TEACHERS PERCEPTIONS OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS ON CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION

DANNY L. DEWITT

2017

The undersigned, approved by the Department Chair of Graduate Studies in Education, have examined a dissertation entitled:

A STUDY OF THE MISSOURI EDUCATOR EVALUATION SYSTEM AND ITS EFFECT ON CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION

Presented by Danny DeWitt a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Education and hereby certify that in their opinion it is worthy of acceptance.

Dr. Michael Arnold, Committee Member
Professor, Graduate Studies in Education

Dr. Tammy Condren, Committee Member
Associate Professor, Graduate Studies in Education

Dr. Patricia Wilson, Committee Member
Principal

TEACHERS PERCEPTION OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS ON CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION

_____

A Dissertation
Presented to
The Faculty of the Graduate Education Department
Southwest Baptist University

_____

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

_____

By

Danny DeWitt, B.S., M.S., Ed.Spec.

May 19th, 2018

Abstract

The subject of school improvement and accountability continues to be a discussion topic of legislators and organizational leaders nationwide. In Missouri, the focus has shifted somewhat from the student to the teacher. Teacher improvement and growth are now at the forefront of discussions when organizations look at school reform. School administrators are now tasked with focusing more on teacher growth in their evaluation of their staff. This has caused a new approach to the teacher evaluation process in Missouri. The goal of this study was to determine perceptions about the teacher evaluation process in their respective school districts. Research questions were answered through distributing surveys and collecting responses from the respondents. Respondents were asked to answer questions regarding the evaluation tool and the process itself. According to the statistical data, the responses seemed to indicate there was a difference of opinion among teachers based on their professional development practices and evaluation tool being used. On this basis it is determined that there are slight variances of perceptions of the evaluation process based on the different evaluation tools being used and the size of the school being surveyed. Further research could be undertaken to identify factors that could make the evaluation process more seamless for districts during implementation.

Keywords: growth, teacher evaluation, evaluation tool, professional development

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Introduction

The practice of evaluating teachers has seen continual changes from the time teaching was accepted as a formal profession (Thomas, Holdaway, & Ward, 2000). This evolution continues today with the members of the media, the public, and legislators calling for more teacher accountability and higher standards for students in America (Crouch & Bock, 2014). Through observation the researcher has noted the overarching goal of evaluating teachers is to guide and motivate them to improve as instructors. It is hoped that by going through this process, teachers bring a better understanding of how students learn into the classroom, which in turn leads to improved student learning. Teacher evaluation models come in different forms. Until 2011, the models used most often did not give specific feedback and essentially did not achieve the desired goal, which is the improvement of instruction (Coulter, 2013). There was minimal training for supervisors on how to properly evaluate teachers and therefore, the evaluation tool became more of a formality than a useful tool.

In Missouri, the scrutiny of classroom instruction and teacher accountability has been documented by (Addo) 2012 and Birch (2012). The Missouri School Improvement Program 5 sets a new standard for district accreditation beginning with the 2014-2015 school year. As a result of the waiver from No Child Left Behind (NCLB) by the State Board of Education, the state of Missouri can use its own accountability system to measure schools (Darling-Hammond, 2012). In the state of Missouri, as well as nationally, school district administrators use the educator evaluation process to provide

feedback to teachers and ultimately help them modify classroom instruction. In theory, this will lead to better education for all students. Regardless of which type of evaluation system is selected, these results can only be achieved when evaluators educate, explain, and work with their staff on the expectations of the evaluation system (Darling-Hammond, 2012). A successful evaluation model may establish clear expectations and outcomes. Moreover, it is incumbent on three primary factors: the evaluation methods, evaluator's skills, and teacher perceptions (Marshall, 2009).

Background of the Evaluation System in Missouri

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) in 1965 earmarked $1,000,000,0000 per annum for helping educational institutions enroll and educate students belonging to low-income families (Klein, 2015). This was reframed and launched as NCLB in 2001. More funds were made available to the states, and in return, greater federal control was taken and more explicit linkage of accountability of schools to student achievement. After nearly a decade of criticism of NCLB being responsible for a highly intrusive federal role, there was a slight rollback in 2005 in the form of Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). Standardized testing for students and evaluation of educators on the basis of test scores were adopted by ESSA (Crouch & Bock, 2014). However, the role played by the states in education was strengthened. Adding to the incentive for state involvement, Race to the Top (RTT) was initiated in 2015 as a fund with a little over $4,000,000,000 to motivate the states and educational institutions to bring about innovation in teaching practices.

In Missouri, like in most other states, state laws on education govern the academic curriculum, funding for educational establishments, educator qualifications and

certifications, and educator evaluation methods. Missouri teachers are assessed on standardized test scores of their students, in addition to other parameters of evaluation. However, the state is flexible on the weight given to students' test scores while evaluating teacher performance, which it has left to the discretion of the districts (Crouch & Bock, 2014).

The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE, 2013) has developed the seven Essential Principles of Effective Evaluation plan, which defines what constitutes effective evaluation and how should it be implemented. It consists of targets for evaluation of educators, differentiated levels of performance for educators, support to new teaching staff, and utilization of evaluation results to develop policies. Further, it includes using growth in student learning as the main basis for evaluating educators, developing methods for providing regular and focused feedback to educators, and organizing training on a regular basis for educators and evaluators. The Missouri effective evaluation plan also specifies making use of evaluation data for formulating relevant policies for employing teachers (DESE, 2013).

The evaluation system, also known as the Missouri Growth Model, is a value-added model (VAM), where growth in districts is measured relative to the standard set by the state. Further, student data is used to help design effective classroom practices, growth data are made available to districts to fine-tune the evaluation system, and relevant information is used for formulating teacher development programs. This is calculated by taking the Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) results of 4 consecutive years for students between Grades 3 and 8 for English and Mathematics. Two successive years' scores of a student are paired together and are grouped on the basis of school. A

predicted score is developed, taking into consideration previous test scores, student movement from one school to another, and the average scores at the same school in the previous year. This statistical number is calculated for each pair of scores of the student. Variance between the predicted score and the actual score translates to student performance (DESE, 2013).

In addition to this, Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) have been adopted to gauge the effectiveness of educators. Student Learning Objectives are effective means to link student learning growth to teacher evaluation, by analyzing student's learning growth, over a wide spectrum of subjects and assessment options. As it is a more well-rounded, comparable, and holistic assessment of students, it does not just prove to be an effective evaluating tool for educators but also helps build an inherent sense of accountability and improvement in classroom instructional methods (DESE, 2013). In Missouri, the SLO process is implemented by first reviewing student data by an individual or a team of teachers to enumerate student needs and then designing two realistic and meticulous SLOs based on the initial data and the state performance standards. Administrators or mentors review the SLOs and give relevant feedback or approvals. The progress on SLOs is monitored and a final appraisal is done on the achievement of the growth target. This constitutes a part of the evaluation process of the educators. Finally, the performance analysis done by the evaluator is discussed by the teacher and evaluator, and performance objectives and SLOs are set for the future (DESE, 2013). Hence, from evaluation by observing teachers in a classroom setting to the present sophisticated multiparameter system, there seems to be a concerted effort by

policy makers and administrators to build in more objectivity, reliability, and validity in the evaluation system.

Statement of the Problem

Teacher perception of educator evaluations may have a direct impact on the classroom instruction, and in turn, on student learning. This impact may be either positive or negative, and can have a bearing on student achievement both in the short and long term. Educators are under pressure to increase student performance in the age of high-stakes testing. With NCLB and Race to the Top driving educational changes, educators are looking for new and innovative ways to increase standardized test scores. One area that has been targeted for reform is the educator evaluation system. Research indicates that teachers and instruction have a significant impact on student performance (Stronge, Tucker, & Ward, 2003). Therefore, it is imperative that quality teachers are retained and developed, which can affect students in a positive way. Teacher evaluations are currently one of the main components for the enhancement of teaching skills and accountability. In the words of Darling-Hammond (2012) "A high-quality teacher evaluation system should create a coherent, well-grounded approach to developing teaching, crafted collectively by state and district leaders with teachers and their representatives" (p. i). As much as designing a high-quality teacher evaluation system is imperative, so is the way it is viewed by teachers. A recent study (Goddard & Goddard, 2007) found that students attending schools with higher teacher involvement in school improvement achieved higher levels in mathematics and reading. In a recent study, it was found that students attending schools with higher teacher involvement in school improvement achieved higher levels in mathematics and reading (Goddard & Goddard, 2007). Therefore, teacher

evaluation is an important tool for developing quality teachers, however the efficacy is highly dependent on the perception by teachers.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine teachers' perceptions of the current evaluation system to ascertain if classroom instruction is modified or improved due to evaluation feedback. The effectiveness of the evaluation tools, which are undergoing additional changes and improvements at the current time in the state of Missouri, has yet to be determined. Teacher evaluations in Missouri had never been tied to standardized test scores. That changed in 2014 when the state Department of Elementary and Secondary Education introduced a new evaluation system guidelines for Missouri schools. Schools must now incorporate student growth into the process. The weight of this component was left up to the individual school districts.

An additional purpose of this study involves comparing the perceptions of educators to determine their level of professional development in their schools before implementation of their evaluation system. Proper professional development is needed for a system to work. If the educators were not aware of the specific expectations prior to implementation, this could change their perception of the evaluation system itself.

Conducting this research is an attempt to provide information that may allow other parties to better understand teachers' beliefs toward the evaluation process and how to enhance the process as we move forward. It may do this by analyzing the results of the survey and using that data in considering implementation of other evaluation systems throughout the state. Additionally, this study may provide insight into teacher perceptions of professional development practices as they relate to the educator evaluation system in

the state of Missouri. Administrators and school officials responsible for implementing these systems might find the study valuable when researching and planning their evaluation model. It may also be useful to these same school officials to utilize when planning their professional development as it relates to either their current evaluation system or a new model they may wish to introduce to their staff. The result is the study may help other parties as they modify educator evaluations in the future to better ensure success for teachers and ultimately what all school districts hope for, better student learning results as a result of putting these evaluation models in place.

Research Questions

The main objective of this research study is to assess the opinion of teachers on the existing teacher evaluation system and how it affects the delivery of their lessons. The primary question of this research will elicit responses from teachers. These responses should help in arriving at the desired outcome of this research.

Research Question 1: What is the difference in the teacher perception of the impact of the evaluation process on classroom instruction based on the involvement of the teachers in the designing of evaluation requirements?

Research Question 2: What is the difference in perception of the impact of the evaluation process between teachers based on which type of evaluation tool is being used?

Research Question 3: What is the difference in teacher perception of the impact of the evaluation process based on the size of the school being surveyed?

Research Question 4: What is the difference in teacher perception of the impact of the evaluation process based on professional development practices of individual school districts?

Hypotheses

Null Hypotheses

Hypotheses 1: There will be no difference in teacher perceptions regarding the impact of evaluation process on classroom instruction based on the involvement of the teachers in the designing of evaluation requirements.

Hypotheses 2: There will be no difference in teacher perception of impact of the evaluation process on classroom instruction based on the type of evaluation tool being used.

Hypotheses 3: There will be no difference in teacher perception of impact of the evaluation process on classroom instruction based on the size of school being surveyed.

Hypotheses 4: There will be no difference in teacher perception of the impact of evaluation process on classroom instruction based on the professional development practices of the individual school districts**.**

Significance of the Study

Determining the extent to which teachers perceive the efficacy of the Missouri Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation process and the accuracy of the reporting to help improve teacher performance is the focus of this study. Most educators recognize that "teaching is an activity that a single, brief observation of a classroom does not adequately portray" (Danielson, 2001, p. 12). Instead, Danielson went further to say an "evaluation

system should be one that recognizes and cultivates quality teaching" (Danielson, 2001, p. 12).

Danielson (2001) wrote about the evaluation system and the fact that the teachers and their evaluators portray it often as being a meaningless exercise that is endured. "Recently, however, schools and districts have discovered that they can shape an evaluation system so that it contributes substantially to the quality of teaching" (Danielson, 2001, p. 12). According to the Missouri Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation criteria, (Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Guidelines for Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation; Principals Performance-Based Evaluation, 1999, DESE 1999), administrators are the number 1 source in implementing efficient use of the teacher evaluation tools in their buildings (DESE, 1999 p. 26). Some educators believe that teacher evaluations are valuable to teacher performance and improvement (Danielson, 2001).

With more knowledge about teacher evaluations becoming available, evaluations appear to be part of a bigger picture than merely measuring the basic skills a teacher exhibits. This study will provide insight about administrator and teacher perceptions regarding whether the Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation is considered efficacious according to the performance-based teacher evaluation model criteria. The results of the study may prove the necessity of further studies in determining if Missouri school districts feel the Missouri performance-based teacher evaluation model (DESE, 1999) is adequate or if the districts should develop their own teacher evaluation model unique and independent of the Missouri performance-based teacher evaluation model (DESE, 1999).

Theoretical/Conceptual Framework

While there are major theorists when it comes to educator evaluations, Danielson and Marshall stand out as premiere experts in the field. Their research and publishing has guided formulation of the instrument for this study. Both models are very sophisticated, and have been adopted by various states as their evaluation tools for educators. In the words of Danielson (2012) on the effectiveness of these frameworks, "That is, high level of teacher performance on the instructional framework as a whole should predict high levels of student performance" (p.33).

Marshall began a teaching career in Boston in 1969. During his career, he was witness to numerous school reforms. He eventually became a building principal and subsequently a superintendent. During his time as a building leader, Marshall led changes including special focus on teacher improvement and the evaluation process. Marshall (2009) devised a comprehensive teacher evaluation matrix with the following six domains:

- Planning and Preparation for Learning
- Classroom Management
- Delivery of Instruction
- Monitoring, Assessment, and Follow-Up
- Family and Community Outreach
- Professional Responsibilities (Marshall, 2009, p. 37)

Each of these aspects is further assessed over 10 parameters. The assessment is quantified under one of the four levels: *highly effective, effective, improvement necessary, and does not meet standards*, with scores from 4 to 1 in descending order. As the

evaluation is on several parameters, it requires continuous interaction between the evaluator and teacher. These domains are intended to assess teachers and provide feedback in each performance area at the end of every school year. They also provide additional guidance on how to improve. (Marshall, 2009).

Charlotte Danielson, an educational consultant, worked as a teacher at all levels from elementary to college. While specializing in teacher evaluation and curriculum planning, she developed the Framework for Teaching, which was a blueprint for schools to create an evaluation system. This framework consists of four domains, which are as follows:

- Domain 1 - Planning and Preparation
- Domain 2 - The Classroom Environment
- Domain 3 - Instruction
- Domain 4 - Professional Responsibilities (Danielson, 2013, p. 77)

Each domain is further divided into two to five sub elements. There are over 70 elements based on which teachers can prepare themselves. This is a very exhaustive list, which leads to a well-rounded evaluation of educators. The Framework has a variety of uses but is intended to provide a foundation for a school's mentoring and evaluation process thereby joining the processes together and helping teachers become better practitioners.

