Lindenwood University

Digital Commons@Lindenwood University

Spring 5-2015

Teacher Evaluation and Student Achievement in Elementary Education

Eric L. Allen
Lindenwood University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lindenwood.edu/dissertations

Part of the Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons

Recommended Citation

Allen, Eric L., "Teacher Evaluation and Student Achievement in Elementary Education" (2015). *Dissertations*. 320.

https://digitalcommons.lindenwood.edu/dissertations/320

Teacher Evaluation and Student Achievement

in Elementary Education

by

Eric L. Allen

April 2015

A Dissertation submitted to the Education Faculty of Lindenwood University in

partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education

School of Education

Teacher Evaluation and Student Achievement

in Elementary Education

by

Eric L. Allen

This Dissertation has been approved as partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education

Lindenwood University, School of Education

Dr. Julie Williams, Dissertation Chair   4-27-15
                                                            Date

Dr. Sherry DeVore, Committee Member   4-27-15
                                                            Date

Dr. Terry Reid, Committee Member   4-27-15
                                                            Date

Declaration of Originality

I do hereby declare and attest to the fact that this is an original study based solely upon my own scholarly work at Lindenwood University and that I have not submitted it for any other college or university course or degree.

Full Legal Name: Eric L. Allen

Signature: _____ Date: 4/27/15

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my appreciation to the Lindenwood University faculty who have guided me during this process. I would also like to sincerely thank my wife, Melissa, and my children for demonstrating patience and understanding during the years it took to accomplish this educational goal. Finally, I also want to state my gratitude to my parents, Albert and Becky, for both instilling and nurturing my desire to excel academically from a very young age.

Abstract

Historically, the state of Missouri has utilized the Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation (PBTE) system developed by Dr. Jerry Valentine from the University of Missouri (Valentine & Harting, 1986). The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 mandated more rigorous accountability standards for state education systems (Moe, 2014). The 2012 revisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) provided to Missouri by the U.S. Department of Education relieved the original mandates of the NCLB Act (MODESE, 2015a). However, added were provisions for teacher and administrator accountability which required evaluation of research-based principles of effective instruction (MODESE 2015a). In this study, the researcher reviewed one evaluation system, the Network for Educator Effectiveness (NEE) teacher evaluation system, to determine if a correlation existed between principal evaluation data and student perception data of specific classroom teachers in relation to student performance on state assessments. Of the six research questions included in the case study, the data generated for question three with a bivariate correlate for the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient for the NEE Evaluation Indicator 4.1 principal's evaluation and student survey data for Indicator 4.1 revealed the best line of fit with $r = .63$. The significance output of $p < .01$ was the greatest significant correlation of the study. These data indicate both the students and the principal recognize the teacher's level of implementation for Indicator 4.1 (teacher instructional strategies leading to student problem-solving and critical thinking). No other correlates were found to be significant for this study.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter One: Introduction

The recently adopted and more comprehensive Network for Educator

Effectiveness (NEE) Evaluation Model was to be utilized by rural Missouri school

districts beginning in the 2014-2015 school year (NEE, 2013b). The NEE Evaluation

Model is differentiated from more traditional teacher evaluation models in the following

ways: (a) mandatory training for administrators in use of the tool; (b) using shorter but

ongoing and more numerous observation events by principals of classroom teachers; and

(c) mandatory administrator feedback to teachers along with embedded professional

development tasks for teachers (NEE, 2013b). The ultimate goal of this study was to

improve elementary student achievement in the area of English language arts at rural

Missouri school districts, including the elementary school where the case study was

conducted.

Background of the Study

Missouri law dictates all public school districts in Missouri shall evaluate

educators under contract with a public school district (Missouri Department of

Elementary and Secondary Education [MODESE], 2013e). The mechanism for the

evaluation of the educator is left to the discretion of public school districts in Missouri as

long as the evaluation system complies with the parameters of the Missouri Elementary

and Secondary Education Act Waiver of 2012 (MODESE, 2013e). The state of Missouri

was granted an Elementary and Secondary Education Act Waiver on June 27, 2012 (U.S.

