized research. The TAP system uses rigorous evaluations, training, and strong incentives—including performance-based pay—to keep successful teachers in classrooms and recognize effective school leadership. Of the initial respondents, 90 replied, and of this group, 27 indicated they would be using an alternative teacher evaluation tool to the Indiana RISE model.

<center>Data Sources</center>

Two hundred seventy district administrators were contacted through the IAAPSS listserve in the fall of 2011. They were asked to participate by responding to a 15-question survey based on demographic information of their school district such as poverty level, student population, and geographic region. There was a return of over 140 electronic and telephone conference contacts/correspondences with administrators from across the state resulting in 90 school districts completing the survey tool. The poverty level was determined by the percentage of free and reduced students that were designated and served within that school district. The percentage designations were less than 10%, 11%-25%, 26%-50%, 51%-75%, and 76%-100%. Poverty level was determined to represent the very low percentage (<10%) then to represent the second, third, and fourth quartiles equally. The student population was determined by the most recently reported average daily membership (ADM) count provided by the IDOE for that school district. The five population options to consider for each district include less than 500, 501-1,000, 1,001-3,000, 3,001-10,000, and over 10,001. This designation allowed for a diverse grouping without being too specific with the population of the school district. The geographic region was considered as one of the three options of urban, suburban, or rural to represent the diverse regions of the study as defined by the IDOE and located in Appendix B.

46

Following these initial questions, the district administrators were asked about their intentions of utilization of the Indiana RISE model. The survey inquired if the school district will wait for RISE implementation or create an alternative teacher evaluation tool. If the school intends to use RISE, will administrators create an addendum to the model to be included with their teacher evaluations? At this point, if administrators are using RISE for school year 2012-13 they were done and had completed all that they were requested to answer.

The remaining questions to the survey asked about the process for not implementing RISE, what local determinants influenced the choice to use an alternative teacher evaluation, what type and form of evaluator training will take place or had taken place, and whether or not there were secondary evaluators utilized in the overall evaluation process for the district. Following this step in the process, those school district administrators who affirmed they would be using an alternative teacher evaluation tool were asked to supply a copy of their intended 2012-13 teacher evaluation tools or their research being utilized to develop their tools. The evaluation tool was compared to a predetermined evaluation template based on best practices research and current experts in the field of teacher evaluation. The evaluation tool received a score and, based on that score, was determined to have strong or lesser comparability to current research and best practices. The evaluation item template has a strong research base founded in the work of Danielson's (2007) third domain of instruction along with Marshall's (2005) and Marzano's (2004) evaluation elements addressing the same area of instruction. After receiving a score, the evaluation tool was categorized in the previously mentioned demographic areas of poverty level, district enrollment, and geographic region. Following this designation the findings were reported and comparisons or differences among the designated groupings were made.

Method of Analysis

The survey asked for the superintendent of each participating school district to explain the determining factors for his or her choice of either using the Indiana RISE teacher evaluation tool or utilizing an alternative teacher evaluation model in his or her district. Once it was determined the superintendent was using an alternative teacher evaluation, the district's evaluation model was compared to a designated teacher evaluation template. The evaluation tool received a score and then was categorized in its appropriate demographic category. The score for the evaluation tool was established by the overall number of evaluation elements it had in common with the research-based evaluation template. Using step-wise multiple regression, the evaluation tool was categorized considering all three demographic areas. This method was used because it allowed a view of one variable at a time (a total of 12) to systematically determine the importance of the predictors and the amount of variance that is in the criterion variable. The overall Type 1 error inflated p values using the four 12 multiple regressions resulting in experiment-wide Type 1 errors thus inflated with larger numbers of statistical tests. Consequently, findings of significance were interpreted appropriately. The results and findings are presented in Chapter 4 along with proposals for further study in Chapter 5.

Summary

In summary, this research was to determine whether there is a relationship between the research-based elements of alternative teacher evaluation tools and the school district demographics. The research identified Indiana schools that were not using the state-prescribed teacher evaluation tool, RISE, for their 2012-13 teacher evaluation tool. This was accomplished by creating and administering a state-wide survey for all school district superintendents to complete. The RISE model is a research-based teacher evaluation instrument that was piloted by

three schools in Indiana. Indiana SEA 1 requires statewide implementation of new or modified evaluation systems compliant with the law by school year 2012-2013.

The study described will enable administrators and other education officials to determine if the evaluation tools being used that are an alternative to the Indiana RISE model will be utilizing research best practices to evaluate their teachers. If they meet those criteria it may be assumed that a better teacher evaluation tool will create a better teacher, which is the most important part for student success in the classroom.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The purpose of this study was to determine if there is a relationship between the research-based elements of alternative teacher evaluation tools and the school district demographics. The research identified Indiana schools that were not using the state-prescribed teacher evaluation tool, RISE, for their 2012-13 teacher evaluation tool. The RISE model is a research-based teacher evaluation instrument that was piloted by three schools in Indiana, under the direction of the IDOE, starting in the fall of 2011 and ending June 2012. The 2011-2012 Indiana Teacher Effectiveness Pilot will create a helpful blueprint for school leaders and teachers across the state seeking to take advantage of new opportunities created by Indiana's "Putting Students First" education reforms.

Of the identified schools using alternative teacher evaluation models, a determination was made to see if the alternative evaluation models had the same or similar research-based characteristics as the RISE model. These school corporations were selected based on their commitment and readiness to successfully implement annual evaluations that incorporated student growth data. These districts demonstrated strong school leadership and a unique collaborative working relationship at every level. In each community, local teachers expressed support for participation in the program and excitement to work with IDOE and school leadership. SEA 1 requires school corporations to develop annual educator evaluations based on

multiple measures. Multiple measures included purposeful planning, student instruction, teacher leadership, and core professionalism. The legislation also expands the criteria for awarding teachers pay raises by adding students' needs, teachers' leadership roles, and student performance data to a list that previously included only years of performance and degrees held. The overall frequency data indicating which school districts were utilizing alternative evaluation models are located in Tables 1 through 33.

The design of the study included analyses of school districts' alternative evaluation tools, comparing them to a research-based template to determine evaluation item similarities as well as frequencies for best practices. A survey was developed for non-RISE schools to determine demographics such as poverty levels, geographic location, and size of school based on student enrollment.

The research question determined if the levels of research-based evaluation in alternative evaluation models can be predicted based on the school district demographics. The hypothesis of this study focused on the possibility that the larger, more suburban schools with less poverty would have the resources and personnel to develop alternative teacher evaluations that are supported by established research. Those school superintendents who chose to participate by returning the initial surveys and designating their 2012-13 teacher evaluation model as an alternative model to the state RISE model were asked to submit their research and/or their evaluation instrument. This information was then reviewed and individually compared to the evaluation item template that contains the research-based best practices for instruction from current teacher evaluation researchers. Following the analysis of comparison of their research or their evaluation tools with the evaluation template, the generated data were segregated into specific demographic categories based on poverty, population, and geographic region.

There were three models that the template utilized for the comparison process. Work from Danielson (2007), Marshall (2005), and Marzano (2004) has been cross-referenced in the area of instruction to determine the key concepts in that domain that generate the most concrete research-based platform to create the template for this study. Danielson separated her elements into 18 specific items for the domain of instruction. After comparison, much of her work can be combined to be comparable with the definitions used for similar elements that Marzano and Marshall explained in their domain of instruction. Marshall identified 10 items that are considered in the domain of instruction, and Marzano had nine items in the domain of instruction. A listing of these elements is located in Appendix A.

Final assumptions of this research along with recommendations for additional studies are highlighted in Chapter 5. This chapter provides descriptive data of the school districts that participated and presents the results of the study. The remainder of this chapter is organized into the following categories: descriptive data, findings, analysis, and summary.

One primary research question was utilized to guide this study. The emphasis was on the predictive qualities of three specific demographic classifications on the success of alternative teacher evaluation practices to the Indiana-prescribed RISE model, which will be implemented August 2012. Is there a relationship between the research-based elements of alternative teacher evaluation tools and the school district demographics?

The following descriptive tables are from those schools designating an alternative evaluation tool for the 2012-13 school year. They are identified through the three demographic areas of geographic setting, student population, and free and reduced percentage.

The superintendent's response to geographic setting is a common description of what the community vernacular supports, and it also unified the topic by simplifying the overall

designation of what a geographic setting in most Indiana communities is understood to be and

represents. The DOE definitions and categories are found in Appendix B. The superintendents'

response results are contained in Table 1.

Table 1

Overall Sample Size Depicted by Geographic Setting (n = 27)

Setting	Percentage
Rural	40.7
Suburban	33.3
Urban	25.9

Results for the distinction of school district population indicates that one-fourth of all

distinctions were either from 501-1,000 or 1,001-3,000. Results are located in Table 2.

Table 2

Overall sample size (n = 27) Depicted by School District Population

Population	Percentage
<500	14.8
501 – 1,000	25.9
1,001 – 3,000	25.9
3,001 – 10,000	14.8
Over 10,001	18.5

The sample size ($n = 27$) had five percentage classifications. Of the sample size, 44.4% were designated as 51-75% F/R. The next largest group was designated at 26-50%. These two designations accounted for 81.4 % of the respondents. Free and reduced (F/R) percentages are located in Table 3.

Table 3

Overall Sample Size Depicted by Poverty Level Based on Free/Reduced Percentages

Free/Reduced	Percentage
<10%	0.0
11 – 25%	3.7
26 – 50%	37.0
51 – 75%	44.4
76 – 100%	14.8

The descriptive data found in Table 3 identifies the information for district population and F/R percentages. Of the sample size ($n = 27$), the population mean was 4,918.6 students. The minimum student population was 207 students and the maximum student population was 22,568. The standard deviation was 6970.79. The F/R mean was 53.28% with 11.2% as the minimum and 89% as the maximum. The F/R standard deviation was 19.30

The alternative evaluation template had 12 elements established from the research of Danielson (2007), Marzano (2004), and Marshall (2005). Several unique elements were determined for the evaluation process. Twelve common elements of the research were established and a common comparative template was developed. The 12 elements could have multiple representations on each alternative evaluation tool that were included for this study.

The descriptive data in Table 4 illustrates the mean and standard deviation for each of the 12

elements. Table 6 illustrates the inclusion template elements by number of school districts.

Table 6 represents the total number of elements included in the sample group. The mean column

identifies how many times the elements are found on each alternative tool. For example, for

Setting Expectations, it was anticipated to reflect a reference of 2.56 times on every alternative

evaluation tool. The standard deviation indicated how the scores were spread around the mean.

A smaller standard deviation would indicate less difference among the amount of scores where a

large standard deviation would indicate that the scores are more widely distributed.

Table 4

Evaluation Template Elements, Mean, and Standard Deviation

	Mean	SD
Setting Expectations	2.56	.97
Engagement	1.30	.72
Application	1.26	.98
Connections/Questions	1.59	1.12
Clarity	.37	.56
Goals	.96	.34
Differentiation	1.04	.44
Instructional Repertoire	1.04	.71
Cooperative Grouping	1.15	.82
Summarizing/Notes	.07	.27
Homework/Feedback	1.59	.57
Effort	.85	.36

Table 5

Inclusion of Template Elements by Number of School Districts

Elements	No. of School Districts	Percentage
Setting Expectations	26	96
Engagement	27	100
Application	17	63
Connections/Questions	27	100
Clarity	9	33
Goals	25	93
Differentiation	26	96
Instructional Repertoire	24	89
Cooperative Grouping	23	85
Summarizing/Notes	2	7
Homework/Feedback	26	96
Effort	23	85

Table 6, for example, indicates that schools really do not view Clarity or Summarizing/Notes to be important indicators of teaching effectiveness. Similarly all schools viewed Engagement, Connections, and Questions as important while almost every school viewed differentiation, homework and feedback, and setting expectations and objectives as important criteria for teacher effectiveness. It appears that the majority of respondents are using the 12 most important criteria of instruction identified in the research.

Table 6

Total Number of Elements Included

Elements	Frequency of Elements Included
Setting Expectations	69
Engagement	35
Application	34
Connections/Questions	43
Clarity	10
Goals	26
Differentiation	28
Instructional Repertoire	28
Cooperative Grouping	31
Summarizing/Notes	2
Homework/Feedback	43
Effort	23

The established template elements were reviewed based on their overall district population. The mean and standard deviation for each population category are represented in Table 7. Each of the 12 evaluation elements was reviewed by the specific population designation.

Table 7

Evaluation Template Elements by District Population

	<500	501-1,000	1,001–3,000	3,001–10,000	10,001>
	M (SD)	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*
Setting Expectations	3.00 (.00)	2.00 (1.15)	2.86 (1.21)	2.25 (.96)	2.80 (.45)
Engagement	1.00 (.00)	1.57 (.98)	1.00 (.00)	1.50 (1.00)	1.40 (.89)
Application	2.00 (.00)	.86 (1.07)	1.14 (1.07)	1.00 (1.15)	1.60 (.89)
Connections/ Questions	1.00 (.00)	1.86 (1.46)	1.57 (.79)	1.75 (1.50)	1.60 (1.34)
Clarity	.00 (.00)	.43 (.53)	.57 (.79)	.50 (.58)	.20 (.45)
Goals	1.00 (.00)	.86 (.38)	1.00 (.58)	1.00 (.00)	1.00 (.00)
Differentiation	1.00 (.00)	1.00 (.00)	1.14 (.90)	1.00 (.00)	1.00 (.00)
Instructional Repertoire	1.00 (.00)	.86 (.38)	1.43 (1.27)	.75 (.50)	1.00 (.00)
Coop Grouping	1.00 (.00)	1.00 (.82)	1.43 (1.27)	1.00 (.82)	1.20 (.45)
Summarize/ Notes	.00 (.00)	.00 (.00)	.29 (.49)	.00 (.00)	.00 (.00)
Homework/ Feedback	2.00 (.00)	1.29 (.76)	.29 (.49)	1.50 (.58)	1.80 (.45)
Effort	1.00 (.00)	.73 (.49)	1.00 (.00)	.75 (.50)	.80 (.45)

The established template elements were reviewed based on their overall district Free and

Reduced percentage (F/R %). The mean and standard deviation for each F/R category is

represented in Table 8. Each of the 12 evaluation elements was reviewed by the specific F/R

designation.