In both frameworks, classroom instruction and professional responsibilities figure prominently and encompass a wide gamut of teaching practices and pedagogical aspects being assessed. In Marshall's (2009) model, student-centric differentiation in teaching instruction is an important aspect of educator evaluation, and that has been highlighted in

the questionnaire. Further, being receptive to feedback from colleagues and administrators, one of the elements of Danielson's (2007) framework, has been included in the research instrument. Another element of Danielson's framework is flexibility in conducting a lesson, and this has been included in the questionnaire too. Therefore, this research study aims to understand the perception of educators on the evaluation system with the help of these frameworks. This forms the conceptual basis for this research study.

Definition of Terms

Accountability: "confirming time that is adequate for teacher professional growth with ample opportunities to do so by participating in professional activities such as mentoring, peer coaching, or working on a professional team that the teacher feels their contributions to can be adequate" (DESE, 1999, p.47).

Administration: "the execution of public affairs as distinguished from policy making" (*Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*, 1999).

Assessment: "this term is used to convey how the school system should provide a connection between the evaluation criteria and student performance" (DESE, 1999, p. 11).

Danielson Model: "A framework for teaching aspects of a teacher's responsibilities that has been documented through empirical studies and theoretical research as promoting improved student learning. These teaching responsibilities seek to define what teachers should know and be able to do in the exercise of their profession. The framework is divided into 22 components clustered into the 4 domains of teaching

responsibility: Domain 1: Planning and Preparation, Domain 2: The Classroom Environment, Domain 3: Instruction, and Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities"

Evaluation: "a way to determine the significance or worth using appraisal and study" (DESE, 1999, p. 32).

Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation: "this term encompasses ideas that supply information and feedback to the teachers. Information and feedback used for effective practices offer a pathway for individual growth through professional organizations, common goals, and a supportive learning community" (DESE, 1999 p. 9).

Teacher: "for the purposes of this study teacher means the person who can create a learning environment where students can acquire information and apply knowledge and skills" (DESE. 1999 p. 12).

Limitations and Delimitations

Limitations

Some limitations to this study may include but may not be limited to, the following:

- A limitation of this study is the response rate to this survey.
- A limitation includes the integrity of responses and research accessibility.
- Teacher perceptions and attitudes toward the evaluation system may be a limitation of this study, as well as their overall perceptions and attitudes of the teaching profession.
- School districts are using different types of teacher evaluation tools. Depending on these differences, the impact can vary from district to district.

- Some administrators are more adept at using evaluation tools to improve instruction. This can have an effect on teachers and how effective they perceive the process to be.

Delimitations

- A delimitation of the study is that the schools surveyed were limited to the state of Missouri.
- A delimitation of the study is that no first-year teachers were included in this study.
- A delimitation of the study is that no K-8 school districts were included in this study.
- A delimitation of this study was that the Kansas City and St. Louis school districts were not included in the study as they were not a part of the respective RPDC regions.

Summary

The present teacher evaluation system has evolved over a period of time. Previously teacher evaluation was limited to observing teachers in a classroom setting, however now it has evolved into a more sophisticated multiparameter system. There seems to be a concerted effort by policy makers and administrators to build in more objectivity, reliability, and validity in the evaluation system. All the same, whether the present teacher evaluation system has been able to enhance effective teaching and more important, effective learning, remains to be seen. It is imperative to access the teachers' perspective on the efficacy of the existing system of assessment. Therefore, this study is an attempt to understand teacher perceptions on the current evaluation system, analyzed

through various parameters such as classroom instruction, evaluation tools used, and professional development.

This chapter gives a succinct summary of the legislative background of the present evaluation system, through No Child Left Behind in 2001 and Race to the Top Act in 2009. In addition, Missouri's present evaluation system and likely changes have been introduced.

Therefore, this chapter gives an overview of the foundation for the study. The subsequent chapters will elaborate on the relevant literature of renowned researchers, methodology for conducting this study, the statistical analysis of the primary data collected, and the interpretation and ramifications of the analysis. In the words of Darling-Hammond, "A high-quality teacher evaluation system should create a coherent, well-grounded approach to developing teaching, crafted collectively by state and district leaders with teachers and their representatives" (Darling-Hammond, 2012, p. 4). Therefore, this study attempts to understand the teachers' point of view on the evaluation system, and this chapter forms the basis for the successful undertaking of this research study.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

With the advent of globalization, nations are struggling to stay competitive, resulting in manpower becoming the most critical determinate of socioeconomic success. Education has assumed tremendous importance, with economic growth of nations linked to the quality of their human resources. The better the quality of human capital of a nation, the higher the growth in gross domestic product (GDP) will be. Hanushek and Wobmann elaborated, "Each year of schooling boosts long-run growth by 0.58 percentage points" (Hanushek and Wobmann, 2007, p. 4). Further quality of education is the biggest indicator of economic success of nations. Economic powerhouses, such as Japan, Finland, and South Korea, exemplify this with students belonging to these nations attaining highest scores on international student achievement tests (Hanushek & Wobmann, 2007). Therefore, it is imperative for educators to be inclined towards making their education standards robust. NCLB in 2001 and more recently, Race to the Top, have been introduced to bolster education infrastructure and increase accountability of educators and institutions.

In 2001, Congress reauthorized ESEA, known as NCLB of 2001. With concerns over the lack of international competitiveness of the education system, the act was initiated to exert more federal control over educational institutions. The act supported standards-based education reform that held school leaders accountable for increasing student achievement. The special focus of the act was on bolstering the performance of students belonging to poor and minority communities, English language learners, and

students with special needs. The term Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) became the key focus for educators with a shift in emphasis to the improvement of grade-level scores from the advancement of individual student achievement. In addition, NCLB also stated that individual states bore the responsibility to provide highly qualified teachers to all students. Highly qualified teachers, as defined by the act, are teachers who possess a bachelor's degree and state certification or licensure, and can prove their competence in the subject they teach.

Beyond the above criteria, the federal government did not define what highly qualified meant, and left that to the individual states to determine. As the onus to give a tangible form to "highly qualified" fell on the states, many adopted a standardized content knowledge exam for educators to pass to receive certification. Further, under the act, each state was responsible to bring all students to "proficiency level" in the respective state test by Academic Year 2013-2014. Again the proficiency level of the students was left to the states to define. However, there are major ramifications for educational establishments for non-achievement of AYP, which includes allowing students to transfer to better performing schools, free tutoring, and possible closure of the educational institution (Klein, 2015).

In an effort to step away from NCLB, President Barrack Obama in 2011 announced that his administration would accept waivers from NCLB if individual states would meet new criteria by creating rigorous plans for academic improvement. These plans were to be created with the idea to close achievement gaps and increase the overall level of instruction. Presently 35 states have been granted waivers from NCLB, with Missouri attaining a waiver in June 2012. These waivers have certain attached conditions

for states to fulfill with regard to teacher and principal evaluation guidelines. This led to a renewed scrutiny on teacher evaluation methods in Missouri as well as nationwide. The federal requirement was a more comprehensive approach to evaluating teachers on several parameters involving many different methods, such as observations and feedback, as well as student test scores to assess instructional effectiveness (Darling-Hammond, 2012).

Background of the Evaluation System in Education

Teacher evaluation is a process by which the performance of a teacher is assessed on various parameters in an objective manner by a trained individual (Darling-Hammond, 2012). It is a concept that is almost as old as teaching itself. However, its quality, significance, and consequences have undergone a sea change, and continue to do so. In the words of Darling-Hammond, "A high-quality teacher evaluation system should create a coherent, well-grounded approach to developing teaching, crafted collectively by state and district leaders with teachers and their representatives" (Darling-Hammond, 2012, p. 4),

The 1900s were the most eventful for the development of education as a structured field of study. This was in no small measure due to the evolution of educational psychology. The start of the 20th century brought to the forefront several thoughts in the field of education. John Dewey and Fredrick Taylor were two of the most prolific among them. Dewey's school of thought was based on furthering democracy, such that, educational process should provide practical application of passive concepts. This was a pragmatic approach, whereby students were made aware of their role in the real world (Dewey, 1981). On the other hand, Taylor had a more specific approach,

which was highly appreciated by industrialists and businessmen. Taylor spoke about focusing on the best way of doing a task, and thereby increasing productivity. His studies centered around factory work and efficiency (Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston, 2011).

The Great Depression until World War II saw the beginning of measurable data being used to determine school effectiveness as well as specific teacher feedback in evaluating the lesson. Throughout the remainder of the 1930s, however, there were ongoing issues between the two different philosophies and the effectiveness of each. These two conflicting viewpoints appear to have laid the groundwork for today's educational approach, relying heavily on data to determine educational progress and the transition to standardized testing (Marzano et al., 2011). Post-World War II, there was a dramatic change in the educational system. From a task-oriented approach to formal curriculum-based schooling, education had undergone a paradigm shift. Teachers were given due importance, assistance to develop effective teaching practices, and access to resources. The supervisory role was also created and defined clearly. However, at the outset, the role of the supervisor seemed to be that of a collaborator, with upholding democratic principles, sharing responsibility, joint decision making being some of the responsibilities. Gradually the role of the supervisor expanded. It was at this time classroom observation was identified as an effective way for supervisors and administrators to evaluate teaching practices (Marzano et al., 2011). This was a new approach to education as teachers had always been judged on the based on what types of morals and ethics they were perceived to have, rather than the knowledge they possessed. Classroom observations and teacher evaluations were left entirely to the evaluator, with no standardized process in place. In addition, there was no formal way to measure teacher

performance or growth. Prior to this time period, the theories of personality characteristics formed the basis for evaluating educators, with little emphasis on knowledge and effective instructional methodology. Around the same time, Marzano and Toth (2013) expressed their views about scientific application in the field of education. They introduced testing student performance through scientific methods to arrive at conclusions that could be used to improve the practice of teaching. Educators at the time embraced this, as it was not a tool to evaluate teachers but to assess teaching practices. Over time, many models for supervision of educators were developed.

The Missouri Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation Model

According to DESE (1999), the evaluation system was introduced to all Missouri public school districts as a guideline for educator evaluations. After this, each public school district could choose to use one of the two evaluation models created by DESE or the districts could create their own individual evaluation models. Both of the state's versions of the performance-based teacher evaluation model included evaluative and professional development criteria (DESE,1999).

The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education outlined the evaluations and standards, which were written in the form of a chart. This chart makes up the Missouri Show-Me Standards, and utilizes data to support student performance and assessment (DESE, 1999). Educator performance evaluation measures are needed to emphasize both teacher and administrative training regarding their own and their studied evaluation procedures. This collaborative process can be the development of a successful learning, educational community (Eaker, DuFour, & Burnette, 2002). These

characteristics progress and create a system that permits reliability and valid judgments regarding teacher performances (DESE, 1999).

The Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation Model Criterion (1999) supplied information regarding feedback pertaining to teaching practices and offered pathways for individual professional growth. Collaboration with peers was highly encouraged specifically through peer assistance and coaching. This allowed a mechanism for nurturing professional growth toward a common goal within a teaching community (DESE, 1999).

The state of Missouri has created a model for the primary purpose of evaluating teachers. This model has two parts, performance and professional development (DESE, 1999). Administrators can use these models for the purpose of tenure and for beginning teacher induction. The current performance-based teacher evaluation model suggests that "formal evaluations are performed on non-tenured teachers every year and on tenured teachers every five years" (DESE, 1999, p. 11). However, building administrators and supervisors may formally evaluate a tenured teacher according to each school district's own schedule, with some districts choosing to perform summative evaluation on every employee on an annual basis. All teachers, regardless of their tenure status, should receive frequent unscheduled observations each school year, otherwise known as "drop-in" observations (DESE, 1999).

The professional development portion of the Missouri Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation "provides information and reinforcement of educator professional growth both individually and collectively" (DESE, 1999, p. 11). For example, a school district's implementation of the Missouri Show-Me Standards may mean that teachers

will be forced to redesign their teaching methods to include increasing numbers of classroom "best practices" (DESE, 1999, p. 15). If schools are continually asked to improve the quality of instructional programs and are perceived as a struggling district, then an evaluation system designed to encourage teacher growth should be their Number 1 priority (DESE, 1999).

A performance-based teacher evaluation system should and usually does supply information and feedback regarding valuable practices and may offer a pathway for individual professional growth (DESE, 1999). When teachers are evaluated, administrators are the ones that can make the feeling positive or negative in the classroom at the time of evaluation. If teachers believe they are part of a positive learning community, sharing ideas and encouraging ways to improve will be seen in a more affirmative light (DESE, 1999).

One reason for the differences between public school educator perceptions regarding teacher evaluation may stem from the "basic nature of the relationship between teachers and administrators" (Embretson, Ferber, & Langager, 1984, p. 26). In this regard, Embretson et al. (1984) went on to state that "effective and consistent teacher supervision and evaluation is one of the most important tasks assigned a principal" (p. 26). Because of the administrator's role as evaluator, they establish the climate and tone of the "teacher-administrator relationship" (Embretson et al., 1984, p. 26).

Heller (2004) summed up in his research regarding teacher development and the principal's role by concluding, "In each stage of teacher development, the principal will have a crucial role to play. Creativity, leadership style, communication, diplomacy and knowledge are all significant pieces of the process" (Heller, 2004, p. 11).

In a paper presented at the Annual Conference of California Secondary School Principals, McKay (1986) stated the following: “Therefore, it seems reasonable to examine the nature of the relationship between administrators and teachers and to determine the extent to which teacher perceptions affect general attitudes towards Performance-Based Teacher Evaluations” (McKay, 1986, p. 9).

When looking at relationships between administrators and teachers and then teachers and students, the atmosphere of a classroom also can affect the perceptions of the environment. Schmidt (2003) explored how the atmosphere could affect the evaluative process: “during classroom observations, talkative, humorous, and bright students often capture an evaluators attention and keep it quiet, while well-behaved students get completely ignored” (p. 24). Thus, a valid question must be asked each time a classroom teacher is evaluated: “are all students able to learn from this educator, even the ones who aren’t demanding attention?” (Schmidt, 2003, p. 24). For the answer, the evaluator must be trained to look at all students, the classroom environment as a whole, and teacher interactions (Schmidt, 2003).

According to other researchers like Ellis (1984) and Payton (2000), questions were asked including standards a teachers meet to be considered teaching at a satisfactory level rather than a minimal level and types of general skills required for a person to perform at the satisfactory level (Ellis, 1984; Payton, 2000). They believed that defining these levels was vital in determining a baseline for teachers. Identifying these standards and skills help determine important benchmarks for educators as it relates to the evaluation process.