Department of Education, 2012). Principle Three of the waiver deals with supporting

effective instruction in the classroom and effective leadership in the school building by

developing and adopting guidelines for local teacher and building principal evaluation and support systems (U.S. Department of Education, 2012).

The MODESE endorsed any teacher evaluation method or format as long as it meets the seven principles (Katnik, 2013). With that condition stated, the rural Missouri school district involved in this case study adopted and implemented the NEE Evaluation Model. Missouri has 520 public school districts which must comply with the Missouri Elementary and Secondary Education Act Waiver of 2012 (Katnik, 2013). As of September 2014, 50% of districts were utilizing their own self-designed evaluation systems, 28% were implementing the NEE Evaluation Model, and 22% employed the MODESE evaluation system (Associated Press, 2014).

Not only does the teacher bear the largest impact on student standardized test achievement, but that impact is a better indicator of student academic achievement growth than race, socio-economic level, and class size (Strahan, 2013). An essential method to improving the quality of teachers coming into the profession is to increase the knowledge base and skillsets of all undergraduate teachers who complete college degrees in the field of education (Richardson, 2013). Additionally, teacher quality improves with experience no matter the initial starting point of the skills of a given teacher (Hopkins, 2008). Good or effective teachers are not evenly or fairly distributed among all schools or districts in states or around the United States as a whole (Haycock & Crawford, 2008). Teachers in the top quartile of effectiveness advance a student five additional percentile points per year relative to peers provided classroom instruction by any teacher whose effectiveness is ranked in any of the other three quartiles (Haycock & Crawford, 2008).

In regard to teacher evaluation, Marzano (2012b) offered the following concerning more traditional teacher evaluation models: "Teacher evaluation systems have not accurately measured teacher quality and have not aided in developing a highly skilled teacher workforce" (p. 15). Marzano (2012b) further added, "An evaluation system that fosters teacher learning will differ from one whose aim is to measure teacher competence" (p. 14). Following up on the goal of this new type of teacher growth evaluation, Marzano (2012b) asserted, "Measuring teachers and developing teachers are different purposes with different implications" (p. 16). Furthermore, Marzano (2012b) advocated for a teacher evaluation system designed to reward teacher growth and instill a desire for all teachers, no matter the current level of performance, to strive to get better at the craft of teaching. The teacher evaluation process can no longer be thought of in the context of being a fringe component of a building principal's job duties (Marzano, 2012b). In the private sector, it is uncommon for a supervisor to have a caseload of more than 15 supervisees; in the public education realm, a supervisor's caseload is often much higher (Donaldson & Donaldson, 2012).

Successful teacher observation systems employ multiple classroom observations ranging the entire academic year (Darling-Hammond, Amrein-Beardsley, Haertel, & Rothstein, 2012). The teacher evaluation tool is implemented and utilized by expertly trained evaluators (Darling-Hammond et al., 2012). The evaluators then provide timely and meaningful feedback to the classroom teacher (Darling-Hammond et al., 2012). A new component to the classroom teacher evaluation process is the use of student survey data concerning teacher performance (MODESE, 2013d). According to the Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) Project, well-crafted student surveys do provide reliable and

valid data in determining the effectiveness of a classroom teacher on student achievement as measured by standardized assessments (MODESE, 2013d).

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual base for this case study is that by improving the quality of instruction provided by the classroom teacher to students, students will then increase academic achievement on standardized test scores (Marzano, 2012a). Studies have indicated the single-most crucial factor in student achievement, even more important than race, socio-economic status, or parental education level, is the effectiveness of the classroom teacher (Strahan, 2013). Classroom teachers do not enter the field of education as fully effective educators; thus, it is imperative building principals develop the relevant skillsets of teachers over time (Hopkins, 2008).

Changing the expectation of the building principal from a manager of daily activities to being a proactive educational leader is significant (Moss & Brookhart, 2013). Additionally, training of the building principal in the evaluation instrument is important (MODESE, 2013d). Other factors of note include the need for central office support for this new type of work and the focus expected of the building principal in improving the effectiveness of classroom teachers (Corda, 2012). Multiple and frequent evaluations of classroom teachers by building principals are more productive in improving classroom teacher effectiveness than are more traditional and structured summative evaluations (Marshall, 2009). Also, relevant and meaningful feedback to classroom teachers by building principals within 24 hours of the evaluation event is conducive to improving teacher effectiveness in the classroom (Hattie, 2012).