Table 8

Descriptive Data of the Sample Defined by the Poverty Level Represented by F/R Percentages

	11–25%		26–50%		51–75%		76–100%	
	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*
Setting Expectations	3.00	.00	2.20	1.31	2.67	.78	3.00	.00
Engagement	1.00	.00	1.80	1.03	1.00	.00	1.00	.00
Application	2.00	.00	.40	.84	1.67	.78	2.00	.00
Connect/Questions	1.00	.00	2.60	1.35	1.00	.00	1.00	.00
Clarity	.00	.00	.80	.63	.17	.39	.00	.00
Goals	1.00	.00	.90	.57	.00	.00	1.00	.00
Differentiation	1.00	.00	1.10	.74	1.00	.00	1.00	.00
Instructional Repertoire	1.00	.00	1.30	1.06	.83	.39	1.00	.00
Coop Grouping	1.00	.00	1.60	1.17	.83	.39	1.00	.00
Summarizing/Notes	.00	.00	.20	.42	.00	.00	.00	.00
Homework/Feedback	2.00	2.00	1.10	.57	1.83	.39	2.00	.00
Effort	1.00	1.00	.60	.52	1.00	.00	1.00	.00

Findings

Stepwise multiple regression was conducted for the demographic categories to determine

if there were predictive qualities that tied the demographic categories to the type of teacher

evaluation elements that are proven to be best practice. A brief explanation of the five

assumptions for multiple regression included the assumption of linearity, assumption of

multicollinearity, assumption of independence, assumption of normality, and assumption of

homoscedasticity. The assumption of linearity ensures the relationship between X and Y is

linear in nature. If there was no evidence of a violation of linearity there was a bowed pattern in

the plot of observed versus predicted values. The assumption of no multicollinearity ensured

that the independent variables were not so highly correlated to impact the prediction levels. If

tolerance levels of predictors were below the .20 level, this indicated a violation of the

assumption of no multicollinearity. The assumption of independence ensured the residuals were

free to vary. If a systematic pattern in the distribution of the residuals in the p-p plot was

evident, then a violation of the assumption of independence occurred. The assumption of

normality ensured the data was normally distributed. There would be evidence of a violation of

the assumption of normality if the points on the normal probability plot of residuals fell far from

the diagonal line. The assumption of homoscedasticity ensured that residuals were equal among

all values of X. There would be evidence of a violation of the assumption of homoscedasticity if

the plot of residuals versus predicted values demonstrated the residuals were getting larger as X

increased.

Multiple Regression 1

Can the demographic of geographic setting predict the variable of Setting Expectations

and objectives? The assumptions for this multiple regression were all met. The assumption of

linearity was met in the regression with almost all of the residuals falling within the 95%

confidence bands around zero (between +2 or -2) on the scatter plot of residuals. The

assumption of no multicollinearity was met due to having executed the colinearity diagnostics

which demonstrated the tolerance levels for all of the predictors well above the .2 minimum that was needed for this assumption. While examining the assumptions for the residuals, the assumption of independence was met as there was no systematic pattern on the plot of residuals. Based on the distribution of residuals in the p-p plot it was assumed that the assumption was met. The assumption of homogeneity of variance of residuals was met as the residuals were the same across all values of X. There was a constant scatter of residuals among all values of X for this regression.

The multiple correlation coefficient showed the correlation between the observed and predicted values of the criterion. With a multiple correlation coefficient of .356, it was considered a moderate correlation between the predictors and criterion. The coefficient of multiple determination gave the proportion of the total variance in the criterion (Setting Expectations) that was shared with the linear combination of the predictor variables (Demographics). With a coefficient of multiple determination (R^2) value of .126, 12.6% of the variance in setting expectations was explained by the demographic scores. The adjusted R^2 gave an unbiased estimate of the variance explained by the predictors as it gave a more conservative estimate based on the number of predictors and sample size. R^2 was .126, but adjusted R^2 was .012 as the number of predictors and sample size was examined. The .114 difference between the R^2 and adjusted R^2 was the shrinkage in the model. The standard error of the estimate (.968) measured the amount of variability in the points around the regression line. It was the standard deviation of the data points as they were distributed around the regression line. This meant this model had a standard deviation of .968 units of Setting Expectations scores regarding the distance of the residuals from the regression (prediction) line.

The multiple regression revealed that the criterion variable, Setting Expectations, cannot be predicted by the demographic variables. The ANOVA tests determined there was not a strong enough correlation between the predictors and the criterion variable with F (2,23) = 1.109, p = .366.

Multiple Regression 2

Can demographics predict the variable of Engagement? The assumptions for this multiple regression were all met. The assumption of linearity was met in the regression with almost all of the residuals falling within the 95% confidence bands around zero (between +2 or -2) on the scatter plot of residuals. The assumption of no multicollinearity was met due to having tolerance levels for all of the predictors (school effectiveness standards) well above the .2 minimum that was needed for this assumption. While examining the assumptions for the residuals, the assumption of independence was met as there was no systematic pattern on the plot of residuals. Based on the distribution of residuals in the p-p plot it was assumed that the assumption had been met. The assumption of homogeneity of variance of residuals was met as the residuals were the same across all values of X. There was a constant scatter of residuals among all values of X for this regression.

The multiple correlation coefficient showed the correlation between the observed and predicted values of the criterion. With a multiple correlation coefficient of .438, this was considered a moderate correlation between the predictors and criterion. The coefficient of multiple determination gave the proportion of the total variance in the criterion (Engagement) that was shared with the linear combination of the predictor variables (Demographics). With a coefficient of multiple determination (R^2) value of .191, 19.1% of the variance in Engagement was explained by the demographic scores. The adjusted R^2 gave an unbiased estimate of the

variance explained by the predictors as it gave a more conservative estimate based on the number of predictors and sample size. R^2 was .191, but adjusted R^2 was .086 as the number of predictors and sample size was examined. The .105 difference between the R^2 and adjusted R^2 was the shrinkage in the model. The standard error of the estimate (.692) measured the amount of variability in the points around the regression line. It is the standard deviation of the data points as they were distributed around the regression line. This meant this model had a standard deviation of .692 units of Engagement scores regarding the distance of the residuals from the regression (prediction) line.

The multiple regression revealed that the criterion variable, Engagement, cannot be predicted by the demographic variables. The ANOVA tests determined there was not a strong enough correlation between the predictors and the criterion variable with F (2,23) = 1.816, p = .172.

Multiple Regression 3

Can demographics predict the variable of Application? The assumptions for this multiple regression were all met. The assumption of linearity was met in the regression with almost all of the residuals falling within the 95% confidence bands around zero (between +2 or -2) on the scatter plot of residuals. The assumption of no multicollinearity was met due to having tolerance levels for all of the predictors (school effectiveness standards) well above the .2 minimum that is needed for this assumption. While examining the assumptions for the residuals, the assumption of independence was met as there was no systematic pattern on the plot of residuals. Based on the distribution of residuals in the p-p plot it was assumed that the assumption had been met. The assumption of homogeneity of variance of residuals was met as the residuals were the same

across all values of X. There was a constant scatter of residuals among all values of X for this regression.

The multiple regression revealed that the predictors (Demographics) can be used to predict Application in the alternative teacher evaluation tool. An ANOVA was completed to test the significance of R^2 within the model. The ANOVA was significant, F (3,23) = 4.47, p = .013, two-tailed thus showing a linear relationship between at least one predictor and Application in the alternative teacher evaluation model.

Through the use of stepwise regression, the model indicated one predictor (F/R %) that significantly predicted Application within the alternative teacher evaluation tool t(3,23) = 2.55, p = .018. F/R had an unstandardized partial regression coefficient of.024, which meant application scores were predicted to increase by .024 units with a one unit increase in F/R. These results are located in Table 9.

Table 9

Applications by F/R Percentages

Independent Variable	B	*SE*	β	*t*	Sig.
F/R %	.024	.009	.467	2.55	.018

Multiple Regression 4

Can demographics predict the variable Connections/Questions? The assumptions for this multiple regression were all met. The assumption of linearity was met in the regression with almost all of the residuals falling within the 95% confidence bands around zero (between +2 or -2) on the scatter plot of residuals. The assumption of no multicollinearity was met due to having tolerance levels for all of the predictors (school effectiveness standards) well above the .2

minimum that is needed for this assumption. While examining the assumptions for the residuals, the assumption of independence was met as there was no systematic pattern on the plot of residuals. Based on the distribution of residuals in the p-p plot it was assumed that the assumption had been met. The assumption of homogeneity of variance of residuals was met as the residuals were the same across all values of X. There was a constant scatter of residuals among all values of X for this regression.

The multiple regression revealed that the predictors (Demographics) could be used to predict connections/questions in the alternative teacher evaluation tool. An ANOVA was completed to test the significance of R^2 within the model. It determined that demographics could be used to predict Connections/Questions in the alternative teacher evaluation models. The ANOVA was significant, F (3,23) = 3.394, p = .035, two-tailed thus showing a linear relationship between demographics and Connections/Questions in the alternative teacher evaluation model.

Through the use of stepwise regression, the model indicated one predictor (F/R %) that significantly predicted Connections/Questions within the alternative teacher evaluation tool. t(3,23) = -2.86, p = .009. F/R had an unstandardized partial regression coefficient of -.032, which meant application scores were predicted to decrease by .032 units with a one unit increase in F/R. Details are depicted on Table 10.

Table 10

Connections/Questions by F/R Percentages

Independent Variable	B	*SE*	β	*t*	Sig.
F/R %	-.032	.011	-.550	-2.86	.009

Note. Results are important.

Multiple Regression 5

Can demographics predict the variable of Clarity? The assumptions for this multiple regression were all met. The assumption of linearity was met in the regression with almost all of the residuals falling within the 95% confidence bands around zero (between +2 or -2) on the scatter plot of residuals. The assumption of no multicollinearity was met due to having tolerance levels for all of the predictors (school effectiveness standards) well above the .2 minimum that was needed for this assumption. While examining the assumptions for the residuals, the assumption of independence was met as there was no systematic pattern on the plot of residuals. Based on the distribution of residuals in the p-p plot it was assumed that the assumption had been met. The assumption of homogeneity of variance of residuals was met as the residuals were the same across all values of X. There was a constant scatter of residuals among all values of X for this regression.

The multiple regression revealed that the predictors (demographics) could be used to predict Clarity in the alternative teacher evaluation tool. An ANOVA was completed to test the significance of R^2 within the model. It determined that demographics could be used to predict Clarity in the alternative teacher evaluation models. The ANOVA was significant, F (3,23) = 3.439, p = .034, two-tailed thus showing a linear relationship between at least one predictor and Clarity in the alternative teacher evaluation model.

Through the use of stepwise regression, the model indicated one predictor (F/R %) that significantly predicted Clarity within the alternative teacher evaluation tool t(3,23) = -3.042, p = .006. F/R had an unstandardized partial regression coefficient of -.017, which meant application scores were predicted to decrease by .017 units with a one unit increase in F/R. Details are depicted in Table 11.

Table 11

Clarity by F/R Percentages

Independent Variable	B	SE	β	t	Sig.
F/R %	-.017	.006	-.583	-3.042	.006

Note. Results are important.

The assumptions for this multiple regression were all met. The assumption of linearity was met in the regression with almost all of the residuals falling within the 95% confidence bands around zero (between +2 or -2) on the scatter plot of residuals. The assumption of no multicollinearity was met due to having tolerance levels for all of the predictors (school effectiveness standards) well above the .2 minimum that was needed for this assumption. While examining the assumptions for the residuals, the assumption of independence was met as there was no systematic pattern on the plot of residuals. Based on the distribution of residuals in the p-p plot it was assumed that the assumption had been met. The assumption of homogeneity of variance of residuals was met as the residuals were the same across all values of X. There was a constant scatter of residuals among all values of X for this regression.

The multiple correlation coefficient showed the correlation between the observed and predicted values of the criterion (Table 20). With a multiple correlation coefficient of .403, this was considered a moderate correlation between the predictors and criterion. The coefficient of multiple determination gave the proportion of the total variance in the criterion (Goals) that was shared with the linear combination of the predictor variables (Demographics). With a coefficient of multiple determination (R^2) value of .162, 16.2% of the variance in goals could be explained by the demographic scores. The adjusted R^2 gave an unbiased estimate of variance explained by

the predictors as it gave a more conservative estimate based on the number of predictors and sample size. R^2 was .162, but adjusted R^2 was .053 as the number of predictors and sample size was examined. The .109 difference between the R^2 and adjusted R^2 was the shrinkage in the model. The standard error of the estimate (.328) measured the amount of variability in the points around the regression line. It was the standard deviation of the data points as they were distributed around the regression line. This means this model had a standard deviation of .328 units of Goals scores regarding the distance of the residuals from the regression (prediction) line. Data related to Goals are located in Table 12.