Professional relationships between public school classroom teachers and building administrators can become an important issue regarding a Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation. “Nurturing relationships is the key to good leadership” (Findley & Estabrook, 1991, p. 294), and if those relationships are fractured, educational progress could be compromised while also harboring ill feelings from educators and administrators. Educators can agree that teacher evaluation can sever professional relationships, which in turn can lead to negative attitudes that may tend to affect the actual educational process as a whole (Findley & Eastbrook, 1991).

Teacher Evaluation Literature

The researcher reviewed literature addressing the historical practice of teacher evaluation. According to Medley, Coker, and Soar (as cited in Pearlman, p. 1), “This history might be divided into three overlapping periods: (1) The Search for Great Teachers; (2) Inferring teacher Quality from Student Learning; and (3) Examining Teaching Performance”

The idea that good teachers possess common characteristic traits and those common traits could be standardized in a manner that could be used to evaluate all teachers was found as a common theme in the historical background review. In 1896, Kratz conducted a study to identify characteristics of 2,411 students’ best teachers in order to establish a benchmark against all other teachers could be judged. Domas and Tiedeman (1950) extended the search to standardize the qualities of good teachers. The two researchers reviewed more than 1,000 studies on teacher characteristics, which resulted in finding no clear identifiers that would help guide evaluators. Getzels and

Jackson (1963) stated that there was no merit to linking teacher characteristics to student learning for evaluation purposes.

Beginning in the 2016-2017 school year, the Performance Evaluation Reform Act (PERA) included student achievement as a significant factor in a teacher's evaluation. The idea of evaluating teachers by the performance of their students has been found throughout the historical review of teacher evaluation. Berk (1988) analyzed 83 studies, which resulted in identifying 50 factors of pupil achievement scores that are not under the control of teachers. The influencing factors could be categorized into the four major groups consisting of student characteristics, school characteristics, test validity, and pretest-posttest design characteristics. While some of these variables could possibly be factored out under experimental conditions, those conditions are not the reality found in schools. Medley et al., (as cited in Berk, 1988) concluded

> "Both the validity and the reliability of such evaluation procedures are far too low to be useful. The basic difficulty arises from the multiplicity of factors not under the teacher's control that affect pupil achievement, the operation of which prevents the most competent teachers from obtaining the highest scores and the least competent from obtaining the lowest scores"(p.24) .

According to Peterson (1995), "No correlation appreciably different from zero was discovered between the evaluation of the teachers on the different rating scales and the evaluations based on the achievement of their pupils in the subject matter areas" (p. 13). Glass (1974) pointed out the dangers of using standardized achievement tests for teacher evaluation purposes, stating that standardized tests are not designed to "reveal the variety of ways in which teaching and learning can be creative, favorably opportunistic,

and uniquely meaningful to students"(p.16) Glass explained that connecting student gains on standardized tests to individual teachers would require random assignment of students, which is not practiced in the school setting.

Peterson (1995) conducted research on teacher evaluation for three U.S. Department of Education and one Utah State Office of Education studies, concluded, "Seventy years of empirical research on teacher evaluation indicate that evaluation practices do not improve teachers or accurately tell what happens in classrooms. Administrator reports do not increase good teachers' confidence or reassure the public about teacher quality" (p.23).

According to Ovando (2001), Tetenbaum and Mulkeen (1988), and Henson and Hall (1993), the demands of increased accountability, academic success of students, and the need to connect staff development and teacher evaluation to improve teaching call for the restructuring of teacher evaluation systems. These demands on public school educational systems and the governmental agencies that oversee them have led to recent and ongoing teaching evaluation reform.

Factors Impacting Evaluation Systems

There is little disagreement in the teaching profession that teachers have the largest impact on student achievement, especially after a large-scale study at the University of North Carolina (Henry, Kershaw, Zulli, & Smith, 2012). This particular study cited evidence that teachers with more education, advanced degrees, experience, and skills have a much greater impact on student learning, regardless of the student's race or background. It would then stand to reason that our largest investment needs to be in the area of teacher preparation. Policymakers, parents, and practitioners all agree that the

best way to improve public education is to ensure that teachers are effective in the classrooms. The dilemma that continues to haunt educators and supervisors is that there is still no practical set of standards of assessment that ensure teacher effectiveness in the classroom (Darling-Hammond, 2010).

Stronge, Tucker and Ward (2003) stated "without high quality evaluation systems, we cannot know if we have high quality teachers" (p. 3); they further added that a lack of quality teachers would impede the success of the education system. In other words, a sound evaluation system constitutes the backbone of a robust education system. A teacher evaluation system first accesses the performance of a teacher by means of various parameters and then provides tangible feedback on improvement. Therefore, a teacher evaluation program has a dual purpose of establishing accountability and providing professional growth (Danielson & McGreal, 2000). These are several factors both accountability oriented and summative, as well as professional development-oriented or formative that impact teacher perceptions on the evaluation system.

Evaluation Methods and Teacher Perceptions

In the United States, standards and methodology of evaluating teacher effectiveness in the classroom is defined by each state's policies and guidelines. An effective teacher evaluation system aims to garner data from various sources, with assessment being undertaken by the most relevant and qualified authority (Felder & Brent, 2004). There are several tools for evaluating teachers such as classroom observations, principal and peer review of a teacher's performance, teacher self-assessment, teacher portfolio review, and value-added measures (Little, Goe, & Bell, 2009).

Classroom observations. Traditionally, instructional effectiveness has been assessed by observing educators in the classroom environment with their students. As enumerated by a study conducted in four districts, it is still the primary educator assessment tool; almost 80% percent of the teachers were evaluated on the basis of classroom instruction, and 50-75% percent of the evaluation scores were based on classroom observation (Whitehurst, Chingos, & Lindquist, 2014). Little, Goe and Bell (2009) stated, "Observations can provide significant, useful information about a teacher's practice if used thoughtfully, but districts must take care to administer them in ways that minimize rater bias and other measurement concerns" (p.6).

However, a report submitted by The New Teacher Project (Weisberg, Sexton & Mulhern, 2009) completely shook the core of the existing teacher evaluation system. Known as "the widget effect", it questioned the paltry presence of less than 1% of unsatisfactory teachers in San Francisco Unified School District, post the instructional effectiveness evaluation undertaken (Weisberg et al. 2009). This was in contrast to feedback by administrators and other teachers, 81% and 57%, respectively, of whom percent reported the presence of at least one ineffective teacher in their midst (Kraft & Gilmour, 2016). In fact, after a research study involving teachers in New York schools by Rockoff and Speroni (2010), the researchers surmised that subjectivity by evaluators and unbiased teacher performance information are the underlying reasons behind the development of the evaluation system. Further, education and knowledge of the evaluators and their ability or inability to understand the complexity and depth of the teacher's professional knowledge are of paramount significance for the success of this system (Kleinhenz & Ingvarson, 2004). "Teachers with students with higher incoming

achievement levels receive classroom observation scores that are higher on average than those received by teachers whose incoming students are at lower achievement levels" (Whitehurst et al. 2014, p. 3).

Classroom observations alone do not give a comprehensive picture of teaching ability as there may be only four or fewer classroom visits by evaluators (Marzano & Toth, 2013). This can be further exemplified by Measure of Effective Teaching (MET; Kane, 2012), a study which compared the Value-Added Models of students with the respective teacher's classroom observation scores. The outcome of the study suggested that several high- performing teachers on the basis of VAM of students were in the lowest percentile when it came to classroom observation scores. In fact, almost 66% of teachers who fell in the lowest percentile did not belong there (Marzano & Toth, 2013). According to Wang and Day (2002), post dialogue with teachers who have undergone assessment, classroom observations are very stressful for them; they feel pressurized to be different from their usual self, and may feel threatened during the assessment. With a view of the inadequacies in the existing system, many states have moved towards a more comprehensive teaching assessment plan based on multiple levels of classroom observations and many parameters to gauge each such level. So apart from firsthand observations of action in a classroom, evaluators also assess other paraphernalia associated with the lesson plan. "Most other measures in teacher evaluation are indirect: the artifacts of instruction (such as lesson plans and student work samples), student reports (via surveys), teacher self-reports (such as portfolio entries), and the outcomes of instruction (student learning growth)" (Danielson, 2013, p. 7).

Student achievement. Student achievement is the degree of attainment of goals and objectives set for different academic levels from primary to university level in a formal educational environment (Steinmayr, Meibner, Weidinger, & Wirthwein, 2014). Every grade has defined academic goals and objectives that need to be met in order for the student to be promoted to the next higher grade. Monitoring of student progress and achievement is becoming more and more important in helping teachers make instructional decisions. Student achievement is impacted by a number of variables such as home environment, school environment, classroom orientation, teacher attributes, and student characteristics (Hattie, 2009).

Teacher characteristics, both experiential as well as personality related, have a critical bearing on student performance. Sanders and Rivers (1996) assessed the impact of teacher instruction on student performance in Tennessee and deduced that the average percentile score of students in Grade 3 with effective teachers for 3 consecutive years was 96 as opposed to 44 for students with low-performing teachers. The Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS), initiated in 1990, was the first system ever designed to capture data on parameters for teacher influence on annual student achievement (Center for Public Education, 2005). The two most relevant findings of TVAAS were that student achievement was high for effective teachers despite weak socioeconomic background, and that consecutive years of effective teaching can significantly enhance the learning ability of students. Fetler (1999) enumerated that student achievement in the subject of mathematics was high, even in low-income schools, where teachers were experienced, qualified, and thoroughly prepared.

There are a number of educator-related characteristics that work in conjunction to bring about student achievement (Rockoff, Jacob, Kane, & Staiger, 2008). In fact, researchers now suggest that performance of students in a classroom could give reliable pointers to administrators on aspects to consider while hiring and evaluating teachers (Darling-Hammond & Haselkorn, 2009). Characteristics of educators that relate to student achievement can be classified as qualification and experience oriented, and classroom practices oriented. There seems to be no consensus on the relative importance of certain teacher characteristics over others as far as student achievement is concerned. Some researchers believe that teaching experience is a bigger determinant of student achievement, rather than qualification or standardized test scores of teachers (Rockoff et al., 2008). Others highlight a link between the scores of educators at college entrance exams assessing a broad range of subjects (ACT) to student achievement (Ferguson & Ladd, 1996).

Even though the minimum qualification required by a teacher is a bachelor's degree, there exists a system of linking pay hike to advancement of education level of teachers. Research suggests that there is little correlation between higher education level of teachers and language ability of students (Clotfelter, Ladd, Vigdor, & Diaz 2004). However, for mathematics and science, educators with advanced qualifications have a positive impact on student achievement (Wayne & Youngs, 2003, Clotfelter et al. 2007). Additionally, certification, which is a mandatory requirement for teachers to enter the profession, has also been assessed to have little bearing on student achievement, with mathematics being the only exception (Wayne & Youngs, 2003). Further, teacher

preparation programs are considered to be completely theoretical, lacking practical application of classroom practices (Levine, 2006).

Classroom practices, where more time is spent by students on active engagement and less on disciplinary activities, positively relates to student achievement (Lewis, Newcomer, Trussell, & Richter, 2006). Marzano (2003) elaborated, "effective classroom management has a powerful impact on students" (p.10). Research suggests that teachers who use progress monitoring and differentiated instruction method not only improve the learning standard of their students but also raise a sense of accountability among them, and these can serve as reliable predictors in student learning outcome. Monitoring students is an important component of student achievement, as it serves dual purpose: at a micro level, it gives a clear understanding of an individual student's strengths and weaknesses, and on a macro level, it provides valuable insights into the robustness of the curriculum (Danielson, 2007). Further, a recent study, done over a 3-year period, concluded that a differentiated approach was extremely successful across a varied group of students (McQuarrie, McRae, & Stack-Cutler, 2008).

Rockoff et al. (2008), in their study while analyzing data from other research studies, found that differentiated instructional methods were more successful than traditional ones in motivating and engaging students, and therefore were more likely to be instrumental in student achievement. In the words of Wang and Holcombe (2010), a constantly developing picture "also suggests that the social, instructional, and organizational climate of schools influences both students' engagement and their academic achievement" (p. 635). Finally, teachers who possess pedagogical ability and in-depth knowledge of the subject will be able to alter instruction and use diverse

materials to explain concepts, and this will most certainly increase student achievement (Danielson, 2007).

Professional development and teacher perceptions. Professional development entails the enhancement of knowledge and pedagogical skills of teachers. This has a much wider scope than career advancement. Imperative for bringing about effective instruction, it can have a positive effect on student achievement (Marzano, 2003). However, the challenge lies in clearly identifying areas in need for professional development. For this to occur, it is critical for administrators and educational establishments to be accurate in collecting individual teacher data, analyzing it thoroughly, and implementing the required development program. Effective professional development programs encompass dissemination of subject-centric and pedagogical content and follow-up for ensuring internalization, helping in application and support from other educators (Blank & de las Alas, 2009).

The first step to professional development is effective evaluation of the teaching practices of educators and emphasis on the formative aspect of the assessment. Shulman (2009) stated, "the very act of preparing for and engaging in assessment would be a powerful form of professional development" (p. 241). Also, superficial teacher evaluation systems cannot adequately address the quality of instruction, and therefore cannot facilitate identification of appropriate professional development of teachers (Toch & Rothman, 2008). In 2009, the widget effect (Weisberg et al., 2009) highlighted the failure of organizations to provide accurate information relating to the effectiveness of teacher instruction, which can lead to failure of providing the best professional development solutions. However, evaluation of educators is the single most important

determinant to identifying professional developmental needs of teachers. “Evaluation planning should be an integral part of professional development planning” (Haslam, 2010, p. 9). Haslam (2010) further added that evaluators should be a part of the team designing professional development programs, and teachers themselves can play a significant role in this respect.

Different stages of teacher evaluation can enhance understanding of professional development needs. With early evaluations to formative evaluations and from summative evaluations to ongoing evaluations, the focus on identifying and implementing professional development program is intact during the entire evaluation exercise (Haslam, 2010). According to Jayaram, Moffit, and Scott (2012), a professional development plan for teachers should be in consonance with the district standards, school goals, and evaluation data; should be content-centric with effective ways to disseminate the new content; provide avenues for new pedagogical enhancement; encourage partnering with peers; and provide formal and informal feedback. Further elements of an effective professional development program should foster a constructive work environment and should include leadership training, self-motivated training and collaborative learning, linking training module to classroom practices, overall enhancement of the school, and continuous development of skills (Stronge, 2006).