Statement of the Problem

The format utilized in the quantitative research was the collective case study. The researcher studied multiple cases (or classrooms) at the same time as part of an overall larger study (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2015). The ability to generalize results is greater for a collective case study as opposed to a single-case case study (Fraenkel et al., 2015). A three-pronged approach was utilized in this collective case study. The triangulation of data involved three distinct data sets: archival student Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) English language arts (ELA) achievement data, NEE building administrator teacher evaluation data, and student survey data of specific teacher's classroom performance. The data from the MODESE were statistically sound and produced on a state-wide scale (MODESE, 2013d). The teacher evaluation data and student survey data provided by the NEE Evaluation Model also meet validity and reliability thresholds (NEE, 2013b). The dependent variable in the study was student MAP ELA scores on state-level assessments (Fraenkel et al., 2015). The independent variables in the study were the building administrator evaluations of teacher classroom performance along with the student survey data of the same teachers' classroom performance (Fraenkel et al., 2015).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research was to conduct a case study to determine the correlation between elementary teachers' NEE Evaluation Model data and archival MAP ELA data from students who were provided ELA instruction by the same elementary teachers. Data from NEE Evaluation Model student surveys of teacher performance were compared to administrative evaluations of teacher performance to determine whether a

relationship exists between the two metrics for discerning teacher effectiveness. The rationale for this case study was to determine if a significant correlation exists between NEE Evaluation Model teacher evaluation data and teacher classroom sets of archival student MAP ELA data. Data from this case study may contribute to the building administrator's understanding of factors which comprise effective teaching in elementary English language arts classrooms.

Research Questions

1. What is the correlation between teachers' NEE Evaluation data generated by the building administrator of specific teacher performance for the 2014-2015 school year and the archival data of classroom students' MAP ELA data for the school years 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014?

H1$_0$: There is no correlation between teachers' NEE Evaluation data generated by the building administrator of specific teacher performance for the 2014-2015 school year and the archival data of classroom students' MAP ELA data for the school years 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014.

2. What is the correlation between archival data of classroom students' MAP ELA data for the school years 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014 and the NEE Evaluation student survey data on the classroom performance of the specific teachers for the 2014-2015 school year?

H2$_0$: There is no correlation between archival data of classroom students' MAP ELA data for the school years 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014 and the NEE Evaluation student survey data on the classroom performance of the specific teachers for the 2014-2015 school year.

3. What is the correlation between teachers' NEE Evaluation data generated by the building administrator of specific teacher performance for the 2014-2015 school year and the NEE Evaluation student survey data on the classroom performance of the teachers for the 2014-2015 school year?

H3₀: There is no correlation between teachers' NEE Evaluation data generated by the building administrator of specific teacher performance for the 2014-2015 school year and the NEE Evaluation student survey data on the classroom performance of the teachers for the 2014-2015 school year.

Definition of Key Terms

For the purposes of this study, the following terms are defined:

Archival data. Archival data are previously collected and stored data that are not personally identifiable (Fraenkel et al., 2015).

Building-level administrator. A building-level administrator is the principal of a specific school building.

Case study. A case study involves a situation where a researcher focuses on a single individual, classroom, school, or program (Fraenkel et al., 2015).

Cluster random sampling. Cluster random sampling is the selection of groups, or clusters, of subjects rather than individuals (Fraenkel et al., 2015). This format is more effective with larger numbers of clusters (Fraenkel et al., 2015).

ELA. ELA stands for English language arts (MODESE, 2013a).

IEP. IEP stands for individualized educational plan (MODESE, 2013b).

MAP. MAP stands for Missouri assessment program (MODESE, 2013b).

NEE. NEE stands for the Network for Educator Effectiveness (NEE, 2013b).