Table 12

Goals by Demographics

Criterion Variable	R	R^2	Adjusted R	Shrinkage	Standard Error of the Estimate
Goals	.403	.162	.053	.109	.328

The multiple regression revealed that the criterion variable, Goals, cannot be predicted by the demographic variables. The ANOVA tests determined there was not a strong enough correlation between the predictors and the criterion variable with $F(2,23) = 1.487$, $p = .244$.

Multiple Regression 6

Can demographics predict the variable of Differentiation? The assumptions for this multiple regression were all met. The assumption of linearity was met in the regression with almost all of the residuals falling within the 95% confidence bands around zero (between +2 or -2) on the scatter plot of residuals. The assumption of no multicollinearity was met due to having tolerance levels for all of the predictors (school effectiveness standards) well above the .2

minimum that was needed for this assumption. While examining the assumptions for the residuals, the assumption of independence was met as there was no systematic pattern on the plot of residuals. Based on the distribution of residuals in the p-p plot it was assumed that the assumption had been met. The assumption of homogeneity of variance of residuals was met as the residuals were the same across all values of X. There was a constant scatter of residuals among all values of X for this regression.

The multiple correlation coefficient showed the correlation between the observed and predicted values of the criterion. With a multiple correlation coefficient of .417, this was considered a moderate correlation between the predictors and criterion. The coefficient of multiple determination gave the proportion of the total variance in the criterion (Differentiation) that was shared with the linear combination of the predictor variables (Demographics). With a coefficient of multiple determination (R^2) value of .173, 17.3% of the variance in differentiation could be explained by the demographic scores. The adjusted R^2 gave an unbiased estimate of variance explained by the predictors as it gave a more conservative estimate based on the number of predictors and sample size. R^2 was .173, but adjusted R^2 was .066 as the number of predictors and sample size was examined. The .107 difference between the R^2 and adjusted R^2 was the shrinkage in the model. The standard error of the estimate (.422) measured the amount of variability in the points around the regression line. It was the standard deviation of the data points as they were distributed around the regression line. This meant this model had a standard deviation of .422 units of Differentiation scores regarding the distance of the residuals from the regression (prediction) line. Differentiation data are presented in Table 13.

Table 13

Differentiation by Demographics

Criterion Variable	R	R^2	Adjusted R	Shrinkage	Standard Error of the Estimate
Differentiation	.417	.173	.066	.107	.422

The multiple regression revealed that the criterion variable, Differentiation, cannot be predicted by the demographic variables. The ANOVA tests determined there was not a strong enough correlation between the predictors and the criterion variable with F (2,23) = 1.609, p = .215.

Multiple Regression 7

Can demographics predict the variable of Instructional Repertoire? The assumptions for this multiple regression were all met. The assumption of linearity was met in the regression with almost all of the residuals falling within the 95% confidence bands around zero (between +2 or -2) on the scatter plot of residuals. The assumption of no multicollinearity was met due to having tolerance levels for all of the predictors (school effectiveness standards) well above the .2 minimum that was needed for this assumption. While examining the assumptions for the residuals, the assumption of independence was met as there was no systematic pattern on the plot of residuals. Based on the distribution of residuals in the p-p plot it was assumed that the assumption had been met. The assumption of homogeneity of variance of residuals was met as the residuals were the same across all values of X. There was a constant scatter of residuals among all values of X for this regression.

The multiple correlation coefficient showed the correlation between the observed and predicted values of the criterion. With a multiple correlation coefficient of .269, this was considered a moderate correlation between the predictors and criterion. The coefficient of multiple determination gave the proportion of the total variance in the criterion (Instructional Repertoire) that was shared with the linear combination of the predictor variables (Demographics). With a coefficient of multiple determination (R^2) value of .072, 7.20% of the variance in the Instructional Repertoire could be explained by the demographic scores. The adjusted R^2 gave an unbiased estimate of variance explained by the predictors as it gave a more conservative estimate based on the number of predictors and sample size. R^2 was .072, but adjusted R^2 was -.049 as the number of predictors and sample size was examined. The -.121 difference between the R^2 and adjusted R^2 was the shrinkage in the model. The standard error of the estimate (.723) measured the amount of variability in the points around the regression line. It was the standard deviation of the data points as they were distributed around the regression line. This meant this model had a standard deviation of .723 units of Instructional Repertoire scores regarding the distance of the residuals from the regression (prediction) line. Data for instructional repertoire are reflected in Table 14.

Table 14

Instructional Repertoire by Demographics

Criterion Variable	R	R^2	Adjusted R	Shrinkage	Standard Error of the Estimate
Differentiation	.269	.072	-.049	-.121	.723

The multiple regression revealed that the criterion variable, Instructional Repertoire, cannot be predicted by the demographic variables. The ANOVA tests determined there was not a strong enough correlation between the predictors and the criterion variable with F (2,23) = .597, p = .642.

Multiple Regression 8

Can demographics predict the variable of Cooperative Grouping? The assumptions for this multiple regression were all met. The assumption of linearity was met in the regression with almost all of the residuals falling within the 95% confidence bands around zero (between +2 or -2) on the scatter plot of residuals. The assumption of no multicollinearity was met due to having tolerance levels for all of the predictors (school effectiveness standards) well above the .2 minimum that was needed for this assumption. While examining the assumptions for the residuals, the assumption of independence was met as there was no systematic pattern on the plot of residuals. Based on the distribution of residuals in the p-p plot it was assumed that the assumption had been met. The assumption of homogeneity of variance of residuals was met as the residuals were the same across all values of X. There was a constant scatter of residuals among all values of X for this regression.

The multiple correlation coefficient showed the correlation between the observed and predicted values of the criterion. With a multiple correlation coefficient of .400, this was considered a moderate correlation between the predictors and criterion. The coefficient of multiple determination gave the proportion of the total variance in the criterion (Cooperative Grouping) that was shared with the linear combination of the predictor variables (Demographics). With a coefficient of multiple determination (R^2) value of .400, 40.0% of the variance in the cooperative grouping could be explained by the demographic scores. The

adjusted R^2 gave an unbiased estimate of variance explained by predictors as it gave a more conservative estimate based on the number of predictors and sample size. R^2 was .160, but adjusted R^2 was .050 as the number of predictors and sample size was examined. The .110 difference between the R^2 and adjusted R^2 was the shrinkage in the model. The standard error of the estimate (.798) measured the amount of variability in the points around the regression line. It was the standard deviation of the data points as they were distributed around the regression line. This meant this model had a standard deviation of .798 units of Cooperative Grouping scores regarding the distance of the residuals from the regression (prediction) line. This information is presented in Table 15.

Table 15

Cooperative Grouping by Demographics

Criterion Variable	R	R^2	Adjusted R	Shrinkage	Standard Error of the Estimate
Cooperative Grouping	.400	.160	.050	.110	.798

The multiple regression revealed that the criterion variable, Cooperative Grouping, cannot be predicted by the demographic variables. The ANOVA tests determined there was not a strong enough correlation between the predictors and the criterion variable with $F (2,23) = 1.456, p = .252$.

Multiple Regression 9

Can demographics predict the variable of Summarizing Notes? The assumptions for this multiple regression were all met. The assumption of linearity was met in the regression with almost all of the residuals falling within the 95% confidence bands around zero (between +2 or -

2) on the scatter plot of residuals. The assumption of no multicolinearity was met due to having

tolerance levels for all of the predictors (school effectiveness standards) well above the .2

minimum that was needed for this assumption. While examining the assumptions for the

residuals, the assumption of independence was met as there was no systematic pattern on the plot

of residuals. Based on the distribution of residuals in the p-p plot it was assumed that the

assumption had been met. The assumption of homogeneity of variance of residuals was met as

the residuals were the same across all values of X. There was a constant scatter of residuals

among all values of X for this regression.

The multiple correlation coefficient showed the correlation between the observed and

predicted values of the criterion. With a multiple correlation coefficient of .277, this was

considered a moderate correlation between the predictors and criterion. The coefficient of

multiple determination gave the proportion of the total variance in the criterion (Summarizing

Notes) that was shared with the linear combination of the predictor variables (Demographics).

With a coefficient of multiple determination (R^2) value of .277, 27.7% of the variance in the

Summarizing Notes could be explained by the demographic scores. The adjusted R^2 gave an

unbiased estimate of variance explained by the predictors as it gave a more conservative estimate

based on the number of predictors and sample size. R^2 was .077, but adjusted R^2 was -.044 as the

number of predictors and sample size were examined. The -.121 difference between the R^2 and

adjusted R^2 was the shrinkage in the model. The standard error of the estimate (.273) measured

the amount of variability in the points around the regression line. It was the standard deviation

of the data points as they were distributed around the regression line. This meant this model had

a standard deviation of .273 units of Summarizing Notes scores regarding the distance of the

residuals from the regression (prediction) line. These data are reflected in Table 16.

Table 16

Summarizing Notes by Demographics

Criterion Variable	R	R^2	Adjusted R	Shrinkage	Standard Error of the Estimate
Cooperative Grouping	.277	.077	-.044	-.121	.273

The multiple regression revealed that the criterion variable, Summarizing Notes, cannot be predicted by the demographic variables. The ANOVA tests determined there was not a strong enough correlation between the predictors and the criterion variable with F (2,23) = .637, p = .599.

Multiple Regression 10

Can demographics predict the variables of Homework/Feedback? The assumptions for this multiple regression were all met. The assumption of linearity was met in the regression with almost all of the residuals falling within the 95% confidence bands around zero (between +2 or -2) on the scatter plot of residuals. The assumption of no multicollinearity was met due to having tolerance levels for all of the predictors (school effectiveness standards) well above the .2 minimum that was needed for this assumption. While examining the assumptions for the residuals, the assumption of independence was met as there was no systematic pattern on the plot of residuals. Based on the distribution of residuals in the p-p plot it was assumed that the assumption had been met. The assumption of homogeneity of variance of residuals was met as the residuals were the same across all values of X. There was a constant scatter of residuals among all values of X for this regression.

The multiple regression revealed that the predictors (demographics) could be used to predict Homework/Feedback in the alternative teacher evaluation tool. An ANOVA was completed to test the significance of R^2 within the model. It determined that demographics could be used to predict Homework/Feedback in the alternative teacher evaluation models (Table 30). The ANOVA was significant, $F(3,23) = 3.876$, $p = .022$, two-tailed thus showing a linear relationship between at least one predictor and Homework/Feedback in the alternative teacher evaluation model.

Through the use of stepwise regression, the model indicated one predictor (F/R %) that significantly predicted Homework/Feedback within the alternative teacher evaluation tool $t(3,23) = 2.215$, $p = .037$. F/R had an unstandardized partial regression coefficient of -.012, which meant application scores were predicted to decrease by .012 units with a one unit increase in F/R. Those details appear in Table 17.

Table 17

Homework/Feedback by F/R Percentages

Independent Variable	B	SE	β	t	Sig.
F/R %	-.012	.006	.416	2.215	.037

Note. Results are important.

Multiple Regression 11

Can demographics predict the variable of Effort? The assumptions for this multiple regression were all met. The assumption of linearity was met in the regression with almost all of the residuals falling within the 95% confidence bands around zero (between +2 or -2) on the scatter plot of residuals. The assumption of no multicollinearity was met due to having tolerance

levels for all of the predictors (school effectiveness standards) well above the .2 minimum that was needed for this assumption. While examining the assumptions for the residuals, the assumption of independence was met as there was no systematic pattern on the plot of residuals. Based on the distribution of residuals in the p-p plot it was assumed that the assumption had been met. The assumption of homogeneity of variance of residuals was met as the residuals were the same across all values of X. There was a constant scatter of residuals among all values of X for this regression.

The multiple correlation coefficient showed the correlation between the observed and predicted values of the criterion. With a multiple correlation coefficient of .438, this was considered a moderate correlation between the predictors and criterion. The coefficient of multiple determination gave the proportion of the total variance in the criterion (effort) that was shared with the linear combination of the predictor variables (Demographics). With a coefficient of multiple determination (R^2) value of .191, 19.1% of the variance in the effort could be explained by the demographic scores. The adjusted R^2 gave an unbiased estimate of variance explained by the predictors as it gave a more conservative estimate based on the number of predictors and sample size. R^2 was .191, but adjusted R^2 was .086 as the number of predictors and subjects were examined. The .105 difference between the R^2 and adjusted R^2 was the shrinkage in the model. The standard error of the estimate (.346) measured the amount of variability in the points around the regression line. It was the standard deviation of the data points as they were distributed around the regression line. This meant this model had a standard deviation of .346 units of Effort scores regarding the distance of the residuals from the regression (prediction) line. These data are reflected in Table 32.

Table 18

Effort by Demographics

Criterion Variable	R	R^2	Adjusted R	Shrinkage	Standard Error of the Estimate
Effort	.438	.191	.086	.105	.346

The multiple regression revealed that the criterion variable, Effort, cannot be predicted by the demographic variables. The ANOVA tests determined there was not a strong enough correlation between the predictors and the criterion variable with F (2,23) = 1.816, p = .172.