However, most professional development programs are found to be standard and repetitive in their content, with not much analysis done to ascertain relevance and impact (Jayaram et al., 2012). In a study done by Johnson and Kardos (2002) on the attitudes and perceptions of teachers on the professional development initiative in New Jersey, the researcher identified a dissonance between the educator’s requirements and the actual

professional development module. In fact, a survey study conducted by Jayaram et. al. (2012) revealed that less than 30% of the teachers felt that the professional development program on pedagogical skills was effective in bringing about enhancement in their classroom practices. Another shortcoming of professional development is that a majority of the programs take place off site. Professional development is most effective when it takes in the working environment and is interwoven with the daily classroom functioning (Guskey, 2000). Professional development of less than 14 hours is known to have no impact on student performance; therefore, skill and content enhancement of teachers needs to be conducted within the working day (Darling-Hammond, Wei, Andree, Richardson, & Orphanos, 2009; DuFour, DuFour, Eaker, & Many, 2010). Therefore, effective professional development programs are imperative for enhancing teacher effectiveness and increasing student learning. The development of effective professional programs is possible with the involvement of teachers, principals, and evaluators in the process of their designing. Further as stated above, professional development is an ongoing process that needs to be undertaken on the job for maximum benefits.

Teachers' Perceptions of the Teacher Evaluation System and Process

Historically, teacher evaluation purposes or goals are generally categorized into terms being formative or summative. Formative evaluations often include classroom observations from a principal or assistant principal, involve data and evidence collection, and normally consist of meetings or conferences with the evaluator and teacher to discuss the lesson(s) observations and data. The formative evaluation process is meant to shape, form, and improve a teacher's practice. The summative process, as the word implies, summarizes all the evidence and data collected to form a final judgments of the teacher's

overall ability. Summative evaluation decisions are primarily used in promoting and terminating teachers. Although the formative and summative processes focus on fundamentally different tasks, they both essentially make up the teacher evaluation system. Stanley and Popham (1988) stated that "the blending of formative and summative teacher evaluation represents a grave conceptual error" (p. 58). While the Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) Project conducted by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation suggested having multiple evaluators to increase validity and reliability of the observation portion of teacher evaluation, Stanley and Popham (1988) suggested different evaluators should be used for the formative and summative components of the teacher evaluation process. Stanley and Popham (1988) explained that for improvement to occur, evaluators need to address classroom procedures or instructional practices that are weak. Teachers are less likely to fully participate in the formative process to improve their teaching practice, and admit to their instructional shortcoming, if they believe the information gathered will later be used against them to form a summative judgment.

Four methods of evaluating teachers were researched using 40 interviews as the primary source of data and 168 questionnaires results as the secondary source of data in a 1985 study of Utah and Florida teachers. The analysis of the data focused on the four methods of evaluating teachers: principal visits, student reports, achievement test scores, and peer evaluations (Kauchak, 1985). The principal visits in the study were something that teachers reported as a "necessary evil" or something done to "maintain the status quo." The large majority of teachers believe that principal visits had little to no impact on their teaching practice (Kauchak, 1985, p. 33). The next evaluation method discussed was student evaluations. The researchers stated, "Though teachers appear to gauge the

effectiveness of their work through the nature of the interactions with students, they have much less confidence in what students say about these interactions" (Kauchak, 1985, p. 34). The approval rate for student evaluations was 38%. When the researchers asked teachers in the study how they felt about using student achievement test results for evaluation purposes, the responses were so consistently against the idea that researchers removed the question from the study. Using student achievement as an evaluative measure of teacher effectiveness was the lowest rated method of the study. The method that did have positive responses from participants in the study was peer evaluations, though some teacher concerns surrounding this form of evaluation dealt with the possible negative impact it could have on peer relationships and the potential to have a negative effect on the school climate (Kauchak, 1985).

The body of research pertaining to teachers' perspectives on teacher evaluation suggests that teachers do not have an overall positive approval rate. A poll conducted by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching found of the 21,698 public school teachers surveyed, only 10% of the teachers felt that they had any say in the issue of teacher evaluation (Peterson & Comeaux, 1990, p. 5). Teachers did however, report the teacher evaluation system does have the potential to have a positive impact on their teaching. In fact, when teachers were asked about the purpose of teacher evaluation, "80% of the teachers responded that evaluation should be used for the improvement of instruction through professional development. Fewer than 20% felt that evaluation should be used to judge competency or to determine continuation of contracts" (Peterson & Comeaux, 1990, p. 5).

Researchers Wagoner and O'Hanlon (1968), along with Zelanak and Snider (1974), documented teacher attitudes towards the Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation process and how it influences their ability to show progress from the evaluation. They went on to say how those who had favorable attitudes towards the performance-based teacher evaluation model process were more likely to benefit from it more so than those with negative attitudes. Similarly, Jensen (1981), who ascertained that classroom teachers varied in their degrees of willingness to be evaluated, also found that teacher opinions toward the Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation process could help or hinder the usefulness of the evaluative process.

James Stigler (2010) wrote in a commentary about talks he had with the U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan and Microsoft cofounder Bill Gates. He spoke of Duncan and Gates' support regarding a new accountability system. The research itself showed varying effectiveness of student progress with much of the same type of varying effectiveness of teacher knowledge in their fields. Stigler told of Gates and Arne proposing developing measures that they considered effective to get rid of bad teachers and increase the pay of good ones.

With concerns regarding teacher shortages and high-stakes testing, researchers Kaplan and Owings (2002) encouraged administrators to employ teachers with degrees in their fields of teaching and full certifications to match. Even now, these educators are under scrutiny from their administrators as well as the state guidelines to provide evidence of knowledge in the classroom and instruction.

Teachers' Perceptions of the Teacher Evaluation System and Professional Growth

Guskey (1994), Weisberg et al. (2009), Garet, et al. (2001), and Peterson (1995) indicated that teacher evaluation systems are one way for schools and school districts to assess a teacher's continued professional growth. State guidelines and school district policies often map out professional development for novice teachers through induction and mentoring programs. Teachers receiving unsatisfactory or needs improvement performance ratings often require written plans that include professional development activities to enable them to improve. It is important to note that numerous research studies old and new conclude that teacher evaluation ratings outside of satisfactory, proficient, or any summative rating that would suggest performance outside of the acceptable range is rare. Since very few school districts have established professional development systems for all teachers tied to their teacher evaluation system, outside of novice or unsatisfactory teachers, professional development continues to be an area of concern in the literature.

Many education professionals still do not see their system as fair, objective or unbiased. Professional development programs that have shown success require a substantial time commitment and are connected to a teacher's specific subject content area, the district's curriculum, and teaching materials. "Most professional development programs do not share these features. There is little or no evidence on how best to evaluate teachers in order to help them grow professionally" (Loeb, Miller, & Strunk, 2009, p. 18).

Fullan (1990) stated that "those involved in staff development must think and act more holistically about the personal and professional lives of teachers as individuals" (p.

22). To ensure that professional development opportunities are effective, the components of adult learning must be an integral part of the experience. Danielson and McGreal (2000) stated, "The principals of adult learning show that when people use self-assessment and self-directed inquiry in professional development, they are more likely to sustain their learning, in more disciplined ways, than when outsiders impose professional development requirements" (p. 25).

A school must maintain and promote a system that is proven effective in enhancing teacher performance. "It is difficult to contemplate an effective education system that does not include infrastructures to support teachers in becoming more effective in the classroom" (Loeb et al., 2009, p. 227). Machell (1995) reported that a significant barrier to teacher growth through effective evaluation was, "the complete domination of the evaluation process by concerns for due process rights and evaluation for accountability concerns to the exclusion of concerns for teacher growth" (p. 262).

Teachers in the Kimball (2002) study reported that professional development opportunities were not pursued with teacher evaluation in mind or for the purposes of improving their overall evaluation. Teachers did not see a correlation between the professional development opportunities provided by the school district and the teachers' own professional development needs. Furthermore, teachers reported that they did not see a clear connection between the purpose and goals of the teacher evaluation system and professional development (Kimball, 2002; Machell, 1995).

Recent research suggests the need to partner professional development and teacher evaluation. "The classroom observation's greatest promises lies in its use as a development tool. To realize that promise, professional development will need to be

individualized to meet teachers' specific needs just as content is being individualized to meet students' needs in some schools today" (Kane, 2012, p. 10).

According to Garet et al. (2001), there has been a growing interest in reform types of professional development. Unlike those most often criticized in literature, such as teacher workshops, mini courses, and conferences, reform activities often take place during the regular school day and include mentoring, coaching during classroom instruction, and being sustained over time. Reform professional development is designed for groups of teachers from the same content or grade level and includes a common goal area. Active learning is a core feature of professional development reform and often includes meaningful discussions, observing and being observed, reflection on videotaped lessons, and reviewing student work with mentor teachers. This type of professional development also has coherence and often is seen as building on earlier activities while becoming more and more advanced through time (Garet et al., 2001).

Teachers' Perceptions

It is important to those who are initiating change to understand teacher perception to the implementation process. Changes in school or state policies cause teachers to respond emotionally to the potential affects these changes may bring. These emotional responses influence how teachers perceive, interpret, and evaluate the changing environment (Troman & Woods, 2001).

Change to any process isn't about getting teachers to conform to new practices. Rather it is about getting teachers to collaborate and reflect on current practices while sharing a vision, promoting risk-taking and building trust. The hope is the end result will be one of collegiality between the teacher and evaluator (Price, 2012).

Feedback. How teachers perceive the quality and effectiveness of teacher evaluation often relates to the quality of the feedback given by the teacher's evaluator. "Among a number of variables studied by Stiggens and Duke, attributes of feedback were identified as having the highest correlation with teachers' perceptions of evaluation quality" (Kimball, 2002, p. 244). In taking a panoptic look at the various characteristics that constitute quality feedback, this one component of the teacher evaluation process may be one of the most complex and may be the most important. Researchers state that feedback needs to be timely, include specific evidence, and show a depth of information. The feedback from evaluators needs to have a persuasiveness of rational for change and the suggestions provided must be credible. In simplistic terms, the feedback needs to be useful for the teacher. The feedback needs to be written in a manner where the teacher can easily apply it to their teaching practice (Stiggens & Duke, 1988; McLaughlin & Pfeifer, 1988; Danielson & McGreal, 2000).

Growth. The New Teacher Project (Weisberg et al., 2009) reported that evaluator and teacher conversations should be ongoing through the evaluation process. The evaluator should discuss, "Overall classroom performance and student progress; professional goals and developmental needs; and the support leaders will provide to meet those needs. Teachers and instructional mangers should come away from these conversations with a shared understanding of what the teacher needs to focus on" (p. 8). If these conversations are not approached as potential learning opportunities and are not done in an open and constructive manner, feedback will be useless.

Researchers in the New Teacher Project study, The Widget Effect, found that in the 12 districts studied, only 26% of teachers received feedback concerning development

areas. “In other words, nearly three of four teachers went through the evaluation process but received no specific feedback about how to improve their practice” (Weisberg et al., 2009, p. 14). In addition to the lack of written feedback, 47% of teachers in the study reported not having a single conversation with their evaluator concerning ways to improve their instructional performance. For the few teachers who did report having developmental areas identified on their evaluation, only 45% of them said they received useful support to improve (Weisberg et al., 2009).

In a study by Kimball (2002) analyzing the evaluation feedback of three school districts that newly implemented the framework for teaching standards-based evaluation system, the majority of teachers reported that verbal and written feedback was given within a week of the observation (Kimball, 2002). The teachers in the study stated that evaluators were only able to provide generic feedback. Several high school teachers stated that their evaluator’s lack of content knowledge lead to their inability to fully evaluate them. “Changes in teaching practice as a result of feedback were generally not characterized as deep” (Kimball, 2002, p. 259). The lack of specific and meaningful feedback was also the theme in the Center for American Progress study. Danielson (2012) stated, “Teachers did not report changing their instructional practices as a result of evaluations. In general teachers noted that they did not receive targeted feedback, more observations, or suggestions on how to teach differently through the program” (p. 3).

Summary

Education, as a field, has developed in leaps and bounds, keeping pace with the fast-changing world. From moral value-led studies, to the present day vast curriculum, education has become all pervasive. The profession of teaching has come a long way too.

Subject-based knowledge, pedagogical practices and classroom practices are some of the many dimensions under the purview of an educator (Killion & Harrison, 2006). Further, there has been tremendous interest in this field owing to its impact on the development of future generations and the quantum of public funds invested in it. This has translated to more scrutiny of educators and educational institutions. Teacher evaluation has existed in the past; however, its application, form, and seriousness have changed over time. Now student performance is taken as a parameter for assessing teacher effectiveness. This has not found favor with educators. Their argument is that a student's performance is impacted by a number of variables that are not under the control of the teacher. Therefore, to hold the teacher solely accountable for a student's performance is unfair (Crouch & Bock, 2014).

With legislations (NCLB) and parental pressure, educators have been toeing the line, albeit with a lot of stress and anxiety. This is evident with the steep increase in teacher turnover rates (Goldring, Taie & Riddles, 2014). This researcher has done a thorough analysis of the relevant literature in this chapter. It is a critical step in understanding the perceptions of educators on the performance evaluation system existing in the state of Missouri. The gaps that exist in the present literature may be bridged by this research study.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOOLGY

Introduction

Teaching has undergone a change in recent years. Although some of the changes have been organic and spontaneous, some proportion is attributed to legislation and increased federal control. From the days of clergy-controlled education to the present scenario of teacher accountability on the basis of student performance, the checks and measures have only increased over time. The ESEA of 1965, NCLB in 2001, and ESSA in 2015 have a profound impact on educators and the education system. With emphasis on student performance, the accountability of teachers has increased; hence, evaluation of teaching practices in the classroom has become more relevant than ever before. Each state has its own evaluation system, however, the essence remains the same. Moreover, student achievement, assessed by means of standardized tests, as one of the parameters for evaluating teacher performance has been met with reservation. As the importance of effective teaching has been reiterated, it stands to reason that educators need to be armed with skills to bring about academic success of their students.

However, it is important to note that this ideal scenario may not exist. Therefore, this research study aimed to understand the perceptions held by teachers on the present evaluation system and its ramifications on classroom instruction. This chapter outlines, in detail, the process followed by the researcher to make factual analysis of the main and supplementary questions posed to understand the research topic. In the words of Leedy and Ormrod (2001) research methodology is “the general approach the researcher takes in carrying out the research project” (p.14).