Pearson product-moment coefficient. The Pearson product-moment coefficient is the appropriate statistical treatment of data when both variables are expressed in quantitative scores (Fraenkel et al., 2015). It is designed for use with interval or ratio data (Fraenkel et al., 2015).

Purposive sample. The researcher uses his or her judgment to select a purposive sample he or she believes, based on prior information, will provide the data needed (Fraenkel et al., 2015).

Limitations and Assumptions

One limitation of the case study is the rural Missouri school district with an enrollment of less than 1,000 students is not representative of all school districts. Another factor to consider as a limiting agent is the free and reduced priced meal rate of over 70% for the rural Missouri school district sampled for this study. An additional potential weakness of this case study in determining a direct correlation between student MAP ELA scores and teacher evaluation data is the introduction of other programs by the school district which may also have led to changes in MAP ELA scores. The same weakness is noted concerning the correlation between student MAP ELA scores and survey data for the introduction of other programs which may have contributed to changes in MAP ELA scores.

The rural Missouri school district has implemented other programs prior to or concurrent with the adoption of the NEE Evaluation Model as methods to improve teacher performance in the classroom and student performance on the MAP ELA test. These other programs included the following: (a) departmentalization at the fifth and sixth-grade levels for communication arts; (b) Response to Intervention strategies; (c)

Positive Behavior Support strategies; (d) Title I interventions; (e) and the use of Reading

Plus and Acuity computer programs. These programs vary in both implementation length

and amount of time weekly each is being utilized by the rural Missouri school district. In

the context of full disclosure, acknowledgement of the other variables is important to the

outcomes of the NEE Evaluation Model case study.

Sample demographics. The participants were inclusive of students enrolled at

the rural Missouri school district in grades three through six for the school years 2011-

2012, 2012-2013, 2013-2014, and 2014-2015. Archival MAP ELA data, NEE model

archival teacher evaluation data for specific teachers collected by the building

administrator, and NEE model archival student survey data of classroom performance of

specific teachers were used for this study. Students with IEPs were excluded, as each of

these students receives an additional amount of ELA instruction in a different setting and

from a different teacher separate from the purposive sample of classroom teachers.

Instrument. All data utilized for the collective case study were archival data

generated by the standard and routine practices of the rural Missouri school district and

the MODESE.

Summary

The implementation of the NEE Evaluation Model at a rural Missouri school

district was the catalyst for this case study. Determining a correlation effect of each of

three components—archival teacher evaluation data, archival student MAP ELA data,

and archival survey results by students of teacher performance—will lead to a better

understanding of the impact of the NEE Evaluation Model on increasing student

achievement on standardized tests. The case study coincides with the school district's improvement plan goal of increasing student achievement on standardized testing and increasing the percentage of points earned on the MODESE Annual Performance Report (APR).

Chapter Two: Review of Literature

The components and expectations of the Missouri Elementary and Secondary Education Act Waiver regarding the issue of improving the teacher evaluation system in Missouri was the focus of this case study. First within this chapter, for a proper understanding of the current status of Missouri concerning the teacher evaluation format and system, a historical context is established dating back to 1983. The legislation which established the performance-based teacher evaluation system became the state benchmark in some form over the last 20-plus years. Next, the Missouri Elementary and Secondary Education Act Waiver and its intricacies are explored for a more complete understanding of the commitment this document requires to be implemented with fidelity. Finally, a detailed look at the seven essential components and procedural steps of effective teacher evaluation as described in the Missouri Elementary and Secondary Education Act Waiver are reflected upon from the point of view of implementing the Network for Educator Effectiveness (NEE) model.

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual base for the case study was founded on improvement in the quality of instruction provided by classroom teachers so students will increase academic achievement on standardized state assessments (Marzano, 2012b). The single-most important factor in student achievement, even more important than race, socio-economic status, or parental education level, is the effectiveness of the classroom teacher (Strahan, 2013). College graduates do not enter the field of education as fully effective classroom teachers; thus, it is imperative building principals develop the relevant skillsets of classroom teachers over time (Hopkins, 2008). Building principals can assist novice

teachers in both formal and informal mentoring and professional development activities (Hopkins, 2008).