Summary

The tables and narratives depict the data from each of the 12 template variables. Each variable was tested for significance and labeled appropriately. I discovered that four of the variables showed significance for at least one of the demographic categories. The variables were: Applications, Connections/Questioning, Clarity, and Homework/Feedback. This meant for each change in at least one of the demographics there was an equal reaction in the identified variable. Some of the variables reacted negatively while others reacted positively. Knowing this information could lead to the improvement of educational instruction for schools in these demographic categories.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, RESULTS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This chapter is divided into five sections: summary, results, discussion, conclusions, and recommendations for further research. The summary highlights the purpose of the study: is there a way of predicting effective teacher evaluation tools based on the demographic categories of student population, geographic setting, and poverty levels based on the percentage of free and reduced meal recipients in the district? These results provided a summary of the data that were reported in Chapter 4.

Chapter 5 interprets the findings and results while linking them to the research-based template that was derived from the work of Danielson (2007, Marshall (2005), and Marzano (2004). The summary looked for similarities between the template elements that explained the results. The conclusion provides insight into what was discovered from the schools using alternative evaluation tools and their predictive variables to assist school administrators in creating evaluation tools to not only meet state guidelines but also serve their student population better. This segment of Chapter 5 provides suggestions for additional research topics identified during the course of the study.

Summary

The purpose of this research was to determine if demographics influence the evaluation tools being used in Indiana.

At the beginning of this research, there was not a uniform evaluation tool that could be determined to meet the needs of the educational process or measure teaching ability by the teacher. The state of Indiana piloted a teacher evaluation tool called RISE. The advent of this project greatly reduced the use of alternative teacher evaluation instruments. Many of the public and parochial school districts opted to wait for the results of the state initiative and adopt RISE as their evaluation tool of choice.

A total of 270 Indiana school districts were invited to participate in this study. Ninety districts responded to the survey with a large majority of them identifying that they were waiting to adopt the Indiana RISE teacher evaluation model for their districts. Twenty-seven district administrators indicated they were not going to adopt Indiana RISE and that they were either using another purchased evaluation tool such as TAP, creating their own district evaluation tools, or modifying the Indiana RISE model with their own preferences and beliefs.

<div align="center">Results</div>

The statistical findings of this research were presented in Chapter 4. This research centered around one central question: In Indiana school districts using alternative teacher evaluation models, is there a relationship between a research-based teacher evaluation tool and the school district demographics? Many of the research elements from the comparison template did not have a significant relationship to the demographics. But there were four of the elements that were directly tied to the increase or decrease of the demographic. The four template elements that were related are Applications, Connections/Questions, Clarity, and Homework/Feedback.

Application referred to how the students related classroom material and conversations to life situations. Students are responsible for the implementation and output of the activity. The

ANOVA output indicated that the significant value was .013, R = .607. The R value illustrated the relationship between predictors (demographics) and the criterion variable (template elements). This indicated that at least one of the demographics had a significant relationship to the template element. The only element that had a significant value in range was F/R percentage with a significant value of .018. What this indicates is that F/R% serves as a significant predictor of Applications. Basically, for every one increase in F/R%, the predicted value of Applications will increase by .024.

Connections/Questions were defined by teachers' questions, if they were of high quality with adequate time for students to respond. Students formulated many questions, initiated topics, and made unsolicited contributions. The ANOVA output indicated that the significance value was .035, R = .554. This indicated that at least one of the demographics had a significant relationship with the template element. The only demographic that had a significant value in this range was F/R% with a significant value of .009. Unlike Applications, the Connections/Questions significant value was related negatively at -.032. What this indicates is that F/R% served as a significant predictor of Connections/Questions. Basically, for every one increase in F/R%, the predicted value of Connections/Questions will decrease by .032.

Clarity was defined by teachers' directions and procedures, if those were clear to students, and anticipated possible student misunderstandings. The ANOVA output indicated that the significance value was .034, R = .556. This indicated that at least one of the demographics had a significant relationship with the template element. The only demographic that had a significant value in this range was F/R% with a value of .006. Like Connections/Questions, the Clarity significance value was related negatively at -.017. What this indicated was that F/R%

served as a significant predictor of clarity. Basically, for every one increase in F/R%, the predicted value of Connections/Questions will decrease by .017.

The final element that showed a significant relation to demographics was Homework/Feedback. Teachers' feedback to students was timely and of consistently high quality, and students made use of the feedback in their learning. The ANOVA output indicated that the significance value was .022, $R = .579$. This indicated that at least one of the demographics had a significant relationship to the template element. The only element that had a significance value in range was F/R% with a significant value of .037. What this indicated was that F/R% served as a significant predictor of Homework/Feedback. Basically, for every one increase in F/R%, the predicted value of Homework/Feedback will decrease by .012.

Discussion

When reviewing the output, it was acknowledged that many of the criterion variables were not related significantly to the predictors. The predictor that had the most relationship to the criterion variables was F/R%. Based on this research the predictor of F/R merits attention. Tables 10, 11, 17 illustrated that information.

Three of the dependent variables were found to have negative influences in the relationship with the predictor (F/R%). When the dependent variable increased the predictor had a negative influence. This indicates that the higher F/R% is, the impact of instructional Clarity, classroom Connections/Questions, and Homework/Feedback does not indicate a positive impact on the teacher evaluation tool.

It was also discovered that one of the criterion variables showed a positive relationship with an increase in the F/R%. Application reacted to the positive when there was an increase in

the F/R%. It is accurate to state that with the increase of F/R%, Application is more evident with positive impact on the teacher evaluation tool.

This research had 12 criterion variables that the predictors were compared with. Of the criterion variables, 33% showed significance to the research when compared to at least one of the predictors.

<div align="center">Conclusions</div>

As F/R% increased in the school district, the frequency of Application on alternative evaluation tools increased. Why do schools serving higher amounts of poverty students care more about Application on their evaluation tools? One at-risk strategy found throughout the research dealt with making connections between the content and the real-world. Marzano et al. (2001) stated that teachers should communicate the purpose and comment. As a school district's at-risk population increases, it is likely that F/R% has more of an importance because districts are asking teachers to connect the learning to get students who might otherwise not be motivated to learn.

On the other side, under Connections/Questions there was a negative relationship when looking at the criterion variable of F/R%. Why is it that when there is an increase in Connections/Questions that there is a decrease in the F/R%? One possible answer is that schools that choose to use alternative evaluations often will be doing so with a great deal of teacher input. It is evident throughout the research that school districts' teachers serving higher percentages of free and reduced students often fail to ask higher order questions. Teachers in these schools may allow students to opt-out of questions and save higher-order thinking questions for students they know are more likely to answer correctly. Questions may not be important from the teacher side because it may require them to step outside their comfort zones

and understand their communities. It is important for schools to place an emphasis on appropriate questioning or students will not be able to maximize their educational experience.

I believe that Clarity should be one of the primary predictors for evaluation tools which in turn supports the learning environment with a foundation of understanding for the students. This research suggests differently. Clarity is negatively related to F/R%. Buildings serving higher percentages of free and reduced lunch students have a greater disparity of diversity within them. This often means it is difficult for teachers to ensure understanding for all within the class. This negative relationship could be attributed to the teacher's inability to make connections with each learner, which leads to Clarity within the classroom. Within each heterogeneous classroom, there is an added need to differentiate in order to achieve Clarity for the students. I pointed out that the dependent variable, Differentiation, did not have a significance value of merit.

The final variable with a significant value to the predictors was Homework/Feedback. Research stipulated the importance of quality feedback in driving student achievement. At-risk students greatly benefit from quality feedback that provides advice on how to improve in the learning process. Marzano (2004) stated that for feedback to impact student achievement, it must be timely and specific. Students must receive feedback throughout the process and it must be specific to the content being learned. Researchers have discussed the nature of homework and, if done properly and in the proper volume per age group, it is an extension of the classroom and is a viable tool for increased repetition and exposure to a topic. This allows students the time needed to shape and adapt the skill so they can use it effectively (Marzano, 2004).

Recommendations for Further Research

I discovered through this study that the one positively influenced variable is Application. The only predictor that impacts this area is F/R%. It would appear that F/R% may have a greater

impact than the other predictors. Continuing research more specifically aligned with free and reduced percentages could generate data that may lead to instructional breakthroughs for the classroom teacher. An additional area that would be recommended for further study would be the remaining dependent variables that showed to have little significance in the research. Those variables are linked strongly with the work of Danielson (2007), Marshall (2005), and Marzano (2004). Why was there little significance or in some cases negative significance when viewed with the predictors? It would be helpful to include follow-up study to address these same questions with the RISE schools after a year of student testing results are available. This study could continue for many years to understand where the learning and student results plateau.

The research-based comparison template was founded from the research of Danielson (2007), Marshall (2005, and Marzano (2004), all leading industry analysts in the field of educational evaluation. The 12 most common instructional elements from the three researchers were selected and used to create the template for this research. In the process of alternative evaluation/template comparison, the frequency in which the 12 template items were identified for each alternative evaluation tool was reviewed and documented.

The data were used to develop inferential information that was reviewed through the three demographic areas. The demographic areas were population, geographic setting, and poverty. Each of the alternative evaluation elements were scored, then reviewed and compared by each demographic category individually to determine if there was a demographic predictive quality based on the quantity of template scores. Twelve multiple regression tests were run, one with each template element, and the results were reviewed for significance for the demographic predictive quality of the sample.

The outcome was to review the alternative evaluation tools from the sample and determine if there were predictive qualities in the demographic areas chosen. The predictive qualities will allow educators to direct the efforts of those school leaders who are in districts that were affected. Educators can concentrate their efforts on improving their evaluation tools so that teachers will have the data to make informed decisions to improve their instruction which is the goal to making all classrooms optimal learning environments. The teacher is the most important instructional variable in the classroom.

REFERENCES

Bain, H. P., & Jacobs, R. (1990). *The case for smaller classes and better teachers.* Alexandria,

VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals. (ERIC Document No.

ED322632)

Barker, J. (Producer). (1992). *The business of paradigms.* [videotape]. Available from Chart

House International Learning Corporation.

Barrett, J. (1986). *The evaluation of teachers.* (ERIC Digest 12 [ED278657 comment]).

Retrieved from www.ericdigests.org/pre-925/evaluation.htm

Bennett, T. (2010, October). *Indiana evaluation process.* Symposium conducted at the Indiana

Association of Public School Superintendents, Indianapolis, IN.

Brooks, J. G., & Brooks, M. G. (1993). *In search of understanding: The case of constructivist

classrooms*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Brophy, J., & Good, T. L. (1986). *Teacher behavior and student achievement.* In M. C. Whitrock

(Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 328-371). New York, NY:

Macmillan.

Bruce, M. (2010, August 29). *Top education officials spar over teacher reform, student success.*

[ABC News comment]. Retrieved from http://www.abcnews.go.com/ThisWeek/top-

education-officials-spar-teacher-reform-student-success

Bushaw, W. J., & Lopez, S. J. (2010). A time for change. *Phi Delta Kappan, 92*(1), 9-26.

Retrieved from http://www.kappanmagazine.org

Clare, L. (2000). *Using teachers' assignments as an indicator of classroom practice* (CSE

    Technical Report). Los Angeles, CA: Center for Research and Evaluation, Standards and

    Student Testing.

Cotton, K. (2000). *The schooling practices that matter most*. Portland, OR and Alexandria, VA:

    Northwest Regional Laboratory and Association for Supervision and Curriculum

    Development.

Daggett, W. R. (2010). Preparing U.S. schools for the 21st century. *International Center for

    Leadership in Education*. Retrieved from http://www.LeaderEd.com

Danielson, C. (1996). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching*. Alexandria,

    VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Danielson, C. (2007). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching* (2nd ed.).

    Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Danielson, C., & McGreal, T. L. (2000). *Teacher evaluation to enhance professional practice*.

    Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Donaldson, M. L. (2010). No more valentines. *Educational Leadership, 67*(8), 54-58.

DuFour, R., & Eaker, R. (1998). *Professional learning communities at work: Best practices for

    enhancing student achievement*. Bloomington, IN: National Educational Service.

Dwyer, C. A. (1994). *Development of the knowledge base for the Praxis III: Classroom

    performance assessments assessment criteria*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing

    Service.

Ellett, C. (1990). *A new generation of classroom based assessments of teaching and learning:

    Concepts, issues and controversies from pilots of the Louisiana STAR*. Baton Rouge, LA:

    College of Education, Louisiana State University.

Flanders, N. (1970). *Analyzing teacher behavior*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Forte, L. (2010). *Teacher evaluation program shows promising results.* Retrieved from
www.catalyst-chicago.org/notebook/index.php/entry/721/teacher_evaluation_prog

Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. New York, NY: Jossey-Bass.

Gabriel, J. G. (2005). *How to thrive as a teacher leader*. Alexandria, VA: Association for
Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Gerlic, I., & Jausovec, N. (1999). Differences in cognitive processes observed with EEG.
Educational Technology Research and Development, *36*(1), 5-13.

Gordon, T., & Burch, N. (2003). *T.E.T., teacher effectiveness training: The program proven to
help teachers bring out the best in students of all ages* (1st ed.). New York, NY: Three
Rivers Press.