Research questions serve as a guide to the direction the research should take, and the sources of information that should be accessed to address the research problem in the most effective manner (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001). In case of a quantitative analysis, the way forward is to start with a reasonable theory and to check its verifiability under specific conditions (Newman & Benz, 1998). This research study was an analysis of the cause-effect relationship between several variables. Teachers' Perceptions on Teacher Evaluation System in Missouri is an independent or predictor variable for the research and it is examined by 32 different survey items. This will be discussed in detail subsequently. Teachers' Perceptions of Impact of Teacher Evaluation System on Classroom Instruction in Missouri has been identified as a dependent or outcome variable. Size of the school, type of evaluation tool, and professional development practices are mediators. The relevant research questions developed based on these variables are as follows:

Research Question 1. What are teacher perceptions of the impact of evaluation process on classroom instruction based on the involvement of the teachers in the designing of evaluation requirements?

Research Question 2. What is the difference in perceptions of the evaluation process between teachers based on which type of evaluation tool is being used?

Research Question 3. What is the difference in teacher perceptions of the evaluation process based on the size of the district?

Research Question 4. What is the difference in teacher perceptions of the impact of evaluation based on professional development practices of individual school districts?

These research questions were tested using primary data collected from teachers in Missouri, data was analyzed and conclusions will be discussed in following chapters.

Research Design

Participants. According, to the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), in the academic year 2011-2012, the number of teachers in public schools in the state of Missouri, was 68,700. Participants of current research are teachers who are currently working in public schools in the state of Missouri. The sample size for the research study was 518 school districts with teachers from 78 districts responding. This was a representation of 15% of the K-12 school districts in the state of Missouri. The total number of teachers from these districts invited to participate was 4148. Of the 4148 invited, 843 chose to accept the invitation for a return rate of 20%. These teachers are from public schools in rural, urban, and suburban areas. The participating teachers were at various experience levels, ranging from novices in their first year of education to highly experienced with 30-plus years of experience. Both male and female subjects participated in the study. The participants were selected because they met the criteria for inclusion established by the researcher. The sample frame defined by the researcher for this study is classroom teacher, in any area of public education, in the state of Missouri. The pilot sample group was comprised of teachers ranging from Kindergarten through grade 12. The educators were from different regions in Missouri.

Questionnaire. (Appendix B) "The function of a research design is to ensure that the evidence obtained enables us to answer the initial question as unambiguously as possible" (de Vaus, 2013, p. 9). In this case, there are several questions that are

developed, and the aim of the study is to analyze the efficacy of these questions. For hypothesis testing, quantitative analysis is most appropriate. Quantitative research is the explanation of a theory by means of collecting relevant data and deciphering it statistically (Aliaga & Gunderson, 2003). The research design of this study included the data collection from a teacher questionnaire survey. Based on the review of literature, the researcher developed five sections to address the objectives of this study. The five sections to address the objectives of this study are: (a) demographics, (b) evaluation tools used by teachers, (c) professional development practices, (d) Teachers' Perceptions on Teacher Evaluation System in Missouri, and (e) Teachers' Perceptions of Impact of Teacher Evaluation System on Classroom Instruction in Missouri.

Consent. The survey, informed e-mail consent, ethics certificate, and Research Review Board (RRB) application will be sent to the RRB electronically and as a paper copy with the appropriate signatures for approval. Participants gave consent to be involved in the study by completing the online survey. The submitted forms outlined participant confidentiality, the ability to withdraw at any time without penalty, lack of any foreseen harm to respondents, and a brief overview of the purpose of the study to examine principals' perceptions of their current and ideal teacher evaluation process.

Instrumentation

For this research study, a survey questionnaire was developed by the researcher based on the desire to obtain specific information from the participants. The survey instrument elicited demographic information such as educational level, type of district, years of experience, and gender from the participants. Data collection from teachers was confidential as there were no specific identifiers on the survey. The field test was sent to

these educators, and feedback was sought. Feedback from this pilot indicated the study was too lengthy. Based on the results of this pilot study, necessary adjustments or corrections were made to facilitate the smooth undertaking of the final research study. After consulting with experts, the open-ended response questions were removed as they were determined to not adequately address the research questions. This resulted in a more appropriate length survey.

After reviewing the results of the field test, the researcher made necessary corrections, additions, or deletions. The survey was emailed to teachers of Missouri public school districts identified as public. This included urban, suburban and rural schools. The researcher sough to identify rural through the Missouri Association of Rural Educators (MARE) but was unable to obtain clarification as to the classification of rural schools. As a result, the researcher used the definition of rural from the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) of more than 5 mile and less than 25 miles from an urbanized area. No parameters were given as to the population of the school. The parameters were set by the researcher at 1-500, 501-1500, 1501-2500 and 2501 and above for the purpose of the study. The final version of this survey used in this study consisted of 41 questions to be rated on a 6 point Likert scale. Educators were asked to rate their perceptions on the respective evaluation systems within their districts with said scale. The last two questions were asked in order to determine teacher perception regarding the benefits and needs for improvement relating to their evaluation system. These 41 questions were classified into a practices scale, a beliefs scale, and an effectiveness scale for additional analysis. The final questionnaire was administered either as a soft copy through e-mail, or a hard copy through post or hand delivery.

To improve the reliability and validity of the research parameters such as the questionnaire, and the sample, a pilot study was conducted by the researcher. A purposive sampling of two school districts was used to pilot the instrument. After obtaining feedback from the pilot, the researcher revised the survey by deleting several repetitive questions along with the two open-ended response questions. The researcher reviewed feedback, paying particular attention to the wording and length of the survey. Additional refinement of the survey instrument was needed in order for them to be completed within 15 minutes. The final survey was a 15 minute survey. Prior to distribution, the survey was field tested by the researcher using the Scott City, Missouri school district. The regions surveyed are identified as region(s) 1-11 by the Missouri Department of Education by each Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC). The Scott City R-1school district was not included in the final survey sampling due to its use during the piloting process. Districts outside the identified regions were not included in the survey. The data was imported and compiled in Microsoft Excel with the purpose of creating statistical analysis. Based on the statistics produced, necessary adjustments were made before further review. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software was used to calculate statistics. Feedback from the pilot survey seemed to indicate that length would hinder the response rate. With input from the panel of experts, additional revision was made to the survey instrument. The pilot study helped to identify discrepancies, in terms of logistical issues, research instrument appropriateness, and sample frame definition that may exist in undertaking the research study (van Teijlingen & Hundley, V., 2001).

Data Collection Period of Survey Disseminated to Teachers

For this study, surveys were emailed to schools in Missouri identified through a simple random selection process. Email addresses were obtained through the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education directory. Permission was sought from each district's superintendent and surveys were distributed to building principals to give to teachers. A cover letter was also distributed which outlined the purpose of the study, time required for completion and how responses would be kept confidential. A questionnaire (see Appendix B) for this study was distributed online through the survey tool site QuestionPro. The email contained the link to the site for the purpose of completing the survey. The researcher stressed the importance of confidentiality and assured participants only aggregate responses would be reported in the survey results. This ensured confidentiality in the surveying process. Along with the questionnaire, a consent form was sent to each participant explaining the following criteria: purpose of the study, directions for completing the survey, potential risk of participation, steps taken to protect confidentiality of responses, and that the participation in the survey was voluntary. After 7 days, a follow-up questionnaire was distributed to participants to ensure a sufficient number of responses to the survey. When the number of respondents was sufficient, the data collection period ended, the survey was closed, and analysis of the data began.

In January 2018, surveys were e-mailed. The subjects met the criteria of public school superintendents in Missouri public schools. Each received a request to conduct research. The schools were from various geographic regions, various socioeconomic

areas, and diversified populations. An invitation to participate in the study was sent to each school administrator and teacher to increase the response rate of the survey.

Data Analysis

To determine whether or not there was a difference in the perceptions regarding the impact of teacher evaluation system on classroom instruction in Missouri, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) and Pearson *r* was performed. The researcher used the ANOVA to assess the presence of statistically significant differences or uniqueness between perceptions of teachers in different sized districts, different PD practices, and different types of evaluation tools being used. A Pearson r test was used in comparing the two quantitative variables; that there was or was not a statistical relationship in teacher perception between teachers who had involvement in the design or selection of their evaluation tool and teacher who did not.

Summary

The study was based on a quantitative research design focused on public school teachers in Missouri. The data were collected through a questionnaire administered to teachers who were selected by random sampling method. Danielson's (2013) framework for teaching provided the theoretical and conceptual framework for the research instrument developed by the researcher. The data collected was analyzed using SPSS software and the results along with interpretations will be discussed, in the subsequent chapters.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to gather information regarding teacher perceptions of the evaluation process in Missouri public schools. This chapter is utilized to organize and present the data gathered from the study. Data were analyzed statistically in order to address the four research questions. These questions sought to establish teacher perceptions of the evaluation process on classroom instruction based on the region in which they were teaching, the type of evaluation tool being used, and the size of the school being surveyed. In addition, it sought to establish the difference in teacher perceptions of the evaluation process based on professional development practices of individual school districts.

Analysis of Data

The first section of the instrument sought to acquire data from the demographic information of the survey respondents. The second and third sections were organized to ask questions that would give evidence to answer the research questions effectively. The responses were all designed to use a modified Likert scale with six options including 1= *Strongly Agree* (SA), 2= *Agree* (A), 3= *Neutral* (N), 4=*Disagree* (D), 5=*Strongly Disagree* (SD), and 6=*Not Applicable* (NA).

Descriptive Statistics

The first section of the survey questionnaire contained information seeking to identify the location of the school, grade level taught, gender, level of education, teaching

experience as a teacher and within the specific school, evaluation tool used in the school, and the size of the school district as indicated in Table 1:

Table 1

Respondent's Distribution Based on the Location of Their School

Region	Respondents	Percentage
Southeast	65	8.05%
Heart of Missouri	68	8.43%
Northeast	81	10.04%
Northwest	81	10.04%
Agency for Teaching	6	0.74%
South Central	97	12.02%
Greater Ozarks	38	4.58%
Central	167	20.69%
SW Center for Ed. Excel	205	25.40%

Data represented in Table 1 indicates 25.40% of participating schools self-identified as being in the Southwest Center for Educational Excellence professional development region followed by those whose schools are located in Central Missouri (20.69%), South Central (12.02%), Northeast and Northwest (10.04% each), Heart of Missouri (8.43%), Southeast (8.05%), Greater Ozarks Cooperating School Districts (4.58%), and lastly, Agency for Teaching and Learning (0.74%).

Table 2

Distribution of Respondents from Demographic Responses

Question	Respondents	Percentage
Evaluation Model		
NEE	554	65.87%
DESE Model	203	24.14%
District-Developed	84	9.99%
School Size		
500 or fewer students	302	35.91%
501-1,500 students	354	42.09%
1,501-2,500 students	139	16.53%
2,501 or more	46	5.47%
Grade Level Taught		
Elementary	350	41.52%
Middle School	157	18.62%
High School	336	39.86%
Gender		
Male	199	23.66%
Female	642	76.34%
Level of Education		
Bachelor's	288	34.56
Master's	483	57.91
Ed. Specialist	45	5.35
Doctorate	15	1.78
Educator Experience		
Less than 10 years	200	23.78%
10-20 years	400	47.56%
20-25 years	148	17.60%
More than 25 years	93	11.06%
Teaching Experience at Current School		
Less than 10 years	246	29.25%
10-20 years	410	48.75%
20-25 years	118	14.03%
More than 25 years	67	7.97%

As indicated in Table 2, 65.87% of the 841 respondents acknowledged that their schools used the Network for Educator Effectiveness model for evaluating teachers in their district. Those using the DESE model in their schools were 24.14% while those applying the district-developed model were 9.99%.

Of the 841 respondents, 42.09% came from school districts with 501-1,500 students. Three hundred and two teachers surveyed came from districts with 500 or fewer students. The teachers surveyed from school districts with 1,501-2,500 students were 16.53% of the 841 respondents with only 5.47% respondents comprised of teachers from districts of 2,501 or more as indicated in Table 2. Respondents were asked in question 2 of the survey what grade level they taught. Table 2 also illustrates grade level taught for the categories of elementary, middle school and high school. Table 2 shows of the 841 participants in this study, 642 or 76.34% were female and 199 or 23.66% of the participants were male. As indicated in Table 2, 41.52% of respondents identified the grade level taught as elementary with 39.86% high school and 18.62% middle school.

Table 2 also shows of the 841 participants, 57.91% held a master's degree followed by those with a bachelor's degree (34.96%), then those with Ed. Specialist (5.35%), and finally doctorate (1.78%). Also indicated in Table 2, most respondents (47.56%) had taught for 10 to 20 years whereas 23.78% had taught for less than 10 years. Among the 841 respondents, 17.60% had taught for 20 to 25 years and 11.06% had taught for more than 25 years. Of the 841 respondents, 410 or 48.75% identified themselves as having 10-20 years of teaching experience in their current school. One hundred and eighteen or 14.03% of the 841 respondents identified themselves as having a 20- to 25- years teaching experience at their current school and 7.97% reported having a

more than 25-year teaching experience at their current school. Two hundred and forty-six or 29.25% had a less than 10-year teaching experience at their current school.

Inferential Statistics

Inferential statistics were computed based on perceptions of teachers regarding teacher evaluation systems in Missouri and professional development practices. Research evidence was analyzed using an ANOVA to establish the differences in perceptions of the evaluation based on which type of evaluation tool was being used, the size of the school being surveyed, and professional development practices of individual school districts. Analysis of the data assisted the researcher in accepting or rejecting the hypotheses.

Research Questions

Research Question 1: What is the difference in the teacher perception of the impact of the evaluation process on classroom instruction based on the involvement of the teachers in the designing of the evaluation requirements?

Since two groups of teachers emerged regarding their involvement in the designing of specific areas of the evaluation process (those involved and those not involved), ANOVA statistics were used to confirm or reject the first hypothesis.

Table 3

Direct Involvement in the Design of Evaluation Requirements

Process Design	Sig	F
Behaviors and practices in evaluation	0.002	9.820
Summative rating	0.000	.000
Adequate staff development	0.000	.000
Trained evaluator	0.009	.009
Professional dialogue	0.052	.052
No impact on teacher-evaluator relationships	0.034	.034
Collaboration	0.005	.005
Written and verbal feedback	0.016	.016
Written and verbal improve teaching	0.001	.001
Written and verbal feedback accuracy	0.014	.014
Teacher evaluation has a positive impact	0.002	.002
Teacher evaluation offers professional development opportunities	0.000	.000
Unifies teachers and administrators	0.000	.000
Positive impact on teachers	0.000	.000
Fair and objective	0.007	.007
Assess student learning	0.026	.026
Culture	0.032	.032
Professional development	0.027	.027

Note: Significance level of ps < 0.05

While investigating the involvement in the design of evaluation requirements b, *p* values obtained were all below the 0.05 level of significance with the exception of professional dialogue. This indicates the difference in the means of teachers' perceptions regarding being involved in determining the behaviors and practices to be evaluated on were statistically significant. The value was less than the acceptable value of 0.05 in educational contexts (Connolly, 2007).