Changing the expectation of the building principal from a manager of daily activities to being a proactive educational leader is significant; however, traditional managerial duties should not be overlooked or minimized when describing expected duties and roles of a building principal (Moss & Brookhart, 2013). Additionally, training of the building principal in the evaluation instrument is important (MODESE, 2013b). Other factors of note are central office support of this new type of work and focus that will be expected of the building principal in improving the effectiveness of classroom teachers (Corda, 2012). Understanding by the central office administrator of the nomenclature and methodology being utilized by the principal in the classroom observation process is a key component to overall implementation success (Corda, 2012). Multiple and frequent evaluations of classroom teachers by building principals are more productive in improving classroom teacher effectiveness than more traditional and structured summative evaluations (Marshall, 2009). Also, relevant and meaningful feedback to classroom teachers by building principals within 24 hours of the evaluation event is conducive to improving teacher effectiveness in the classroom (Hattie, 2012). Verbal face-to-face communication is also preferred to electronic or written feedback to the teacher by the principal (Hattie, 2012).

History of Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation

The Missouri legislative session of 1983 produced House Bill 38 and House Bill 783, which served as the foundation for Missouri Revised Statute 168.128, which in turn directed school boards of education to implement "comprehensive performance-based

evaluation for each teacher employed in the district" (Teachers and Others Statute, 2013). The MODESE was also to "provide suggested procedures for such an evaluation" (Teachers and Others Statute, 2013). Two years later in the 1985 Missouri legislative session, House Bill 463 was adopted and gave rise to Missouri Revised Statute 168.410, which extended the performance-based evaluation system to all administrators with the same directive that the MODESE was to provide suggested procedures in the matter for school district consideration and guidance (Teachers and Others Statute, 2013).

Through the offices of the MODESE, the first performance-based teacher evaluation guidance documents were made available to school districts in 1984, and a second updated document was released by the MODESE for use by Missouri schools in 1999 (MODESE, 2012). These performance-based teacher evaluation concepts were the backbone of the educator evaluation system at the direction of the Missouri legislature and its statutes until 2010 (MODESE, 2012). During the 2010 legislative session, Senate Bill 291 was passed directing schools to adopt standards for teacher evaluation which at a minimum include the following elements:

> …students actively participate and are successful in the learning process; various forms of assessment are used to monitor and manage student learning; the teacher is prepared and knowledgeable of the content and effectively maintains students' on-task behavior; the teacher uses professional communication and interaction with the school community; the teacher keeps current on instructional knowledge and seeks and explores changes in teaching behaviors that will improve student performance; and the teacher acts as a responsible professional in the overall mission of the school. (MODESE, 2012, para. 10)

All public school districts in Missouri are compelled by Senate Bill 291 to conduct annual evaluations of teachers employed by the district (MODESE, 2012).

Dr. Jerry Valentine established himself over time as the preeminent expert on Missouri's performance-based teacher evaluation system and co-authored a report sponsored by the MODESE during the 1986-1987 school year (Valentine & Harting, 1986). Valentine and Harting (1986) stated in the report over 2,000 people participated in performance-based teacher evaluation training workshops during the first three years of the program. Valentine and Harting (1986) followed this by indicating 98% of all districts in Missouri participated in the performance-based teacher evaluation training sessions within the first three years.

Valentine and Harting (1986) indicated effective skill development in use of the performance-based teacher evaluation system takes the equivalent of several days of training. Extended training results in an increased degree of skill in performance-based teacher evaluation reliability developed by the principal (Valentine & Harting, 1986). Nowhere in the 1986-1987 report was the idea of ongoing or refresher trainings for administrators in the implementation of the performance-based teacher evaluation components ever mentioned (Valentine & Harting, 1986).

Arne Duncan, United States Secretary of Education, stated, "Missouri has... committed to developing, adopting, piloting, and implementing teacher and principal evaluation and support systems that support student achievement…." (as cited in Singer, 2012, p. 1). Missouri law dictates all public school districts shall evaluate educators under contract in the districts (MODESE, 2013e). The mechanism for the evaluation of the educator is left to the discretion of the specific public school district in Missouri as long

as the evaluation system complies with the parameters of the Missouri Elementary and

Secondary Education Act Waiver of 2012 (MODESE, 2013e).