Halik, J., Kern, M., & Peterson, R. (2010, September). *Principals evaluating teachers'
performance: A key ingredient to student learning*. Symposium conducted at the
ISBA/IAPSS Fall Conference, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Hanushek, E., Kain, J., & Rivkin, S. (1998). *Teachers, schools, and academic achievement.*
[Working Paper Series]. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
Retrieved from http://www.cgp.upenn.edu/pdf/Hanushek_NBER.PDF

Hefling, K. (2011, September 23). Obama: Education reform aimed at raising standards.
[Electronic mailing list message]. Retrieved from http://news.yahoo.com/obama-
education-reform-aimed-raising-standards

Indiana Department of Education. (2011). *Multiple measures memo*. Retrieved from
www.doe.in.gov

Iwanicki, E. F. (2001). Focusing teacher evaluation on student learning. *Educational Leadership, 58,* 57-59. Retrieved from www.ascd.org

Jackson, A. W., & Davis, G. A. (2000). *Turning points 2000: Educating adolescents in the 21st century*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Johnson, B. L. (1997). An organizational analysis of multiple perspectives of effective teaching: Implications for teacher evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, *11*(1), 69-87. (EJ548365)

Jones, J. (1992). *Praxis III teacher assessment criteria research base*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Kohn, A. (1998). *What to look for in a classroom: And other essays*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Marshall, K. (2005). It's time to rethink teacher supervision and evaluation. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *86,* 727-735.

Marzano, R. (2004). *Building background knowledge for academic achievement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Marzano, R. J., Norford, J. S., Paynter, D. E., Pickering, D. J., & Gaddy, B. B. (2001). *A handbook for classroom instruction that works*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Marzano, R. J., & Waters, T. (2009). *District leadership that works: Striking the right balance*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

McCombs, B. (1992). *Learner-centered psychological principles: Guidelines for school redesign and reform*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Mendro, R. L. (1998). Student achievement and school and teacher accountability. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 12,* 257-267. Retrieved from www.ascd.org

Mitchell, N. (2009, July 21). *Numbers show teachers evaluation system broken.* [Education News Colorado comment]. Retrieved from www.ednewscolorado.org/ 2009/07/21/numbers-show-teacher-evaluation-system-broken

Moore, R. A. (2004). *Classroom research for teachers: A practical guide*. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.

National Board of Professional Teaching Standards. (2004). *The five core propositions*. Retrieved from http://www.nbpts.org/the_standards/the_five_core_propositio

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 20 U.S.C. § 6319 *et seq.* (2010).

Office of the White House Press Secretary. (2011, September 23). *Obama administration sets high bar for flexibility from no child left behind in order to advance equity and support reform.* Retrieved from http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2011/09/23/obama-administration-sets-high-bar-flexibility-no-child-left-behind-orde

Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy act. *Review of Educational Research, 62,* 307-332.

Pink, D. (2009). *Drive.* New York, NY: Penguin Group.

Porter, A. C., & Brophy, J. (1988). Synthesis of research on good teaching: Insights from the work of the institute for research on teaching. *Educational Leadership*, *45*(8), 74-85.

Rosenshine, B. (1986). Synthesis of research on explicit teaching. *Education Leadership*, *43*(7), 60-69.

Rutherford, P. (2005). *Leading the learning: A field guide for supervision and evaluation*. Alexandria, VA: Just ASK Publications.

Scherer, M. (2010). What Newsweek gets wrong: The key to changing the teaching profession. *Educational Leadership, 67*(8), 5. Retrieved from http://m.ascd.org/ EL/Article/c30344a3fcc18120VgnVCM100000250210acRCRD

Schlechty, P. C. (2001). *Inventing better schools: An action plan for educational reform*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schlegel, M. (2011, October 11). *Understanding the Indiana growth model*. Symposium conducted at the West Central Indiana Education Center, Lafayette, IN.

Schmoker, M. (1999). *Results: The key to continuous school improvement* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Schunk, D. F. (1991). Self-efficacy and academic motivation. *Educational Psychologist, 26,* 207-231.

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

Skowrow, J. (2001). *Powerful lesson planning models: The art of 1,000 decisions*. Arlington Heights, IL: Skylight Training and Publishing.

Stronge, J. H. (2007). *Qualities of effective teachers* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Sykes, G., & Bird, T. (1992). Teacher education and the case idea. *Review of Research in Education, 18,* 457-521.

The New Teacher Project. (2009). *Improving human capital practices in Indianapolis Public Schools*. Retrieved from http://tntp.org/assets/documents/TNTP_ Indianapolis_ExecSum_July09.pdf

Thompson, D. (2011, May). *Peru academic monitoring*. Peru AMP workshop, Veedersburg, IN.

Tomlinson, C. A. (1999). *The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Torp, L., & Sage, S. (1998). *Problems as possibilities: Problem-based learning for K-16 education* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Tucker, P. D., & Stronge, J. H. (2005). *Linking teacher evaluation and student learning.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Wang, M. C., Haertel, G. D., & Walberg, H. J. (1993/94). What helps students learn? *Educational Leadership, 51*(4), 74-79.

Weisberg, D., Sexton, S., Mulhern, J., & Keeling, D. (2009). *The widget effect: Our national failure to acknowledge and act on differences in teacher effectiveness.* Brooklyn, NY: The New Teacher Project. Retrieved from http://widgeteffect.org/downloads/The WidgetEffect.pdf

Wharton-McDonald, R., Pressley, M., & Hampston, J. (1998). Literacy instruction in nine first-grade classrooms: Teacher characteristics and student achievement. *The Elementary Journal, 99*(2), 101-128.

Whitaker, T. (2004). *What great teachers do differently: Fourteen things that matter most.* Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (1998). *Understanding by design.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Wormelli, R. (2003). *Day one & beyond: Practical matters for new middle-level teachers.* Portland, ME: Stenhouse Publishers and Westerville, OH: National Middle School Association.

Zahorik, J., Halbach, A., Ehrle, K., & Molnar, A. (2003). Teaching practices for smaller classes.

    Educational Leadership, *61*(1), 75-77.

APPENDIX A: RISE TEMPLATE: INSTRUCTIONS

DOMAIN 2: EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTION

Teachers facilitate student academic practice so that all students are participating and have the opportunity to gain mastery of the objectives in a classroom environment that fosters a climate of urgency and expectation around achievement, excellence and respect.

Competency	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
Competency 2.1:	Teacher is highly effective at developing student understanding and mastery of lesson objectives	Teacher is effective at developing student understanding and mastery of lesson objectives	Teacher needs improvement at developing student understanding and mastery of lesson objectives	Teacher is ineffective at developing student understanding and mastery of lesson objectives
Develop student understanding and mastery of lesson objectives	*For Level 4, much of the Level 3 evidence is observed during the year, as well as some of the following:* - Students can explain what they are learning and why it is important, beyond repeating the stated objective	- Lesson objective is specific, measurable, and aligned to standards. It conveys what students are learning and what they will be able to do by the end of the lesson	- Lesson objective conveys what students are learning and what they will be able to do by the end of the lesson, but may not be aligned to standards or measurable	- Lesson objective is missing more than one component. It may not be clear about what students are learning or will be able to do by the end of the lesson.
	- Teacher effectively engages prior knowledge of students in connecting to lesson. Students demonstrate through work or comments that they understand this connection	- Objective is written in a student-friendly manner and/or explained to students in easy-to-understand terms - Importance of the objective is explained so that students understand why they are learning what they are learning	- Objective is stated, but not in a student-friendly manner that leads to understanding - Teacher attempts explanation of importance of objective, but students fail to understand	- There may not be a clear connection between the objective and lesson, or teacher may fail to make this connection for students. - Teacher may fail to discuss importance of objective or there may not be a clear understanding amongst students as to why the objective is important.
		- Lesson builds on students' prior knowledge of key concepts and skills and makes this connection evident to students	- Lesson generally does not build on prior knowledge of students or students fail to make this connection	- There may be no effort to connect objective to prior knowledge of students
		- Lesson is well-organized to move students towards mastery of the objective	- Organization of the lesson may not always be connected to mastery of the objective	- Lesson is disorganized and does not lead to mastery of objective.

RISE
Evaluation and
Development System

Competency	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
Competency 2.2: Demonstrate and Clearly Communicate Content Knowledge to Students	Teacher is highly effective at demonstrating and clearly communicating content knowledge to students	Teacher is effective at demonstrating and clearly communicating content knowledge to students	Teacher needs improvement at demonstrating and clearly communicating content knowledge to students	Teacher is ineffective at demonstrating and clearly communicating content knowledge to students
	For Level 4, much of the Level 3 evidence is observed during the year, as well as some of the following:	- Teacher demonstrates content knowledge and delivers content that is factually correct	-Teacher delivers content that is factually correct	- Teacher may deliver content that is factually incorrect
	- Teacher fully explains concepts in as direct and efficient a manner as possible, while still achieving student understanding	- Content is clear, concise and well-organized	- Content occasionally lacks clarity and is not as well organized as it could be	- Explanations may be unclear or incoherent and fail to build student understanding of key concepts
	- Teacher effectively connects content to other content areas, students' experiences and interests, or current events in order to make content relevant and build interest	- Teacher restates and rephrases instruction in multiple ways to increase understanding	- Teacher may fail to restate or rephrase instruction in multiple ways to increase understanding	- Teacher continues with planned instruction, even when it is obvious that students are not understanding content
	- Explanations spark student excitement and interest in the content	- Teacher emphasizes key points or main ideas in content	- Teacher does not adequately emphasize main ideas, and students are sometimes confused about key takeaways	- Teacher does not emphasize main ideas, and students are often confused about content
	- Students participate in each others' learning of content through collaboration during the lesson	- Teacher uses developmentally appropriate language and explanations	- Explanations sometimes lack developmentally appropriate language	- Teacher fails to use developmentally appropriate language
	- Students ask higher-order questions and make connections independently, demonstrating that they understand the content at a higher level	- Teacher implements relevant instructional strategies learned via professional development	- Teacher does not always implement new and improved instructional strategies learned via professional development	- Teacher does not implement new and improved instructional strategies learned via professional development

Competency	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
Competency 2.3:	Teacher is highly effective at engaging students in academic content	Teacher is effective at engaging students in academic content	Teacher needs improvement at engaging students in academic content	Teacher is ineffective at engaging students in academic content
Engage students in academic content	*For Level 4, much of the Level 3 evidence is observed during the year, as well as some of the following:*	-3/4 or more of students are actively engaged in content at all times and not off-task	- Fewer than 3/4 of students are engaged in content and many are off-task	- Fewer than 1/2 of students are engaged in content and many are off-task
	- Teacher provides ways to engage with content that significantly promotes student mastery of the objective	- Teacher provides multiple ways, as appropriate, of engaging with content, all aligned to the lesson objective	- Teacher may provide multiple ways of engaging students, but perhaps not aligned to lesson objective or mastery of content	- Teacher may only provide one way of engaging with content OR teacher may provide multiple ways of engaging students that are not aligned to the lesson objective or mastery of content
	- Teacher provides differentiated ways of engaging with content specific to individual student needs	- Ways of engaging with content reflect different learning modalities or intelligences	- Teacher may miss opportunities to provide ways of differentiating content for student engagement	- Teacher does not differentiate instruction to target different learning modalities
	- The lesson progresses at an appropriate pace so that students are never disengaged, and students who finish early have something else meaningful to do	- Teacher adjusts lesson accordingly to accommodate for student prerequisite skills and knowledge so that all students are engaged	- Some students may not have the prerequisite skills necessary to fully engage in content and teacher's attempt to modify instruction for these students is limited or not always effective	- Most students do not have the prerequisite skills necessary to fully engage in content and teacher makes no effort to adjust instruction for these students
	- Teacher effectively integrates technology as a tool to engage students in academic content	- ELL and IEP students have the appropriate accommodations to be engaged in content	- ELL and IEP students are sometimes given appropriate accommodations to be engaged in content	- ELL and IEP students are not provided with the necessary accommodations to engage in content
		- Students work hard and are deeply active rather than passive/receptive (See Notes below for specific evidence of engagement)	- Students may appear to actively listen, but when it comes time for participation are disinterested in engaging	- Students do not actively listen and are overtly disinterested in engaging.

RISE
Evaluation and
Development System

Competency	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
Competency 2.4: **Check for Understanding**	Teacher is highly effective at checking for understanding	Teacher is effective at checking for understanding	Teacher needs improvement at checking for understanding	Teacher is ineffective at checking for understanding
	For Level 4, much of the Level 3 evidence is observed during the year, as well as some of the following:	- Teacher checks for understanding at almost all key moments (when checking is necessary to inform instruction going forward)	- Teacher sometimes checks for understanding of content, but misses several key moments	- Teacher rarely or never checks for understanding of content, or misses nearly all key moments
	- Teacher checks for understanding at higher levels by asking pertinent, scaffold questions that push thinking; accepts only high quality student responses (those that reveal understanding or lack thereof)	- Teacher uses a variety of methods to check for understanding that are successful in capturing an accurate "pulse" of the class's understanding	- Teacher may use more than one type of check for understanding, but is often unsuccessful in capturing an accurate "pulse" of the class's understanding	-Teacher does not check for understanding, or uses only one ineffective method repetitively to do so, thus rarely capturing an accurate "pulse" of the class's understanding
		- Teacher uses wait time effectively both after posing a question and before helping students think through a response	- Teacher may not provide enough wait time after posing a question for students to think and respond before helping with an answer or moving forward with content	- Teacher frequently moves on with content before students have a chance to respond to questions or frequently gives students the answer rather than helping them think through the answer.
	- Teacher uses open-ended questions to surface common misunderstandings and assess student mastery of material at a range of both lower and higher-order thinking	- Teacher doesn't allow students to "opt-out" of checks for understanding and cycles back to these students	- Teacher sometimes allows students to "opt-out" of checks for understanding without cycling back to these students	- Teacher frequently allows students to "opt-out" of checks for understanding and does not cycle back to these students
		- Teacher systematically assesses every student's mastery of the objective(s) at the end of each lesson through formal or informal assessments (see note for examples)	- Teacher may occasionally assess student mastery at the end of the lesson through formal or informal assessments.	- Teacher rarely or never assesses for mastery at the end of the lesson

Notes:

1. Examples of times when checking for understanding may be useful are: before moving on to the next step of the lesson, or partway through independent practice.