Null Hypothesis 1: There will be no difference in teacher perceptions regarding the evaluation process on classroom instruction based on the involvement of the teachers in the designing of evaluation requirements.

Since the findings show the differences in teacher perceptions regarding the evaluation process on classroom instruction based on their involvement in the designing of evaluation requirements to be statistically significant in each area, the researcher failed to accept Null Hypothesis.

Research Question 2: What is the difference in perception of the impact of the evaluation process between teachers based on the type of evaluation tool being used?

Table 4

Correlation Between the Evaluator's Accuracy and the Evaluation Tool Being Used

		Value	Asymptotic Standardized Error[a]	Approximate *t*[b]	Approximate Significance
Interval by Interval	Pearson's *r*	-.070	.039	-2.006	.045[c]
Ordinal by Ordinal	Spearman Correlation	-.106	.035	-3.050	.002[c]
n of Valid Cases		828			

In Table 4, feedback from the evaluator's accuracy was positively and strongly correlated with the evaluation tool used by the educators while teaching. In some regions, the evaluation model used may be utilized differently or include other variables. Therefore, teachers were more likely to give varying opinions.

Table 5

Correlation Between the Evaluation Tool and the Teacher Evaluation Being Fair and Objective

		Value	Asymptotic Standardized Error[a]	Approximate *t*[b]	Approximate Significance
Interval by Interval	Pearson's *r*	-.084	.034	-2.430	.015[c]
Ordinal by Ordinal	Spearman Correlation	-.095	.035	-2.744	.006[c]
n of Valid Cases		831			

This question was statistically significant, indicating that the relationship between the evaluation tool used and the teacher evaluation being fair and objective was notably different based on the type of evaluation tool being used to evaluate respondents. The different regions had different teacher evaluation models that had varying levels of objectivity and fairness, causing the teachers to have varying perceptions.

Null Hypothesis 2: There will be no difference in teacher perception of the impact of evaluation process on classroom instruction based on the type of evaluation tool being used.

Since the correlations are statistically significant, the researcher failed to accept null hypothesis two.

Research Question 3: What is the difference in teacher perception of the impact of the evaluation process based on the size of school being surveyed?

The researcher disaggregated survey data based on size of the school including those with less than 500 students, 501-1500, 1501-2500 and over 2,500 students. The results are as shown below. The results assess the variation of teacher perception based on their school size and then the statistical significance of the variation so as to reject or retain the null hypothesis 3.

Table 6

Correlation Between the Teacher Perceptions and School Size Regarding Clear Written and Verbal Feedback

		Value	Asymptotic Standardized Error[a]	Approximate t^b	Approximate Significance
Interval by Interval	Pearson's *r*	.068	.036	1.976	.048[c]
Ordinal by Ordinal	Spearman Correlation	.057	.035	1.656	.098[c]
N of Valid Cases		834			

Significant at p<0.05 level

While investigating teacher perception regarding whether teachers received clear written and verbal feedback in the specific areas in which they need to improve when using the Missouri educator systems, it was found this the correlation between receiving clear written and verbal feedback in the specific areas in which they need to improve and

the school size was positive and statistically significant. In this view, they were more likely to have varying perceptions as shown in Table 6.

Table 7

Correlation Between the Teacher Perceptions and School Size Regarding Feedback Being Accurate

		Value	Asymptotic Standardized Error[a]	Approximate t^b	Approximate Significance
Interval by Interval	Pearson's *r*	.079	.036	2.282	.023[c]
Ordinal by Ordinal	Spearman Correlation	.083	.035	2.385	.017[c]
N of Valid Cases		831			

Significant at p<0.05 level

Based on the teacher perceptions regarding receiving educator feedback that was accurate, it was found the correlation between the teacher perceptions regarding obtaining educator feedback that was accurate and their school size was positive and statistically significant. According to respondent perceptions, some of the schools promoted accurate feedback among the teacher evaluators as others did not put forth effort to ensure their teacher evaluators gave accurate feedback so as to improve teaching. As such, the teachers' perceptions were more likely to vary based on the size of the school one came from.

Null Hypotheses 3: There is no difference in teacher perception of the impact of the evaluation process based on the size of the school being surveyed.

Since the correlation between teachers' perceptions regarding the evaluation process on classroom instruction based on school district surveyed was positive and statistically significant, the researcher failed to accept null hypothesis 3 stating that there

will be no variation of teacher perceptions regarding the evaluation process on classroom instruction based on size of the school district surveyed.

Research Question 4: What is the difference in the teacher perception of the impact of the evaluation process on classroom instruction based on the professional development practices of the individual school districts?

Table 8

Perception of Professional Development Practices

		Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	Sig.
Assessment of student learning	Between Groups	3.318	1	3.318	5.002	.026
	Within Groups	547.866	826	.663		
	Total	551.184	827			
	Total	734.554	827			
Creation of a learning culture	Between Groups	3.351	1	3.351	4.622	.032
	Within Groups	598.769	826	.725		
	Total	602.120	827			
Growing and continuous professional development	Between Groups	4.129	1	4.129	4.909	.027
	Within Groups	695.531	827	.841		
	Total	699.660	828			

Concerning the assessment of student learning, it was indicated that differences in the means of teachers' perceptions regarding the assessment of student learning based on the professional development practices of districts were statistically significant.

The question regarding creation of a culture for learning indicated the differences in the means of teachers' perceptions regarding the establishment of a culture for learning were statistically significant. This meant the perceptions associated with the professional development practice of creating a culture of learning was not uniform among the respondents. The schools were unlikely to foster similar levels of learning cultures and by

this, it meant that teachers had varying opinions related to the establishment of the learning culture in their schools.

In relation to continuous growth and advancing professionally, the question was statistically significant indicating that the relationship between continuous growth and advancing professionally was not uniform among respondents. In this view, different schools had professional development programs embraced, which may not have been growth-oriented, resulting in inconsistency in the advancement of teachers. In this view, the respondents of the survey questionnaires were more likely to give varying opinions regarding the schools' ability to support their growth and development as professionals.

Null Hypotheses 4: There will be no difference in teacher perception of the impact of evaluation process on classroom instruction based on the professional development practices of the individual school districts.

Since the findings indicated the differences in the means of teachers' perceptions about growing and developing professionally while in their schools, creation of a learning culture, and student learning assessment were statistically significant, then the researcher failed to accept the fourth hypothesis stating that there will be no difference in teacher perception of the evaluation process on classroom instruction based on the professional development practices of the individual school districts.

Summary

This chapter has presented the differences in perceptions of teachers who participated in this study set to investigate teacher perceptions of the evaluation process in Missouri public schools. The section has highlighted the use of both descriptive and inferential statistics to explain the research data. Through the presentation of the analyzed

data, a general picture regarding perceptions of the teachers towards the teacher evaluation process was highlighted. The findings established there were differences in teacher perception of the evaluation process on classroom instruction based on the size of the school being surveyed.

There were differences in teacher perceptions regarding the evaluation process on classroom instruction based on the involvement of the teachers in the designing of evaluation requirements. Similarly, there were differences in teacher perceptions of the evaluation process's impact on classroom instruction based on the type of evaluation tool being used. Finally, there were differences in teacher perceptions of the evaluation process on classroom instruction based on the professional development practices of the individual school districts. The researcher failed to accept all null hypotheses. The next chapter presents the conclusion and recommendations of the dissertation.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Through the use of the teacher evaluation process in Missouri, more particularly the Network for Educator Effectiveness System based on Model Teacher and Leader Standards adopted in 2011, teacher growth has been targeted. The evaluation of teachers is usually aimed at improving decisions regarding hiring as well as ensuring teacher effectiveness. However, the variables of the teacher evaluation process being used in other institutions may trigger varying perceptions among teachers (Ovando, 2001).

This study was intended to understand the extent to which teachers perceive the Missouri Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation process and the accuracy of reporting were likely to help improve teacher performance. According to Danielson (2001), the evaluation system is expected to promote quality teaching. In the current era, school districts have found there is great potential in adjusting the teacher evaluation system to contribute towards quality teaching. Based on the requirements of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System criteria, educational administrators are key in the implementation of the teacher evaluation tools as established by DESE. Danielson further acknowledged that teacher evaluations are essential with regard to improving their performance. The study sought to determine if the Missouri performance-based teacher evaluation model from the educators' viewpoint or whether the school districts should further develop their individual teacher evaluation tools. This chapter gives a summary of the research methods and findings as well as the limitations of the study. It also gives the discussion

of the findings in relation to previous research studies. In addition, recommendations for future research as well as the implications for practice are noted.

Summary of Methods

This study employed quantitative methods to gather evidence to test the hypotheses thus answering the research. Eight hundred and forty-one participants participated in the study to offer the needed evidence. The sample participants were classroom teachers in any area of public education in the state of Missouri. The survey was used to gather evidence via three sections including one for demographic information, one for perceptions of teachers on the teacher evaluation system in Missouri, and the one for teacher perceptions on professional development practices. Data obtained from the survey questionnaires were then imported into SPSS software and analyzed using an ANOVA and the Pearson's *r* value to establish the significance of the differences in the mean of teacher perceptions regarding the teacher evaluation process and statistical significance of the correlations established respectively.

Summary of Findings

The findings were presented based on the hypotheses that included; (a) there will be no difference in teacher perceptions of the evaluation process impact on classroom instruction based on the involvement of the teachers in the designing of evaluation requirements; (b) there will be no difference in teacher perceptions of the evaluation process impact on classroom instruction based the type of evaluation tool being used; (c) there will be no difference in teacher perceptions of the evaluation process impact on classroom instruction based on the size of school being surveyed; (d) and there will be no difference in teacher perceptions of the evaluation process's impact on classroom

instruction based on the professional development practices of the individual school districts.

In relation to research question 1, all teacher evaluation aspects were correlated with their involvement in the designing of evaluation requirements. In most aspects such as their invlovement in the development of a feedback system and designing the written and verbal feedback process to improve teaching, the correlation was statistically significant since the *p*-value was less than the acceptable value of 0.05, indicating that the aspects were varied as well between the school districts, making the teacher perceptions varied. Regarding being involved in developing clear summative assessments, the result implied the difference in the means of teachers' perceptions based on their involvement was statistically significant. In this view, the teachers were likely to have varying perceptions regarding their involvement in the development of clear summative rating.

Adequate staff development on the evaluation process was also recorded. This question was statistically significant, indicating the relationship between the teacher perceptions of being provided adequate staff development was varied. This indicates there may be conflicting views in this area. As such, the teachers' perceptions were more likely to vary. Furthermore, whether they were involved in determining the extent of training of the evaluators was obtained. The value indicated that the difference in the means of perceptions of teachers regarding their involvement in determining the evaluators' extent of training to give consistent judgments was statistically significant.

For involvement in the engaging in professional dialogue, it was indicated that the difference in the means of teachers' perceptions regarding their involvement in the designing of the professional dialogue was statistically significant.

Regarding the involvement in designing the way feedback was given in the classroom, the value indicated the difference in the means of teachers' perceptions associated with their involvement in designing the way feedback was to be given. In this view, the teachers were more likely to have varying perceptions regarding the involvement in designing the feedback given.

The involvement of teachers in designing how collaboration in the evaluation process should be done implied the difference in the means of the teachers' perceptions regarding their involvement in designing collaboration with evaluators was statistically significant. As such, the teachers in the survey were more likely to have varying perceptions based on their involvement in the designing of the collaboration process.

To determine whether the teachers were involved in designing the written and verbal feedback in the specific areas in which they need to improve, the value implied that the difference in the means of the teachers' perceptions regarding their involvement in designing the written and verbal feedback in the specific areas they needed to improve was statistically significant. In this view, the teacher respondents were more likely to have varying perceptions.

Regarding the designing of the written and verbal feedback to include both areas of improvement and strengths, it was implied that the difference in the means of the teachers' perceptions regarding their involvement in designing the feedback to include areas of improvement and strengths was statistically significant. In this view, it was more likely that the teachers' perceptions would vary. This would be affected by the expectation of feedback from evaluators addressing teacher strengths as well as areas in need of improvement.

Regarding the involvement in designing the accuracy of the feedback from the evaluators, a significant relationship was found. This showed that the difference in the means of the teachers' perceptions associated with their involvement in designing the accuracy of the feedback was statistically significant. In this view, the respondents were more likely to give varying opinions based on whether or not they agreed with the accuracy of feedback being provided to them during the evaluation process.

While investigating to determine whether teachers were involved in designing the evaluation process to have a positive impact on the teaching practice as well as professional development, the value denoted the difference in the means of the teachers' perceptions based on their involvement in designing the evaluation process to have a positive impact on the teaching practice as well as professional development was significant statistically. Therefore, the teacher respondents had varying perceptions. Again, this is found likely to differ based on teacher involvement in the design and selection of the evaluation process.

In relation to getting involved to design the evaluation process to offer more professional development opportunities, a relationship was found to exist. The value indicated that the difference in the means of the teachers' perceptions based on their involvement in designing the evaluation process to offer more professional development opportunities was statistically significant. In this view, the teachers were more likely to have varying perceptions.

While investigating whether teachers were involved in designing their observation feedback to improve the teaching practice, the value obtained implied that the difference in the means of the teachers' perceptions regarding their involvement in designing their

observation feedback to improve the teaching practice was statistically significant. In this view, the teachers responding to the questionnaires were more likely to have varying opinions.

While investigating to understand whether the teachers were involved in designing a unifying evaluation process, the relationship obtained, showed that the difference in the means of the teachers' perceptions was not statistically significant. In this view, it was more likely that they would give varying views in the survey.

While investigating to know if the teachers were involved to design the evaluation process so as to have a positive impact on teacher practice, the value noted, implied that the difference in the means of the teachers' perceptions was statistically insignificant. Therefore, the teacher respondents were more likely to have varying perceptions on this thought.

Between some aspects such as whether feedback improved teaching and applying peer observation to improve teaching, the recorded value indicated teacher perceptions between districts in these areas were similar. It would make sense that there would be a degree of variance in this area. Teachers who have involvement in the design process of their respective evaluation tools would feel more involved in the process, thereby changing their perception toward their respective evaluation tool. Relating to teacher perceptions of applying peer observation to improve teaching, it appears that respondents consistently disagreed this practice was taking place in their school. This proved interesting as it indicates a professional development practice may not be utilized in the majority of Missouri schools.