No Child Left Behind

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) is federal legislation adopted in 2002 (Moe, 2014).

The ultimate goal of NCLB legislation signed into law by President George Bush was to

bring accountability to all public schools districts in every state of the United States

(Moe, 2014). Since the implementation in 2002 of NCLB, the percentage of students

expected to score proficient or better on standardized math and English language arts

(ELA) in grades three through eight has continually increased on an annual basis (Moe,

2014). States and schools that satisfy the specific annual goal for proficiency are referred

to as meeting adequate yearly progress (AYP) (Webley, 2012).

An indirect outcome of attempting to meet AYP goals and standards has been a

lowering at the state level of the definition of "proficient" as used in connection with

student mastery of content knowledge by grade level (Webley, 2012). The end result of

trying to meet the ever-increasing AYP goals has been to change the semantics and

verbiage in defining proficient as a way to technically meet the NCLB standards

(Webley, 2012). Another method to avert the consequences of not meeting NCLB

accountability standards through the AYP tool has been to apply to the U.S. Department

of Education for waivers to exempt the state from the ongoing AYP goals and resulting

consequences when those goals are not met (Posey, 2014).

President Barack Obama announced in 2011 the U.S. Department of Education

had developed standards and provisions under which states could request relief from the

federal NCLB mandates (Posey, 2014). The reason cited by Arne Duncan, Secretary of

the U.S. Department of Education, as to why the various waivers were needed by states was the Federal Congress' inability to come to an agreement to reauthorize the NCLB legislation of 2002 (Posey, 2014). As of 2014, 43 states had requested and been granted some form of a NCLB waiver by the U.S. Department of Education (Posey, 2014).

The initial early round of state waivers involved requesting extensions of time (in school years) in the quest to achieve 100% proficiency in math and English language arts (ELA) for all students in a particular state (Posey, 2014). The U.S. Department of Education, often after many rounds of submit, correct as directed, and resubmit, would grant time frame extensions for a state (Posey, 2014). In exchange for the extension of the original NCLB time lines from the U.S. Department of Education, individual states were mandated in some form to do the following: (a) increase rigor for college and career readiness, (b) develop methods to identify and differentiate student performance by school building, (c) hold continually low-performing schools accountable for improvements over time, and (d) establish teacher and principal systems that among other things will be based in part on student achievement (Posey, 2014).

An additional component of the original round of Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) waivers granted to some states an additional year to become compliant with the implementation of new teacher and principal evaluation systems for specifically incorporating student achievement into summative evaluations (Posey, 2014). This delay pushed full compliance with all aspects of the ESEA waiver states to the 2015-2016 school year (Posey, 2014). Missouri public school districts benefit from this extension through the Missouri ESEA waiver originally granted in 2012 (NEE, 2013b)

Prior to ESEA waiver relief, any school that failed to meet an annual AYP standard for two consecutive years was required to reallocate a portion of its federal funding to assist teachers in development and strategies for improvement in classroom performance (Webley, 2012). This idea of improving teacher performance in the classroom was a cornerstone of the NCLB legislation of 2002 (Webley, 2012). This element has maintained its standing and is now a prime component of the ESEA waiver language in mandating the use of new teacher evaluation methodology incorporating the seven essential principles, along with a demand student performance also be a factor in a teacher's summative evaluation (Webley, 2012).