2. Examples of how the teacher may assess student understanding and mastery of objectives:

• Checks for Understanding: thumbs up/down, cold-calling

• Do Nows, Turn and Talk/ Pair Share, Guided or Independent Practice, Exit Slips

If you have received this document from any source other than the RISE website, it may have been altered from its original version. For the official, and most up-to-date version, please visit www.riseindiana.org

Competency	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
Competency 2.5: **Modify Instruction As Needed**	Teacher is highly effective at modifying instruction as needed	Teacher is effective at modifying instruction as needed	Teacher needs improvement at modifying instruction as needed	Teacher is ineffective at modifying instruction as needed
	For Level 4, much of the Level 3 evidence is observed during the year, as well as some of the following: - Teacher anticipates student misunderstandings and preemptively addresses them - Teacher is able to modify instruction to respond to misunderstandings without taking away from the flow of the lesson or losing engagement	- Teacher makes adjustments to instruction based on checks for understanding that lead to increased understanding for most students - Teacher responds to misunderstandings with effective scaffolding techniques - Teacher doesn't give up, but continues to try to address misunderstanding with different techniques if the first try is not successful	- Teacher may attempt to make adjustments to instruction based on checks for understanding, but these attempts may be misguided and may not increase understanding for all students - Teacher may primarily respond to misunderstandings by using teacher-driven scaffolding techniques (for example, re-explaining a concept), when student-driven techniques could have been more effective - Teacher may persist in using a particular technique for responding to a misunderstanding, even when it is not succeeding	- Teacher rarely or never attempts to adjust instruction based on checks for understanding, and any attempts at doing so frequently fail to increase understanding for students - Teacher only responds to misunderstandings by using teacher-driven scaffolding techniques - Teacher repeatedly uses the same technique to respond to misunderstandings, even when it is not succeeding

Notes:

1. In order to be effective at this competency, a teacher must have at least scored a 3 on competency 2.4 - in order to modify instruction as needed, one must first know how to check for understanding.

2. A teacher can respond to misunderstandings using "scaffolding" techniques such as: activating background knowledge, asking leading questions, breaking the task into small parts, using mnemonic devices or analogies, using manipulatives or hands-on models, using "think alouds", providing visual cues, etc.

Competency	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
Competency 2.6: **Develop Higher Level of Understanding through Rigorous Instruction and Work**	Teacher is highly effective at developing a higher level of understanding through rigorous instruction and work	Teacher is effective at developing a higher level of understanding through rigorous instruction and work	Teacher needs improvement at developing a higher level of understanding through rigorous instruction and work	Teacher is ineffective at developing a higher level of understanding through rigorous instruction and work
	For Level 4, much of the Level 3 evidence is observed during the year, as well as some of the following: ~ Lesson is accessible and challenging to all students - Students are able to answer higher-level questions with meaningful responses - Students pose higher-level questions to the teacher and to each other - Teacher highlights examples of recent student work that meets high expectations; insists and motivates students to do it again if not great - Teacher encourages students' interest in learning by providing students with additional opportunities to apply and build skills beyond expected lesson elements (e.g. extra credit or enrichment assignments)	- Lesson is accessible and challenging to almost all students - Teacher frequently develops higher-level understanding through effective questioning - Lesson pushes almost all students forward due to differentiation of instruction based on each student's level of understanding - Students have opportunities to meaningfully practice, apply, and demonstrate that they are learning - Teacher shows patience and helps students to work hard toward mastering the objective and to persist even when faced with difficult tasks	- Lesson is not always accessible or challenging for students - Some questions used may not be effective in developing higher-level understanding (too complex or confusing) - Lesson pushes some students forward, but misses other students due to lack of differentiation based on students' level of understanding - While students may have some opportunity to meaningfully practice and apply concepts, instruction is more teacher-directed than appropriate - Teacher may encourage students to work hard, but may not persist in efforts to have students keep trying	- Lesson is not aligned with developmental level of students (may be too challenging or too easy) - Teacher may not use questioning as an effective tool to increase understanding. Students only show a surface understanding of concepts. - Lesson rarely pushes any students forward. Teacher does not differentiate instruction based on students' level of understanding. - Lesson is almost always teacher directed. Students have few opportunities to meaningfully practice or apply concepts. - Teacher gives up on students easily and does not encourage them to persist through difficult tasks

Notes:

1. Examples of types of questions that can develop higher-level understanding:

• Activating higher levels of inquiry on Bloom's taxonomy (using words such as "analyze", "classify", "compare", "decide", "evaluate", "explain", or "represent")

• Asking students to explain their reasoning

• Asking students to explain why they are learning something or to summarize the main idea

• Asking students to apply a new skill or concept in a different context

---

Competency	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
Competency 2.7: **Maximize Instructional Time**	Teacher is highly effective at maximizing instructional time	Teacher is effective at maximizing instructional time	Teacher needs improvement at maximizing instructional time	Teacher is ineffective at maximizing instructional time
	For Level 4, much of the Level 3 evidence is observed during the year, as well as some of the following: - Routines, transitions, and procedures are well-executed. Students know what they are supposed to be doing and when without prompting from the teacher - Students are always engaged in meaningful work while waiting for the teacher (for example, during attendance) - Students share responsibility for operations and routines and work well together to accomplish these tasks - All students are on-task and follow instructions of teacher without much prompting - Disruptive behaviors and off-task conversations are rare; When they occur, they are always addressed without major interruption to the lesson.	- Students arrive on-time and are aware of the consequences of arriving late (unexcused) - Class starts on-time - Routines, transitions, and procedures are well-executed. Students know what they are supposed to be doing and when with minimal prompting from the teacher - Students are only ever not engaged in meaningful work for brief periods of time (for example, during attendance) - Teacher delegates time between parts of the lesson appropriately so as best to lead students towards mastery of objective - Almost all students are on-task and follow instructions of teacher without much prompting - Disruptive behaviors and off-task conversations are rare; When they occur, they are almost always addressed without major interruption to the lesson.	- Some students consistently arrive late (unexcused) for class without consequences - Class may consistently start a few minutes late - Routines, transitions, and procedures are in place, but require significant teacher direction or prompting to be followed - There is more than a brief period of time when students are left without meaningful work to keep them engaged - Teacher may delegate lesson time inappropriately between parts of the lesson - Significant prompting from the teacher is necessary for students to follow instructions and remain on-task - Disruptive behaviors and off-task conversations sometimes occur; they may not be addressed in the most effective manner and teacher may have to stop the lesson frequently to address the problem.	- Students may frequently arrive late (unexcused) for class without consequences - Teacher may frequently start class late. - There are few or no evident routines or procedures in place. Students are unclear about what they should be doing and require significant direction from the teacher at all times - There are significant periods of time in which students are not engaged in meaningful work - Teacher wastes significant time between parts of the lesson due to classroom management. - Even with significant prompting, students frequently do not follow directions and are off-task - Disruptive behaviors and off-task conversations are common and frequently cause the teacher to have to make adjustments to the lesson.

RISE
Evaluation and
Development System

Competency	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
Competency 2.8: **Create Classroom Culture of Respect and Collaboration**	Teacher is highly effective at creating a classroom culture of respect and collaboration	Teacher is effective at creating a classroom culture of respect and collaboration	Teacher needs improvement at creating a classroom culture of respect and collaboration	Teacher is ineffective at creating a classroom culture of respect and collaboration
	For Level 4, much of the Level 3 evidence is observed during the year, as well as some of the following: - Students are invested in the academic success of their peers as evidenced by unprompted collaboration and assistance - Students reinforce positive character and behavior and discourage negative behavior amongst themselves	- Students are respectful of their teacher and peers - Students are given opportunities to collaborate and support each other in the learning process - Teacher reinforces positive character and behavior and uses consequences appropriately to discourage negative behavior - Teacher has a good rapport with students, and shows genuine interest in their thoughts and opinions	- Students are generally respectful of their teacher and peers, but may occasionally act out or need to be reminded of classroom norms - Students are given opportunities to collaborate, but may not always be supportive of each other or may need significant assistance from the teacher to work together - Teacher may praise positive behavior OR enforce consequences for negative behavior, but not both - Teacher may focus on the behavior of a few students, while ignoring the behavior (positive or negative) of others	- Students are frequently disrespectful of teacher or peers as evidenced by discouraging remarks or disruptive behavior - Students are not given many opportunities to collaborate OR during these times do not work well together even with teacher intervention - Teacher rarely or never praises positive behavior - Teacher rarely or never addresses negative behavior

Notes:
1. If there is one or more instances of disrespect by the teacher toward students, the teacher should be scored a Level 1 for this standard.
2. Elementary school teachers more frequently will, and are sometimes required to have, expectations, rewards, and consequences posted visibly in the classroom. Whether or not these are visibly posted, it should be evident within the culture of the classroom that students understand and abide by a set of established expectations and are aware of the rewards and consequences of their actions.

Competency	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
Competency 2.9: **Set High Expectations for Academic Success**	Teacher is highly effective at setting high expectations for academic success.	Teacher is effective at setting high expectations for academic success.	Teacher needs improvement at setting high expectations for academic success.	Teacher is ineffective at setting high expectations for student success.
	For Level 4, much of the Level 3 evidence is observed during the year, as well as some of the following: - Students participate in forming academic goals for themselves and analyzing their progress - Students demonstrate high academic expectations for themselves - Student comments and actions demonstrate that they are excited about their work and understand why it is important	- Teacher sets high expectations for students of all levels - Students are invested in their work and value academic success as evidenced by their effort and quality of their work - The classroom is a safe place to take on challenges and risk failure (students do not feel shy about asking questions or bad about answering incorrectly) - Teacher celebrates and praises academic work. - High quality work of all students is displayed in the classroom	- Teacher may set high expectations for some, but not others - Students are generally invested in their work, but may occasionally spend time off-task or give up when work is challenging - Some students may be afraid to take on challenges and risk failure (hesitant to ask for help when needed or give-up easily) - Teacher may praise the academic work of some, but not others - High quality work of a few, but not all students, may be displayed in the classroom	- Teacher rarely or never sets high expectations for students - Students may demonstrate disinterest or lack of investment in their work. For example, students might be unfocused, off-task, or refuse to attempt assignments - Students are generally afraid to take on challenges and risk failure due to frequently discouraging comments from the teacher or peers - Teacher rarely or never praises academic work or good behavior - High quality work is rarely or never displayed in the classroom

Note:

1. There are several ways for a teacher to demonstrate high expectations - through encouraging comments, higher-level questioning, appropriately rigorous assignments, expectations written and posted in the classroom, individual student work plans, etc.

If you have received this document from any source other than the RISE website, it may have been altered from its original version. For the official, and most up-to-date version, please

APPENDIX B: INSTRUCTIONAL ELEMENTS USED FOR THE CREATION OF THE

COMPARISON TEMPLATE

Marshall

- Expectations
- Effort based
- Goals
- Connections
- Clarity
- Repertoire
- Engagement
- Differentiation
- Nimbleness
- Application

Danielson

- Expectations
- Directions / procedures
- Explanations
- Use of oral and written language
- Quality of questions
- Discussion technique
- Student participation
- Activities and assignments
- Grouping of students
- Instructional material and sources
- Structure and pacing
- Assessment criteria
- Monitoring for learning
- Feedback to students
- Student self-assessment
- Lesson adjustment

- Response to students
- Persistence

Marzano

- Identify similarities and differences
- Summarizing and note taking
- Reinforcing effort and providing recognition
- Homework and practice
- Nonlinguistic representations
- Cooperative learning
- Setting objectives / providing feedback
- Generating testing hypothesis
- Questions, queues, advanced organization

APPENDIX C: SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHIC DEFINITIONS

Metropolitan/Urban - Inside a MSA (metropolitan statistical area) with a density of at least 200 students per square mile or containing all of a central city of the MSA.

Suburban - Inside MSA with a density between 20 to 200 students per square mile.

Rural - Less than 20 students per square mile.

Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) - Area may be an MSA if it is the only MSA in the immediate area and it has a city of at least 50,000 population, or it is an urbanized area of at least 50,000 with a total metropolitan population of at least 100,000.

APPENDIX D: EVALUATION TEMPLATE

Teacher Evaluation Template

An Analysis of Indiana Schools Implementing Alternative Teacher Evaluation Systems

The following list of effective teacher evaluation elements is based on the instruction domain found in the research published by Dr. Robert Marzano, Mr. Kim Marshall, and Mrs. Charlotte Danielson. All three researchers shared four of the elements. Marshall and Danielson shared four of the elements. Danielson and Marzano shared three elements. One element was shared between Marzano and Marshall.

Each alternative teacher evaluation tool will be compared to the template, and the number of identical / similar elements represented will be tabulated. Following the tabulation, each alternative evaluation tool will be compared in three demographic areas (population, free/reduced, and geographic region).