Based on research question 2, the data indicated the correlation between the evaluation tools used and the teacher evaluation being fair and the objective as well as the feedback from the evaluator being accurate was positive and statistically significant. Two of the teacher evaluation practices (being fair and objective as well as accurate feedback from the evaluator) in Missouri recorded *p* values which were less than the acceptable value of 0.05. One can argue that since the teacher evaluation elements defined in Missouri's systems were different across school districts, teachers were more likely to give varying views. However, the teacher evaluation process having a positive impact on the teaching practice and professional development; observation feedback helping individuals look for ways to improve teaching practice on their own; teacher evaluation unifying teachers and administrators; the feeling that the teacher evaluation process has a positive impact on teacher practice recorded a *p* value greater than 0.05. This meant that these aspects of the evaluation tool were not statistically significant.

Based on the research question 3, the survey questions ("clear written and verbal feedback" and "educator feedback obtained is accurate") indicated the correlation between the teachers' perceptions and the size of the school surveyed were statistically significant. Based on this finding, the null hypothesis was rejected. However, other teacher evaluation aspects such as the use of professional dialogue, collaboration between evaluators and teachers, the positive impact of teacher evaluation, the provision of professional development opportunities, and the selection of ways to improve teaching after receiving observational feedback recorded a *p* value that was greater than the recommended value of 0.05. Thus, it can be argued the size of the school contributes to the varying perceptions held by teachers responding to the survey questions.

Based on research question #4, teachers' perceptions of the professional development practices regarding assessment of students, participating in professional communities and creating a conducive learning environment indicated a relationship that was positive. Thus, the differences in the mean of the teachers' perceptions were statistically insignificant. The aspects of assessing student learning, establishing the culture of learning, and the ability of the evaluation to offer teachers an opportunity to grow and develop professionally showed a positive relationship, thus the researcher rejected the fourth null hypothesis. In this view, the different professional development practices of individual school districts determined the impact of the teacher evaluation process on the classroom instruction. Since different schools embrace specific professional development practices more than others, the teachers were more likely to give varying opinions.

Limitations of the Study

The collection of data using the questionnaire may have limited the research from gaining in-depth insights into the use of the teacher evaluation process to improve classroom instruction. The impact of teacher evaluation may vary from one district to another, thus affecting the expected outcomes. Limiting the study to the state of Missouri meant that the findings might not be generalized to other populations. It should be noted the study did not include first-year teachers and K-8 school districts making, generalization to those populations difficult. Lastly, the study also faced a limitation in the number of responses since the anticipated response rate was not achieved.

Discussion of Findings

Through the analysis of the survey data, the findings obtained show that teachers had varying perceptions regarding some aspects of the teacher evaluation systems. The current teacher evaluation systems in Missouri offered opportunities that were aimed at improving classroom practice; however, some were found to be different based on school size and professional development practice being promoted in a given school district. This research supports the argument of Darling-Hammond (2012), who stated that the evaluation system creates well-grounded and coherent techniques to advance teaching that is collectively pursued by district educational leaders and state leaders as well. Eaker et al. (2002) asserted the Missouri teacher evaluation system facilitated a collaborative process that integrates a successful learning and educational community. Based on this reasoning, one can argue the teachers' perceptions regarding the evaluation process ought to be similar. However, in some schools, unlike others, the evaluators failed to offer reliable and valid teacher judgments associated with their performance, thereby causing the evaluation process to attract different perceptions among teachers (DESE, 1999).

The teacher evaluation system was noted to encourage the provision of feedback regarding teachers' performance so that they could look for ways of improving their classroom practice. Collaboration was also noted to be embraced in some school districts while in others it was not embraced due to the size and professional development practices involved. This may be one reason for variance in teacher perceptions. The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (1999) contrasted the above arguments by saying that the Missouri teacher evaluation system encouraged collaboration and provision of feedback when an evaluator assesses given teachers. This

would suggest teachers might have similar perceptions about the evaluation process and system at large. Similarly, the evaluation systems supported two sections including performance and professional development (DESE, 1999). However, this was not the case since some aspects including the teacher evaluation process having a positive impact on the teaching practice and professional development, observation feedback helping individuals look for ways to improve teaching practice on their own, and the feeling that the teacher evaluation process has a positive impact on teacher practice attracted varying perceptions. Based on the findings of this study, the Missouri teacher evaluation systems are possibly not being followed as stringently as is recommended for them to accomplish the mission of closely monitoring the growth of Missouri teachers. The provision of unbiased, timely feedback by teacher evaluators was part of the teacher evaluation process found to be the most beneficial for teachers. By this, the evaluation system ought to focus more on giving the teachers a feedback containing the weaknesses and strengths realized so as to identify opportunities for improvement in the future (Darling-Hammond, 2012).

Recommendations for Future Research

From the conclusions and limitations of this research, implications for future research can be drawn. Some of the recommendations that ought to be considered in future research including the following:

1. A more in-depth understanding of the teacher perceptions regarding each school district teacher evaluation process would impact classroom practice depending on the size of the school district. This may assist in addressing the inconsistencies originating as a result of varying school district sizes.

2. The current study focused on teacher perceptions regarding the teacher evaluation process based solely on responses from the teachers. Therefore, future research should consider including the perceptions of administrators because they are a valuable piece of the classroom improvement program.
3. The current study focused on school districts within Missouri and using its teacher evaluation system. Further research might be conducted to focus on the use of the evaluation system in a specific district to avoid the moderating effects of school size while exploring professional development practices in depth.
4. Further research could also explore other factors such as the level of education of the evaluators, the number of years of teaching experience per evaluator, and the administrative experience of the evaluators. As such, their effect on the evaluation process will be established in relation to improving the classroom practice.
5. The current study addressed teachers' perceptions within their current context. Further research could employ longitudinal research to have a full understanding of how teacher perceptions regarding the impact of the teacher evaluation process on classroom practice vary with time. This might obtain a deeper understanding regarding whether the evaluation process is adequate.
6. Further research should incorporate a mixed-method design so that the researcher can integrate both quantitative and qualitative research findings to triangulate evidence associated with the impact of the teacher evaluation process on classroom practice improvement.
7. Lastly, further research could include a study of larger schools and teacher perceptions. In this study, feedback was limited as many larger schools utilized a

vetting process limiting the larger school data pool. Feedback from many superintendents in the largest (2,500 and above) was that their teachers had many other areas of focus and they declined the invitation to participate. Therefore, evaluating larger schools alone would be a valuable study for future researchers. This may provide new data that could show significant differences between the ways larger schools evaluate teachers as opposed to smaller districts.

Implications for Practice

The current research findings are important for school administrators in Missouri who wish to know how their teachers perceive the teacher evaluation system being embraced. By knowing teachers' perceptions evaluators will have an idea of what areas they ought to improve to make the process beneficial rather than being an impediment to the improvement of classroom practice. State officials will also be able to understand how their teacher evaluation system is regarded in relation to improving classroom practice and in the process they can identify its weaknesses and find long-lasting solutions. They can also identify training opportunities for future evaluators with an aim of making the process beneficial to both teachers and students in the future.

Through the analysis of the empirical studies in the current literature, there is a need to promote professional development among teacher evaluators if the schools in Missouri are to realize positive student outcomes. There is a perception of inadequate professional development among the administrators who are supposed to be qualified evaluators. In some professional development practices such as collaboration and participation in professional learning communities, there were variations in teacher perceptions, meaning, in the opinion of the respondent, they were not being done as per

the system requirements. With regard to this concern, it is essential for the state to facilitate administrator development in relation to the supervision and assessment of teachers to ensure the system objectives are met.

Conclusion

This study has revealed that teacher perceptions of the impact of the teacher evaluation process on classroom practice are different depending on the size of the school district size, professional development practices used, and the evaluation tool used. Different evaluation tools used appear to support some aspects of the evaluation process better than others. This causes the teachers to have varying perceptions regarding the evaluation process in their district.

Similarly, the research supports the idea that perceptions of the evaluation process may vary among teachers depending on their school district's support and focus on different professional development practices. The evaluation of teachers throughout the state of Missouri is left largely up to the individual districts. As a result, the practices of each district vary greatly, resulting in a wide array of feedback from respondents.

Finally, the perception regarding the evaluation process aspects may differ as the structure within larger school districts may support some elements of the process as compared to the school districts with fewer students. This would appear to be true in the area of evaluation feedback. This research supports the idea that timely feedback and evaluator trust may play a key role in teacher perception. In smaller districts, the elements of trust and feedback seem to be more present than in larger districts. This is interesting as it may warrant a focused study of the differences in organizational structures between different size schools in Missouri.

As the state of Missouri continues to put more emphasis in a growth model for teachers, this information provided in this study provides valuable insight into teacher perception of the evaluation process. Educational organizations, teacher preparation programs, principals, and stakeholders could utilize the results of this study prior to making decisions as to future approaches to the evaluation process.

REFERENCES

Addo, K. (2012, January 17). Missouri revamps teacher preparation. *St. Louis Post Dispatch*. Retrieved fromhttp://www.stltoday.com/news/local/education/missouri-revamps-teacher-preparation/article_d78dffcd-f613-5eda-bdc0-23cb794fcffc.html

A, D. V. (2013). *Research design in social research*. London: Sage Publications.

Aliaga, M., & Gunderson, B. (2003). Interactive statistics: Student solutions manual. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall/Pearson Education.

Berk, R. A. (1988). Fifty reasons why student achievement gain does not mean teacher effectiveness. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 1*(4), 345-363.

Birch, B.A. (2012). Teacher tenure elimination efforts spread to Missouri. *Education News*. Retrieved from http://www.educationnews.org/education-policy-and-politics/teacher-tenure-elimination-efforts-spread-to-missouri/

Blank, R. K., & de las Alas, N. (2009). *Effects of teacher professional development on gains in student achievement: How meta-analysis provides scientific evidence useful to education leaders.* Washington, DC: The Council of Chief State School Officers. Retrieved from http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2009/Effects_of_Teacher_Professional_2009.pdf

Center for Public Education. (2005). Teacher quality and student achievement: Research review. Retrieved from http://www.centerforpubliceducation.org/Main-Menu/Staffingstudents/Teacher-quality-and-student-achievement-At-a-glance/Teacher-quality-and-student-achievement-Research-review.html

Connolly, P. (2007). *Quantitative data analysis in education: A critical introduction using SPSS*. Routledge.

Coulter, M. P. (2013). *A qualitative study of teacher and principal perceptions of Washington State teacher evaluation instruments: Danielson, Marzano, and CEL 5D+* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. UMI No. (3587064)

Crouch, E., & Bock, J. (2014, August 10). Missouri teachers to be evaluated on their students' achievement. *St. Louise Post-Dispatch*. Retrieved from http://www.stltoday.com/news/local/education/missouri-teachers-to-be-evaluated-on-their-students-achievement/article_8832f975-c7f5-5cca-84db-e2b8bf514429.html

Danielson, C., & McGreal, T. L. (2000). *Teacher evaluation to enhance professional practice.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Danielson, C. (2001). New trends in teacher evaluation. *Educational Leadership, 58*(5), 12-15.

Danielson, C. (2007). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching* (2nd ed). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Danielson, C. (2012). Observing classroom practice. *Educational Leadership, Vol 70*(3), *32-37*.

Danielson, C. (2013). *The framework for teaching: Evaluation instrument*. Princeton, NJ: Danielson Group.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). Teacher education and the American future. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *61*(1-2), 35-47.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2012). *Creating a comprehensive system for evaluating and supporting effective teaching*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Haselkorn, D. (2009). Reforming teaching: Are we missing the boat? *Education Week, 28(27), 30-36*. Retrieved from http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2009/04/01/27hammond.h28.html

Darling-Hammond, L., Wei, R.C., Andree, A., Richardson, N., & Orphanos, S. (2009). Professional learning in the learning profession: A status report on teacher development in the United States and abroad. Dallas, TX: National Staff Development Council & The School Redesign Network.

Domas, S. J., & Tiedeman, D. V. (1950). Teacher competence: An annotated bibliography. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, *19*(2), 101-218.

DuFour, R., DuFour, R., Eaker, R., & Many, T. (2010*). Learning by doing: A handbook for professional learning communities at work* (2nd ed.). Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

Eaker, R., DuFour, R., & Burnette, R. (2002). *Getting started: Reculturing schools to become professional learning communities*. Bloomington, IN: National Education Service.

Ellis, T. I. (1984). *Teacher competency: What administrators can do*. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Information and Technology.

Embretson, G., Ferber, E., & Langager, T. (1984). Supervision and evaluation: Helping teachers reach their maximum potential. *National Association of Secondary Principals Bulletin*, *68*(469), 26-30.

Felder, R. M., & Brent, R. (2004). How to evaluate teaching. *Chemical Engineering Education*, *38*(3), 200-202.

Ferguson, R. F., & Ladd, H. F. (1996). How and why money matters: An analysis of Alabama schools. In H.F. Ladd (Ed.), *Holding schools accountable: Performance based reform in education,* 102-111. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Fetler, M. (1999). High school staff characteristics and mathematics test results. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 7, 9. Arizona State University. Retrieved from http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/544

Findley, D., & Estabrook, R. (1991). Teacher evaluation: Curriculum and instructional considerations. *Contemporary Education*, *62*(4), 294-298.

Fullan, M. (1990). Staff development, innovation, and institutional development. In B. Joyce (Ed.), *Changing school culture through staff development. The 1990 ASCD Yearbook* (pp. 3-25). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Garet, M. S., Porter, A. C., Desimone, L., Birman, B. F., & Yoon, K. S. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 915-945.

Getzels, J. W., & Jackson, P. W. (1963). The teacher's personality and characteristics. In N.L. Gage (Ed), *Handbook of research on teaching,* (pp. 506-582). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Glass, G. V. (1974). Teacher effectiveness. *Evaluating educational performance: A sourcebook of methods, instruments, and examples (pp. 11-32). Berkeley, CA:* McCutchan.

Goddard, Y., & Goddard, R. D. (2007). A theoretical and empirical investigation of teacher collaboration for school improvement and student achievement in public elementary schools. *Teachers College Record, 109*(4), 877-896.

Goldring, R., Taie, S., & Riddles, M. (2014). Teacher attrition and mobility: Results from the 2012–13 Teacher Follow-up Survey (NCES 2014-077). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved [10.31.14] from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch.

Guskey, T. R. (1994). Results-oriented professional development: In search of an optimal mix of effective practices. *Journal of Staff Development, 15*(4), 43-50.

Guskey, T.R. (2000). *Evaluating professional development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Hanushek, E.A., & Wobmann, L. (2007). The role of education quality in economic growth. *Policy Research Working Paper 4122*. Washington, DC: World Bank. Retrieved from http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EDUCATION/Resources/278200-1099079877269/547664-1099079934475/Edu_Quality_Economic_Growth.pdf

Haslam, M.B. (2010). *Teacher professional development evaluation guide*. Retrieved from https://learningforward.org/docs/pdf/evaluationguide.pdf?sfvrsn=0

Hattie, J. A. C. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. London, England.