Seven Principles of Effective Evaluation

The MODESE identified through current research studies seven principles of effective evaluation. These principles include the following: (a) clear expectations and proven performance targets for teachers, (b) differentiated performance levels for teachers, (c) a probationary period for teachers, (d) student growth measures, (e) regular and meaningful feedback to teachers, (f) evaluator training for administrators, and (g) use of evaluation results for district improvement (MODESE, 2013a). The first principle involves measuring educator performance against research-based practices as well as clearly identifying performance targets for teacher success criteria (MODESE, 2013c). Concerning principle number one and clear expectations for teachers, this must align to Missouri Senate Bill 291 passed in 2010 which directs districts to adopt local teaching standards that include the following:

…students actively participate and are successful in the learning process; various

forms of assessment are used to monitor and manage student learning; the teacher

is prepared and knowledgeable of the content and effectively maintains students'

on-task   behavior; the teacher uses professional communication and interaction

with the school community; the teacher keeps current on instructional knowledge

and seeks and   explores changes in teaching behaviors that will improve student

performance; and the teacher acts as a responsible professional in the overall

mission of the school. (MODESE, 2012, para. 10)

All public school districts in Missouri are compelled by Senate Bill 291 to conduct

annual evaluations of teachers employed by the district (MODESE, 2012).

In regards to principle two and differentiated levels of performance, a continuum

is to be in place to discreetly and objectively measure performance and provide

opportunities for growth (MODESE, 2013c). These levels should go beyond years

of service and truly be characterized by performance to ensure all educators the

opportunity for ongoing improvement (MODESE, 2013c). Next, with principle

three, the probationary period is addressed with an emphasis on a support process

and networking opportunities for the new teacher with mentoring as the delivery

system in a non-evaluative context at this critical time in novice teacher

development (MODESE, 2013c).

The fourth principle deals with measurements of student growth in learning

(MODESE, 2013c). Component four must include more than once-a-year state

assessments, though those measurements should be considered in context (MODESE,

2013c). Multiple and ongoing measurements of growth are the general recommendation

for utilization with this principle (MODESE, 2013c). The fifth principle is an explanation

of the role of feedback by an administrator to a teacher after an evaluation event

(MODESE, 2013c). Feedback must be timely and deliberate and in the vein of a formative process by the administrator to have the impact of improving teacher performance and practice (MODESE, 2013c). While classroom observations are included in this principle, so is analysis of student data and other sources of information of relevance to the teacher's performance (MODESE, 2013c).

Principle six seems to be a key component to the effectiveness of the new teacher evaluation system implemented by Missouri (MODESE, 2013c). This principle states the need for intensive initial training for evaluators followed by ongoing and periodic retraining on an annual basis (MODESE, 2013c). The ongoing and periodic retraining component was not present in the 1986-1987 PBTE report issued to the MODESE (Valentine & Harting, 1986). Finally, the seventh principle involves using teacher evaluation data to make informed personnel decisions (MODESE, 2013c). As a result of the new teacher evaluation process, districts are expected to use data to empower and utilize only highly effective educators for the goal of improving student learning (MODESE, 2013c). This has a two-fold implication: using highly effective teachers in empowered roles as mentors and academic coaches beyond their teaching duties and targeting underperforming teachers for improvement (MODESE, 2013c). Teachers targeted for improvement are assigned professional development opportunities facilitated by the district (MODESE, 2013c).

In conclusion, the University of Missouri has developed a teacher evaluation model in conjunction with the Network for Educator Effectiveness (NEE) that meets or exceeds all seven principles outlined in the Missouri ESEA Waiver of 2012 (NEE, 2013b). Also, the MODESE endorsed any teacher evaluation method or format as long as

it meets the seven principles (Katnik, 2013). With that condition stated, the rural Missouri school district included in this case study adopted and implemented the NEE Teacher Evaluation Model. Missouri has 520 public school districts which must comply with the Missouri ESEA Waiver of 2012 (Katnik, 2013).

Waiver Conditions

The state of Missouri was granted an ESEA Waiver on June 27, 2012 (U.S. Department of Education, 2012). Principle three of the waiver deals with supporting effective instruction in the classroom and effective leadership in the school building by developing and adopting guidelines for local teacher and building principal evaluation and support systems (U.S. Department of Education, 2012). The Missouri Waiver of 2012 specifically lists seven principles to be included in the classroom teacher and building principal evaluation systems: (a) performance targets; (b) differentiated levels of performance; (c) probationary periods for new teachers; (d) use of measures of student growth and learning; (e) ongoing, deliberate, and meaningful feedback; (f) standardized and ongoing training for evaluators; and (g) evaluation results inform personnel determinations, decisions, and policy (U.S. Department of Education, 2012).