Evaluation element: Frequency of element

1. Setting Expectations/ Objectives

2. Engagement

3. Application

4. Connections/Questions

5. Clarity

6. Goals

7. Differentiation

8. Instructional Repertoire

9. Cooperative Grouping

10. Summarizing/ Note Taking

11. Homework/Feedback

12. Effort

The following terms are definitions of the items used on the comparison template.

1. Setting expectations and objectives - Teacher makes the purpose of the lesson clear, including where it is situated within the broader learning, linking that purpose to student interests.

2. Engagement - Teacher successfully engages all students in the discussion with the students themselves ensuring that all voices are heard in the discussion.

3. Application - Students relate classroom material and conversations to life situations. Students are responsible for the implementation and output of the activity. Pacing of the lesson is appropriate for all students.

4. Connections/Questions - Teacher's questions are of high quality with adequate time for students to respond. Students formulate many questions, initiating topics, and making unsolicited contributions.

5. Clarity - Teacher's directions and procedures are clear to students and anticipate possible student misunderstandings.

6. Goals - Teacher makes all outcomes clear and establishes criteria to achieve expected outcomes.

7. Differentiation - instructional materials and practices are suitable to the instructional purposes and engage students through multiple resources. Students initiate the choice, adaptation, or creation of the materials to enhance the learning experience. Teacher successfully makes major adjustments to lessons when needed.

8. Instructional Repertoire - Teacher utilizes multiple resources and multiple formats to achieve desired outcomes.

9. Cooperative grouping - Instructional groups are productive and fully appropriate to the students or to the instructional purposes of the lesson. Students take the initiative to influence the information or adjustment of instructional groups.

10. Summarizing /note taking - The lesson's structure is highly coherent, allowing for reflection and closure.

11. Homework/feedback - Teacher's feedback to students is timely and of consistently high quality, and students make use of the feedback in their learning.

12. Effort - Teacher persists in seeking effective approaches for students who need help, using an extensive repertoire of strategies and soliciting additional resources from the school.

APPENDIX E: RISE INSTRUCTION DOMAIN 2

Optional Observation Form 1 – By Competency

Note: It is not expected that every competency be observed during every observation. This form

may be used for formal or informal observations per evaluator preference.

SCHOOL:

OBSERVER:

TEACHER:

GRADE/SUBJECT:

DATE OF OBSERVATION:

START TIME: ___ END TIME: _____

2.1 OBJECTIVE

Evidence

Indicator

2.2 CONTENT

Evidence

Indicator

2.3 ENGAGEMENT

Evidence

Indicator

2.4 UNDERSTANDING

Evidence

Indicator

2.5 MODIFY INSTRUCTION

Evidence

Indicator

2.6 RIGOR

Evidence

Indicator

2.7 MAXIMIZE INSTRUCTIONAL TIME

Evidence

Indicator

2.8 CLASSROOM CULTURE

Evidence

Indicator

2.9 HIGH EXPECTATIONS

Evidence

Indicator

Overall Strengths:

Overall Areas for Improvement:

APPENDIX F: ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY INSTRUMENT

The following informational survey questions are being asked to gather additional information about the teacher evaluation tools utilized in the state of Indiana for the school year 2012-13. The information will be kept confidential and all identifying information specific to any school or school corporations will not be published in the final draft.

Name of person completing survey: _____

Name of School Corporation: _____

Number of buildings in your corporation: _____

Please answer the following survey questions to the best of your ability. Your participation is greatly appreciated.

1. What setting is your school district classified?

   __Rural   __Suburban   __Urban

2. What is your school districts' Free/Reduced population?

   ___Less than 10% __11%-25%   __26%-50%   __51%75%   __76%-100%

3. What is the student population of your school district?

   ___Less than 500

   ___501-1000

   ___1,001-3,000

   ___3,001-10,000

   ___10,001-Up

4. What survey tool will your school district be using for the 2012-13 school year?

    __ R.I.S.E.   __T.A.P

    __ A pre-developed (purchased model)   (Name of Model)_____

    __ A model developed by the district   (Name of Model)_____

5. If waiting for the RISE model, will your school district be creating an addendum to attach?

    __Yes   __No

If you are not using the RISE model, please respond to the following questions.

6. Which of the following contributed to your school district's policy to NOT use the RISE model?

    __ The RISE model was too complicated.

    __ The teachers were against using the RISE model.

    __ We had already decided another purchased model would better serve our district.

    __ Our district already had a working model we desired to keep.

    __ Other (Please explain)_____

_____

_____

7. Please check which of the following factors were considered in the final policy to use an alternative evaluation model.
    ___ The involvement of the union

    ___ The current master contract

    ___ Board policy or board decision

    ___ Recommendation of the administration

    ___Other: (Please explain)_____

_____

_____

8. Is the model to be used by your district, research-based?

    ___ Yes   ___ No

9. Was there training provided for your evaluators?

    ___ Yes   ___ No

10. Who provided your evaluator training?-

    _____
    _____
    _____

11. What form did this training take?

    _____

    _____

    _____

12. What types of observations will be utilized in your 2012-13 model?

    __Extended   ___ Walk-throughs   __ Casual   __ Other _____

13. What is your summative evaluation based upon?

    __ Extended observations   ___ Walk-through observations

    __ Casual Observations   ___Lesson Plans

    __Parent comments   ___Student input

    __Input from other staff members   ___Input from the school board

    __Community Input   __Test scores

    __ Other _____

14. Will you be utilizing primary and secondary evaluators?

    ___ Yes   ___ No

15. Who will be your secondary evaluators?

   __Master teachers   __Department chairs   __Central office administrators

   __Peer teachers   __Paid educators outside of the district   __Other _____

Please return your survey results and your alternative teacher evaluation tool to

austinc@sefschools.org.

     Thank you.

APPENDIX G: RISE TEMPLATE: INSTRUCTIONS

RISE
Evaluation and
Development System

DOMAIN 2: EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTION

Teachers facilitate student academic practice so that all students are participating and have the opportunity to gain mastery of the objectives in a classroom environment that fosters a climate of urgency and expectation around achievement, excellence and respect.

Competency	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
Competency 2.1:	Teacher is highly effective at developing student understanding and mastery of lesson objectives	Teacher is effective at developing student understanding and mastery of lesson objectives	Teacher needs improvement at developing student understanding and mastery of lesson objectives	Teacher is ineffective at developing student understanding and mastery of lesson objectives
Develop student understanding and mastery of lesson objectives	*For Level 4, much of the Level 3 evidence is observed during the year, as well as some of the following:* - Students can explain what they are learning and why it is important, beyond repeating the stated objective - Teacher effectively engages prior knowledge of students in connecting to lesson. Students demonstrate through work or comments that they understand this connection	- Lesson objective is specific, measurable, and aligned to standards. It conveys what students are learning and what they will be able to do by the end of the lesson - Objective is written in a student-friendly manner and/or explained to students in easy-to-understand terms - Importance of the objective is explained so that students understand why they are learning what they are learning - Lesson builds on students' prior knowledge of key concepts and skills and makes this connection evident to students - Lesson is well-organized to move students towards mastery of the objective	- Lesson objective conveys what students are learning and what they will be able to do by the end of the lesson, but may not be aligned to standards or measurable - Objective is stated, but not in a student-friendly manner that leads to understanding - Teacher attempts explanation of importance of objective, but students fail to understand - Lesson generally does not build on prior knowledge of students or students fail to make this connection - Organization of the lesson may not always be connected to mastery of the objective	- Lesson objective is missing more than one component. It may not be clear about what students are learning or will be able to do by the end of the lesson. - There may not be a clear connection between the objective and lesson, or teacher may fail to make this connection for students. - Teacher may fail to discuss importance of objective or there may not be a clear understanding amongst students as to why the objective is important. - There may be no effort to connect objective to prior knowledge of students - Lesson is disorganized and does not lead to mastery of objective.

RISE
Evaluation and
Development System

Competency	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
Competency 2.2:	Teacher is highly effective at demonstrating and clearly communicating content knowledge to students	Teacher is effective at demonstrating and clearly communicating content knowledge to students	Teacher needs improvement at demonstrating and clearly communicating content knowledge to students	Teacher is ineffective at demonstrating and clearly communicating content knowledge to students
Demonstrate and Clearly Communicate Content Knowledge to Students	*For Level 4, much of the Level 3 evidence is observed during the year, as well as some of the following:* - Teacher fully explains concepts in as direct and efficient a manner as possible, while still achieving student understanding - Teacher effectively connects content to other content areas, students' experiences and interests, or current events in order to make content relevant and build interest - Explanations spark student excitement and interest in the content - Students participate in each others' learning of content through collaboration during the lesson - Students ask higher-order questions and make connections independently, demonstrating that they understand the content at a higher level	- Teacher demonstrates content knowledge and delivers content that is factually correct - Content is clear, concise and well-organized - Teacher restates and rephrases instruction in multiple ways to increase understanding - Teacher emphasizes key points or main ideas in content - Teacher uses developmentally appropriate language and explanations - Teacher implements relevant instructional strategies learned via professional development	-Teacher delivers content that is factually correct - Content occasionally lacks clarity and is not as well organized as it could be - Teacher may fail to restate or rephrase instruction in multiple ways to increase understanding - Teacher does not adequately emphasize main ideas, and students are sometimes confused about key takeaways - Explanations sometimes lack developmentally appropriate language - Teacher does not always implement new and improved instructional strategies learned via professional development	- Teacher may deliver content that is factually incorrect - Explanations may be unclear or incoherent and fail to build student understanding of key concepts - Teacher continues with planned instruction, even when it is obvious that students are not understanding content - Teacher does not emphasize main ideas, and students are often confused about content - Teacher fails to use developmentally appropriate language - Teacher does not implement new and improved instructional strategies learned via professional development

Competency	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
Competency 2.3:	Teacher is highly effective at engaging students in academic content	Teacher is effective at engaging students in academic content	Teacher needs improvement at engaging students in academic content	Teacher is ineffective at engaging students in academic content
Engage students in academic content	*For Level 4, much of the Level 3 evidence is observed during the year, as well as some of the following:* - Teacher provides ways to engage with content that significantly promotes student mastery of the objective	-3/4 or more of students are actively engaged in content at all times and not off-task - Teacher provides multiple ways, as appropriate, of engaging with content, all aligned to the lesson objective	- Fewer than 3/4 of students are engaged in content and many are off-task - Teacher may provide multiple ways of engaging students, but perhaps not aligned to lesson objective or mastery of content	- Fewer than 1/2 of students are engaged in content and many are off-task - Teacher may only provide one way of engaging with content OR teacher may provide multiple ways of engaging students that are not aligned to the lesson objective or mastery of content
	- Teacher provides differentiated ways of engaging with content specific to individual student needs	- Ways of engaging with content reflect different learning modalities or intelligences	- Teacher may miss opportunities to provide ways of differentiating content for student engagement	- Teacher does not differentiate instruction to target different learning modalities
	- The lesson progresses at an appropriate pace so that students are never disengaged, and students who finish early have something else meaningful to do	- Teacher adjusts lesson accordingly to accommodate for student prerequisite skills and knowledge so that all students are engaged	- Some students may not have the prerequisite skills necessary to fully engage in content and teacher's attempt to modify instruction for these students is limited or not always effective	- Most students do not have the prerequisite skills necessary to fully engage in content and teacher makes no effort to adjust instruction for these students
	- Teacher effectively integrates technology as a tool to engage students in academic content	- ELL and IEP students have the appropriate accommodations to be engaged in content	- ELL and IEP students are sometimes given appropriate accommodations to be engaged in content	- ELL and IEP students are not provided with the necessary accommodations to engage in content
		- Students work hard and are deeply active rather than passive/receptive (See Notes below for specific evidence of engagement)	- Students may appear to actively listen, but when it comes time for participation are disinterested in engaging	- Students do not actively listen and are overtly disinterested in engaging.

RISE
Evaluation and
Development System

Competency	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
Competency 2.4: **Check for Understanding**	Teacher is highly effective at checking for understanding	Teacher is effective at checking for understanding	Teacher needs improvement at checking for understanding	Teacher is ineffective at checking for understanding
	For Level 4, much of the Level 3 evidence is observed during the year, as well as some of the following:	- Teacher checks for understanding at almost all key moments (when checking is necessary to inform instruction going forward)	- Teacher sometimes checks for understanding of content, but misses several key moments	- Teacher rarely or never checks for understanding of content, or misses nearly all key moments
	- Teacher checks for understanding at higher levels by asking pertinent, scaffold questions that push thinking; accepts only high quality student responses (those that reveal understanding or lack thereof)	- Teacher uses a variety of methods to check for understanding that are successful in capturing an accurate "pulse" of the class's understanding	- Teacher may use more than one type of check for understanding, but is often unsuccessful in capturing an accurate "pulse" of the class's understanding	-Teacher does not check for understanding, or uses only one ineffective method repetitively to do so, thus rarely capturing an accurate "pulse" of the class's understanding
		- Teacher uses wait time effectively both after posing a question and before helping students think through a response	- Teacher may not provide enough wait time after posing a question for students to think and respond before helping with an answer or moving forward with content	- Teacher frequently moves on with content before students have a chance to respond to questions or frequently gives students the answer rather than helping them think through the answer.
	- Teacher uses open-ended questions to surface common misunderstandings and assess student mastery of material at a range of both lower and higher-order thinking	- Teacher doesn't allow students to "opt-out" of checks for understanding and cycles back to these students	- Teacher sometimes allows students to "opt-out" of checks for understanding without cycling back to these students	- Teacher frequently allows students to "opt-out" of checks for understanding and does not cycle back to these students
		- Teacher systematically assesses every student's mastery of the objective(s) at the end of each lesson through formal or informal assessments (see note for examples)	- Teacher may occasionally assess student mastery at the end of the lesson through formal or informal assessments.	- Teacher rarely or never assesses for mastery at the end of the lesson

Notes:

1. Examples of times when checking for understanding may be useful are: before moving on to the next step of the lesson, or partway through independent practice.