Heller, D. A. (2004). *Teachers Wanted: Attracting and Retaining Good Teachers*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Henry, G. T., Kershaw, D. C., Zulli, R. A., & Smith, A. A. (2012). Incorporating teacher effectiveness into teacher preparation program evaluation. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *63*(5), 335-355.

Henson, B., & Hall, P.M. (1993). Linking performance evaluation and career ladder programs: Reactions of teachers and principals in one district. *The Elementary School Journal*, *93*(4), 323-353.

Jayaram, K., Moffit, A., & Scott, D. (2012). Breaking the habit of ineffective professional development for teachers. Retrieved from http://www.mckinsey.com/industries/social-sector/our-insights/breaking-the-habit-of-ineffective-professional-development-for-teachers

Jensen, M. (1981, Winter). How teachers view teacher evaluation. *Education, 102*(2), 130-137.

Johnson, S. M., & Kardos, S. M. (2002). Redesigning professional development: Keeping new teachers in mind. *Educational Leadership, 59*(6), 12-16.

Kane, Thomas, J. (2012, January). *Gathering feedback for teaching: Combining high-quality observations with student surveys and achievement gains.* Retrieved from Measures of Effective Teaching: http://www.metproject.org/

Kaplan, L., & Owings, W. (2002). The politics of teacher quality: Implications for principals. *National Association of Secondary Principals Bulletin, 86*(633), 22-41.

Kauchak, D. P. (1985). An interview study of teachers' attitudes toward teacher evaluation practices. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 19*(1)32-37.

Killion, J., & Harrison, C. (2006). *Taking the lead: New roles for teachers and school-based coaches.* Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council.

Kimball, S. M. (2002). Analysis of feedback, enabling conditions and fairness perceptions of teachers in three school districts with new standards-based evaluation systems. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 16*(4), 241-268.

Klein, J.I. (2015). *Lessons of hope: How to fix our schools*. New York: Harper.

Kleinhenz, E., & Ingvarson L. (2004). Teacher accountability in Australia: Current policies and practices and their relation to the improvement of teaching and learning. *Research Papers in Education*, *19*(1), 31-49.

Kraft, M.A., & Gilmour, A.F. (2016). *Revisiting the widget effect: Teacher evaluation reforms and the distribution of teacher effectiveness.* Retrieved from: https://scholar.harvard.edu/mkraft/publications/revisiting-widget-effect-teacher-evaluation-reforms-and-distribution-teacher

Leedy, P. & Ormrod, J. (2001). Practical research: Planning and design (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Levine, A. (2006). *Educating school teachers.* Washington, DC: The Education Schools Project. www.edschools.org

Lewis, H., & Leps, J. M. (1946). When principals supervise. *Educational Leadership, 3*(4), 160–163.

Lewis, T.J., Newcomer, L., Trussell, R.P., & Richter, M. *(*2006*).* School-wide positive behavior support: Building systems to develop and maintain appropriate social behavior. In C. S. Everton & C.M. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice and contemporary* issues (pp. 833-854), New York, NY: Earlbaum.

Little, O., Goe, L., & Bell, C. (2009). *A practical guide to evaluating teacher effectiveness.* Washington D C: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.

Loeb, S., Miller, L., & Strunk, K. (2009). The state role in teacher professional development and education throughout teachers' careers. *Education Finance and Policy*, 4(2), 212-228.

Machell, J. (1995). The teacher evaluation environment: an examination of attributes related to teacher growth. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 9*(3)259-273.

Marshall, K. (2009). *Rethinking teacher supervision and evaluation: How to work smart, build collaboration, and close the achievement gap*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Marzano, R. J. (2003). *What works in school: Translating research into action.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Marzano, R.J., Frontier, T., & Livingston, D. (2011). *Effective supervision: Supporting the art and science of teaching*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Marzano, R. J., & Toth, M. D. (2013). *Teacher evaluation that makes a difference: A new model for teacher growth and student achievement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development..

McDermott, J.J. (Ed.).(1981). *The philosophy of John Dewey*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

McKay, J. A. (1986, December). *Matching school leadership styles*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of California Secondary School Principals, Anaheim, CA.

McLaughlin, M.W., & Pfeifer, R.S. (1988). *Teacher Evaluation: Improvement, Accountability, and Effective Learning*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary (10th ed.). (1999). Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) (1999). Guidelines for Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation. Jefferson City, MO.

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (2013). Use of student growth measures in educator evaluation. Retrieved from: www.dese.mo.gov

Newman, I., & Benz, C. R. (1998). *Qualitative-quantitative research methodology: Exploring the interactive continuum*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Ovando, M. N. (2001). Teachers' perceptions of a learner-centered teacher evaluation system. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, *15*(3)213-231.

Payton, E. (2000). Teacher competency: What administrators can do. *Education*, *8*(1), 130.

Pearlman, M. M. (2014). *Teacher evaluation - Overview, methods.* Retrieved from State University.com website: http://education.stateuniversity.com/pages/2482/Teacher-Evaluation.html

Peterson, K. (1995). *Teacher evaluation: A comprehensive guide to new directions and practices.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Peterson, P. L., & Comeaux, M. A. (1990). Evaluating the systems: Teachers' perspectives on teacher evaluation. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *12*(1), 3-24.

Rockoff, J. E., Jacob, B. A., Kane, T. J., & Staiger, D. O. (2008). *Can you recognize an effective teacher when you recruit one?* (NBER Working Paper No. 14485). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research. Retrieved from http://www.nber.org/papers/w14485

Rockoff, J.E., & Speroni, C. (2010). Subjective and objective evaluations of teacher effectiveness. *American Economic Review*: *Papers & Proceedings*, 100(2), 261-266. Retrieved from http://ezpolson.nmu.edu:6744/docview/854927790

Ross, A., & Willson, V. L. (2017). One-Way ANOVA. In *Basic and Advanced Statistical Tests* (pp. 21-24). SensePublishers, Rotterd

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

Schmidt, L. (2003). Getting smarter about supervising instruction: *The Flexible Principal*, *82*(4), 24-25. 27-28.

Shulman, L. (2009). Assessment of teaching or assessment for teaching? In D.H. Gitomer (Ed.), *Measurement issues and assessment for teaching quality*. (pp. 234-244). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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

Steinmayr R., Meibner A., Weidinger A. F., & Wirthwein L. (2014). Academic achievement. In L.H. Meyer (Ed.), *Oxford bibliographies online: Education* (2014). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Stiggins, R., & Duke, D. (1988). *The case for commitment to teacher growth: Research on teacher evaluation*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Stigler, J. (2010) Rethinking teacher accountability before it's too late. *Education Week, 29*(33), 35

Stronge, J.H. (2006). Evaluating teaching: A guide to current thinking and best practice. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Stronge, J. H., Tucker, P. D., & Ward, T. J. (2003). *Teacher effectiveness and student learning: What do good teachers do?* Presented at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Tetenbaum, T., & Mulkeen, T. A. (1988). Assessment of educational personnel in the twenty-first century. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, *1*(3), 235-244.

Toch, T., & Rothman, R. (2008). *Rush to judgment: Teacher evaluation in public education*. Retrieved from www.educationsector.org/usr_doc/RushToJudgment_ES_Jan08.pdf

Van Teijlingen, E., & Hundley, V. (2001). The importance of pilot studies. Social research update, (35), 1–4.

Wagoner, R., & O'Hanlon, J. (1968). Teacher attitude toward evaluation. *Journal of Teacher Education, 19(4), 47-475.*

Wang, M., & Holcombe, R. (2010, 04). Adolescents' Perceptions of School Environment, Engagement, and Academic Achievement in Middle School. American Educational research Journal, 47(3), 633-662.

Wang, W., & Day, C. (2002, February/March). *Issues and concerns about classroom observation: Teachers' perspectives*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, St. Louis MO.

Wayne, A. J., & Youngs, P. (2003). Teacher characteristics and student achievement gains: A review. *Review of Educational Research, 73,* 89-122.

Weisberg, D., Sexton, S., Mulhern, J., & Keeling, D. (2009). *The widget effect: Our national failure to acknowledge and act on differences in teacher effectiveness.* Washington, DC: The New Teacher Project.

Whitehurst, G. J., Chingos, M.M., & Lindquist, K.M. (2014). *Evaluating teachers with classroom observations: Lessons learned in four districts.* Retrieved from Brown Center on Education Policies, Brookings website: https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Evaluating-Teachers-with-Classroom-Observations.pdf

Zelanak, M., & Snider, B.(1974) Teacher perceptions of the teacher evaluation process. *California Journal of Educational Research*, 25, 110-134.

Appendix A:

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Teacher Perception of the Evaluation Process on Classroom Instruction

You are asked to participate in a research study conducted by Danny DeWitt enrolled in the Ed.D program at Southwest Baptist University. You are invited to participate in this research project because you are a K-12 teacher in the state of Missouri. The purpose of this research project is examine teacher perceptions of the evaluation process to determine if the evaluation process impacts classroom instruction.

Your participation in this research study is voluntary. You may choose not to participate or skip any question that you are not comfortable in answering. If you decide to participate in this research survey, you may withdraw at any time. If you decide not to participate in this study or if you withdraw from participating at any time, you will not be penalized.

The procedure involves completing an online survey that will take approximately 10-15 minutes. As this is an online survey, participants can complete the survey in the location of his/her choice. Your responses will be confidential and no identifying information such as your name, email address or IP address will be collected.

The questions presented in the survey are focused on eliciting responses from educators in an attempt to provide information that may allow other parties to better understand teachers' perceptions toward the evaluation process and how to enhance the process.

Data gathered will be completely confidential. All data is stored in a password protected electronic format. To help protect your confidentiality, the surveys will not contain information that will personally identify you. The results of this study will be used for scholarly purposes only.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research study, please contact Danny DeWitt at ddewitt@osceola.k12.mo.us. You may also contact the RRB for questions concerning consent. (This research has been approved by the research review board at Southwest Baptist University).

Clicking on the "agree" button below indicates that:

- **You have read the above information.**
- **You have voluntarily agree to participate.**
- **You are at least 18 years of age.**

Appendix B:

Section A: Demographics

1. Check the appropriate RPDC.

   Southeast ____
   Heart of Missouri ____
   Northeast ____
   Northwest ____
   Agency for Teaching and Learning ____
   South Central ____
   Greater Ozarks Cooperating School Districts____
   Central ____
   Southwest Center for Educational Excellence ____

2. Please state the grade you are teaching presently.
   [1] Elementary [2] Middle School [3] High School

3.What is your gender? [1] Male [2] Female

4.What is your level of education?
   [1] Bachelors [2] Masters [3] Ed. Spec [4] Doctorate

5. Which educator evaluation tool is used at your school:
   [1] DESE model [2] NEE [3] District developed

6. Please indicate the size of your school district:
   [1] 500 or less students [2] 501-1500 students [3]1501-2500 students [4] 2501 or more

7. Were you involved in the design of the teacher evaluation tool being used at your school?
   [ ] Yes [ ] No

8. Were you involved in the selection of the teacher evaluation tool being used at your school?
   [ ] Yes [ ] No

Section B: Teachers' Perceptions on Teacher Evaluation Process in Missouri

The Definition of Teacher Evaluation:
For the purpose of this study, teacher evaluation will include the following:

- Formal and informal classroom observations
- Pre-conference and post-conference meetings with the teacher evaluators
- Examination of lesson plans, evaluation documents, and artifacts
- Final written summative evaluation
- Teacher reflection document
- Teacher professional worksheet form
- All written and verbal feedback by the teacher evaluators

Please rate each of the following statements using the following scale. Please answer on the scale for each statement that best represents your opinion about you in your school. 1= Strongly Agree (SA), 2= Agree (A), 3= Neutral (N), 4=Disagree (D), 5=Strongly Disagree (SD), 6=Not Applicable (NA)

	SA	**A**	**N**	**D**	**SD**	**NA**
1. I have an adequate understanding pertaining to examples of behaviors and practices in my district's current teacher evaluation process.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. There is a clear process in forming the summative rating.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. There is adequate staff development on the evaluation process.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. I believe my evaluator is well trained to make consistent judgments about my performance based on evidence of my teaching and evaluation documents.	1	2	3	4	5	6

5. My evaluator and I have professional dialogue or conversations on a continuing basis throughout the entire school year.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Evaluator-teacher relationships are NOT impacted by the way feedback is presented to a teacher following a classroom observation.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. My evaluator and I work collaboratively throughout the evaluation process.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. Written and verbal feedback consistently included both areas of strengths and areas of improvement.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. I believe that the written and verbal feedback from my evaluator improved my teaching practice.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. I believe that the feedback from my evaluator was accurate.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. The teacher evaluation process has a positive impact on my teaching practice and professional development.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. I was given professional development opportunities directly related to my evaluation.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. As the result of my observation feedback, I looked for ways to improve my teaching practice on my own.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. My evaluator recommended that I observe another teacher as part of my professional development.	1	2	3	4	5	6

15. I did not change the way I normally teach during my formal classroom observation.	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. I believe the teacher evaluation process unifies teachers and administrators in their collective effort to educate students.	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. I believe the teacher evaluation process has a positive impact on teacher practice.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. The teacher evaluation system is fair and objective.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Section C: Teachers' Perceptions on Professional Development Practices

To what extent do you agree or disagree that following professional development practices is demonstrated by teachers in your school district.

Please answer on the scale for each statement that best represents your opinion about you in your school.
For Agreement scale: 1= Strongly Agree (SA), 2= Agree (A), 3= Neutral (N), 4=Disagree (D), 5=Strongly Disagree (SD), 6=Not Applicable (NA)

	Agreement Level					
	SA	**A**	**N**	**D**	**SD**	**NA**
Domain 1: Planning and Preparation						
19. Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy	1	2	3	4	5	6
20. Setting Instructional Outcomes	1	2	3	4	5	6
21. Assessing Student Learning	1	2	3	4	5	6
22. Designing Student Assessments	1	2	3	4	5	6
23. **Domain 2: The Classroom Environment**						
24. Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	1	2	3	4	5	6

	Agreement Level					
	SA	**A**	**N**	**D**	**SD**	**NA**
25. Establishing a Culture for Learning	1	2	3	4	5	6
26. Managing Classroom Procedures	1	2	3	4	5	6
Domain 3: Instruction						
27. Engaging Students in Learning	1	2	3	4	5	6
28. Providing Feedback to Students	1	2	3	4	5	6
29. Using Assessment in Instruction	1	2	3	4	5	6
30. **Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities**						
31. Participating in a Professional Community	1	2	3	4	5	6
32. Growing and Developing Professionally	1	2	3	4	5	6

Thank you very much for your Participation in this Survey!