2. Examples of how the teacher may assess student understanding and mastery of objectives:

• Checks for Understanding: thumbs up/down, cold-calling

• Do Nows, Turn and Talk/ Pair Share, Guided or Independent Practice, Exit Slips

Competency	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
Competency 2.5: **Modify Instruction As Needed**	Teacher is highly effective at modifying instruction as needed	Teacher is effective at modifying instruction as needed	Teacher needs improvement at modifying instruction as needed	Teacher is ineffective at modifying instruction as needed
	For Level 4, much of the Level 3 evidence is observed during the year, as well as some of the following: - Teacher anticipates student misunderstandings and preemptively addresses them - Teacher is able to modify instruction to respond to misunderstandings without taking away from the flow of the lesson or losing engagement	- Teacher makes adjustments to instruction based on checks for understanding that lead to increased understanding for most students - Teacher responds to misunderstandings with effective scaffolding techniques - Teacher doesn't give up, but continues to try to address misunderstanding with different techniques if the first try is not successful	- Teacher may attempt to make adjustments to instruction based on checks for understanding, but these attempts may be misguided and may not increase understanding for all students - Teacher may primarily respond to misunderstandings by using teacher-driven scaffolding techniques (for example, re-explaining a concept), when student-driven techniques could have been more effective - Teacher may persist in using a particular technique for responding to a misunderstanding, even when it is not succeeding	- Teacher rarely or never attempts to adjust instruction based on checks for understanding, and any attempts at doing so frequently fail to increase understanding for students - Teacher only responds to misunderstandings by using teacher-driven scaffolding techniques - Teacher repeatedly uses the same technique to respond to misunderstandings, even when it is not succeeding

Notes:

1. In order to be effective at this competency, a teacher must have at least scored a 3 on competency 2.4 - in order to modify instruction as needed, one must first know how to check for understanding.

2. A teacher can respond to misunderstandings using "scaffolding" techniques such as: activating background knowledge, asking leading questions, breaking the task into small parts, using mnemonic devices or analogies, using manipulatives or hands-on models, using "think alouds", providing visual cues, etc.

RISE
Evaluation and
Development System

Competency	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
Competency 2.6: **Develop Higher Level of Understanding through Rigorous Instruction and Work**	Teacher is highly effective at developing a higher level of understanding through rigorous instruction and work	Teacher is effective at developing a higher level of understanding through rigorous instruction and work	Teacher needs improvement at developing a higher level of understanding through rigorous instruction and work	Teacher is ineffective at developing a higher level of understanding through rigorous instruction and work
	For Level 4, much of the Level 3 evidence is observed during the year, as well as some of the following: - Lesson is accessible and challenging to all students - Students are able to answer higher-level questions with meaningful responses - Students pose higher-level questions to the teacher and to each other - Teacher highlights examples of recent student work that meets high expectations; insists and motivates students to do it again if not great - Teacher encourages students' interest in learning by providing students with additional opportunities to apply and build skills beyond expected lesson elements (e.g. extra credit or enrichment assignments)	- Lesson is accessible and challenging to almost all students - Teacher frequently develops higher-level understanding through effective questioning - Lesson pushes almost all students forward due to differentiation of instruction based on each student's level of understanding - Students have opportunities to meaningfully practice, apply, and demonstrate that they are learning - Teacher shows patience and helps students to work hard toward mastering the objective and to persist even when faced with difficult tasks	- Lesson is not always accessible or challenging for students - Some questions used may not be effective in developing higher-level understanding (too complex or confusing) - Lesson pushes some students forward, but misses other students due to lack of differentiation based on students' level of understanding - While students may have some opportunity to meaningfully practice and apply concepts, instruction is more teacher-directed than appropriate - Teacher may encourage students to work hard, but may not persist in efforts to have students keep trying	- Lesson is not aligned with developmental level of students (may be too challenging or too easy) - Teacher may not use questioning as an effective tool to increase understanding. Students only show a surface understanding of concepts. - Lesson rarely pushes any students forward. Teacher does not differentiate instruction based on students' level of understanding. - Lesson is almost always teacher directed. Students have few opportunities to meaningfully practice or apply concepts. - Teacher gives up on students easily and does not encourage them to persist through difficult tasks

Notes:

1. Examples of types of questions that can develop higher-level understanding:

• Activating higher levels of inquiry on Bloom's taxonomy (using words such as "analyze", "classify", "compare", "decide", "evaluate", "explain", or "represent")

• Asking students to explain their reasoning

• Asking students to explain why they are learning something or to summarize the main idea

• Asking students to apply a new skill or concept in a different context

RISE Evaluation and Development System

Competency	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
Competency 2.7: **Maximize Instructional Time**	Teacher is highly effective at maximizing instructional time	Teacher is effective at maximizing instructional time	Teacher needs improvement at maximizing instructional time	Teacher is ineffective at maximizing instructional time
	For Level 4, much of the Level 3 evidence is observed during the year, as well as some of the following:	- Students arrive on-time and are aware of the consequences of arriving late (unexcused)	- Some students consistently arrive late (unexcused) for class without consequences	- Students may frequently arrive late (unexcused) for class without consequences
	- Routines, transitions, and procedures are well-executed. Students know what they are supposed to be doing and when without prompting from the teacher	- Class starts on-time - Routines, transitions, and procedures are well-executed. Students know what they are supposed to be doing and when with minimal prompting from the teacher	- Class may consistently start a few minutes late - Routines, transitions, and procedures are in place, but require significant teacher direction or prompting to be followed	- Teacher may frequently start class late. - There are few or no evident routines or procedures in place. Students are unclear about what they should be doing and require significant direction from the teacher at all times
	- Students are always engaged in meaningful work while waiting for the teacher (for example, during attendance) - Students share responsibility for operations and routines and work well together to accomplish these tasks	- Students are only ever not engaged in meaningful work for brief periods of time (for example, during attendance) - Teacher delegates time between parts of the lesson appropriately so as best to lead students towards mastery of objective	- There is more than a brief period of time when students are left without meaningful work to keep them engaged - Teacher may delegate lesson time inappropriately between parts of the lesson	- There are significant periods of time in which students are not engaged in meaningful work - Teacher wastes significant time between parts of the lesson due to classroom management.
	- All students are on-task and follow instructions of teacher without much prompting - Disruptive behaviors and off-task conversations are rare; When they occur, they are always addressed without major interruption to the lesson.	- Almost all students are on-task and follow instructions of teacher without much prompting - Disruptive behaviors and off-task conversations are rare; When they occur, they are almost always addressed without major interruption to the lesson.	- Significant prompting from the teacher is necessary for students to follow instructions and remain on-task - Disruptive behaviors and off-task conversations sometimes occur; they may not be addressed in the most effective manner and teacher may have to stop the lesson frequently to address the problem.	- Even with significant prompting, students frequently do not follow directions and are off-task - Disruptive behaviors and off-task conversations are common and frequently cause the teacher to have to make adjustments to the lesson.

Competency	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
Competency 2.8: **Create Classroom Culture of Respect and Collaboration**	Teacher is highly effective at creating a classroom culture of respect and collaboration	Teacher is effective at creating a classroom culture of respect and collaboration	Teacher needs improvement at creating a classroom culture of respect and collaboration	Teacher is ineffective at creating a classroom culture of respect and collaboration
	For Level 4, much of the Level 3 evidence is observed during the year, as well as some of the following: - Students are invested in the academic success of their peers as evidenced by unprompted collaboration and assistance - Students reinforce positive character and behavior and discourage negative behavior amongst themselves	- Students are respectful of their teacher and peers - Students are given opportunities to collaborate and support each other in the learning process - Teacher reinforces positive character and behavior and uses consequences appropriately to discourage negative behavior - Teacher has a good rapport with students, and shows genuine interest in their thoughts and opinions	- Students are generally respectful of their teacher and peers, but may occasionally act out or need to be reminded of classroom norms - Students are given opportunities to collaborate, but may not always be supportive of each other or may need significant assistance from the teacher to work together - Teacher may praise positive behavior OR enforce consequences for negative behavior, but not both - Teacher may focus on the behavior of a few students, while ignoring the behavior (positive or negative) of others	- Students are frequently disrespectful of teacher or peers as evidenced by discouraging remarks or disruptive behavior - Students are not given many opportunities to collaborate OR during these times do not work well together even with teacher intervention - Teacher rarely or never praises positive behavior - Teacher rarely or never addresses negative behavior

Notes:

1. If there is one or more instances of disrespect by the teacher toward students, the teacher should be scored a Level 1 for this standard.

2. Elementary school teachers more frequently will, and are sometimes required to have, expectations, rewards, and consequences posted visibly in the classroom. Whether or not these are visibly posted, it should be evident within the culture of the classroom that students understand and abide by a set of established expectations and are aware of the rewards and consequences of their actions.

Competency	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
Competency 2.9: **Set High Expectations for Academic Success**	Teacher is highly effective at setting high expectations for academic success.	Teacher is effective at setting high expectations for academic success.	Teacher needs improvement at setting high expectations for academic success.	Teacher is ineffective at setting high expectations for student success.
	For Level 4, much of the Level 3 evidence is observed during the year, as well as some of the following: - Students participate in forming academic goals for themselves and analyzing their progress - Students demonstrate high academic expectations for themselves - Student comments and actions demonstrate that they are excited about their work and understand why it is important	- Teacher sets high expectations for students of all levels - Students are invested in their work and value academic success as evidenced by their effort and quality of their work - The classroom is a safe place to take on challenges and risk failure (students do not feel shy about asking questions or bad about answering incorrectly) - Teacher celebrates and praises academic work. - High quality work of all students is displayed in the classroom	- Teacher may set high expectations for some, but not others - Students are generally invested in their work, but may occasionally spend time off-task or give up when work is challenging - Some students may be afraid to take on challenges and risk failure (hesitant to ask for help when needed or give-up easily) - Teacher may praise the academic work of some, but not others - High quality work of a few, but not all students, may be displayed in the classroom	- Teacher rarely or never sets high expectations for students - Students may demonstrate disinterest or lack of investment in their work. For example, students might be unfocused, off-task, or refuse to attempt assignments - Students are generally afraid to take on challenges and risk failure due to frequently discouraging comments from the teacher or peers - Teacher rarely or never praises academic work or good behavior - High quality work is rarely or never displayed in the classroom

Note:

1. There are several ways for a teacher to demonstrate high expectations - through encouraging comments, higher-level questioning, appropriately rigorous assignments, expectations written and posted in the classroom, individual student work plans, etc.

17 | P a g e

If you have received this document from any source other than the RISE website, it may have been altered from its original version. For the official, and most up-to-date version, please

APPENDIX H: RISE WORKSHEET: OBSERVATION FORM 1

RISE
Evaluation and
Development System

Optional Observation Form 1 – By Competency

Note: It is not expected that every competency be observed during every observation. This form may be used for formal or informal observations per evaluator preference.

SCHOOL: _____ OBSERVER: _____

TEACHER: _____ GRADE/SUBJECT: _____

DATE OF OBSERVATION: _____ START TIME: _____ END TIME: _____

2.1 OBJECTIVE	
Evidence	**Indicator**

2.2 CONTENT	
Evidence	**Indicator**

2.3 ENGAGEMENT	
Evidence	**Indicator**

2.4 UNDERSTANDING	
Evidence	**Indicator**

2.5 MODIFY INSTRUCTION	
Evidence	**Indicator**

2.6 RIGOR

Evidence	Indicator

2.7 MAXIMIZE INSTRUCTIONAL TIME

Evidence	Indicator

2.8 CLASSROOM CULTURE

Evidence	Indicator

2.9 HIGH EXPECTATIONS	
Evidence	Indicator

Overall Strengths:

Overall Areas for Improvement:

APPENDIX I: PERMISSION TO USE RISE DOCUMENTS

>>> "Mindy Schlegel" <schlegel@doe.in.gov> 3/8/2012 1:12 PM >>>
Hi!

Congrats! Doesn't stand for anything. And of course, you have permission. It is public domain document in my mind. :)

Mindy Schlegel
Senior Advisor for Educator Effectiveness and Leadership
Indiana Department of Education
Tel: 317.232.0549
schlegel@doe.in.gov

From: Corey Austin [mailto:austinc@sefschools.org]
Sent: Thu 3/8/2012 10:51 AM
To: Mindy Schlegel
Subject: RISE

Good Morning Mindy,

I am closing in on the final draft of my dissertation and have been asked by my committee chair., "what does RISE stand for?". I have stuck to my guns and tried to tell my committee that it doesn't represent anything. I want to make certain that R I S E still doesn't stand for anything specific. Second, If I use the RISE document in an appendix, I need to ask permission from the DOE to use their form in my final draft. Who would I ask for that permission?
Your assistance is always appreciated.
Corey Austin
SEFSC