When considering the principle of using student growth and learning, one of the consequences of the No Child Left Behind mandate states, "The testing mandates of No Child Left Behind had generated a sea of data, and researchers were now able to parse student achievement in ways they never had before…" (Niels, 2012, p. 58). As of 2013, no state in the United States based classroom teacher evaluations exclusively on standardized test scores (Exstrom, 2013). Additionally, every state in the United States does require classroom observations be considered as a part of the classroom teacher

evaluation process (Exstrom, 2013). However, many other countries (including some

countries that outpace the United States in student achievement scores) do not use student

achievement data as a primary data point in the summative evaluation process for

classroom teachers (Williams & Engel, 2012).

If student achievement data are to be a principle in the next generation of teacher

evaluation, what percentage of the summative process should student achievement

comprise? Statistical analysis indicates when student achievement standardized test

scores made up more than 50% of the of the evaluation base methodology, the overall

study of teacher effectiveness becomes compromised (Sawchuk, 2013). Over half of all

states now mandate student achievement data play a role in classroom teacher evaluation

systems (Sparks, 2011). As of 2013, 19 states now require student achievement data to be

the single-most significant factor in the classroom teacher summative evaluation process

(Heitin, 2013).

Many of the states which have been awarded Race to the Top Grants or a No

Child Left Behind Waiver are reporting difficulty in measuring student achievement and

growth in non-tested grade levels and subject areas (United States Government

Accountability Office, 2013). Some specific areas in which it is difficult to measure

student achievement and growth without the help of standardized and state-level tests

include lower primary grades, fine arts, foreign language, and vocational education

classes (Cavanaugh, 2011). Progress will need to be made for states in the subject areas

and grade-levels areas where difficulty currently exists in measuring and recording

student achievement and growth factors for No Child Left Behind Waivers to be granted (

Methods of ESEA Waiver Compliance in Missouri

On May 14, 2013, the Missouri State Board of Education approved a model

evaluation system developed by the MODESE that was fully aligned to the ESEA Waiver

of 2012 (MODESE, 2013e). Included in partnership in the development phase of this

model evaluation system were MODESE personnel, classroom educators, administrators,

state-wide educational organizations, and teacher education programs at institutions of

higher education (MODESE, 2013e). The cornerstone of the model evaluation system is

an adherence to the seven essential principles set out in the Missouri ESEA Waiver of

2012. Those seven principles are (a) using research-based practices to measure teacher

performance, (b) establishing performance indicators for teachers based on their current

performance levels, (c) aligning the evaluation process to the teacher's probationary

period, (d) using student performance as a portion of the teacher evaluation process, (e)

assessing teacher performance on a regular basis and providing timely feedback to the

teacher, (f) ensuring the building administrators are highly trained in the evaluation

procedures to be applied to the teachers, and (g) using the evaluation processes to

improve student learning over time (MODESE, 2013a).

Various indicators will be determined for each teacher in coordination with the

building administrator for use in evaluating the classroom teacher under the conditions

set forth in the Missouri ESEA Wavier of 2012 (MODESE, 2013f). The building

administrator will be formally and annually trained in implementing the teacher

evaluation tool, and the score range will be scored on a 0-7 scale for each indicator

(MODESE, 2013f). The next step in the process is for the principal to establish a baseline

performance level for each teacher on each indicator selected in coordination between the

teacher and principal at the beginning of the school year (MODESE, 2013f). The various

indicators available for selection by school districts are derived from research-based

practices espoused by the likes of Marzano, Lemov, and Hattie, among others

(MODESE, 2013f).

The formative assessments performed by the building administrator on classroom

teachers during the school year provide the groundwork for annual teacher summative

evaluations (MODESE, 2013f). This component will provide legal documentation of

teachers demonstrating growth or showing mastery of the chosen indicators (MODESE,

2013f). The ultimate goal of the summative evaluation is to recommend or not

recommend re-employment for the next school year for each teacher in question

(MODESE, 2013f).

While the model evaluation system developed by the MODESE and the Network

for Educator Effectiveness (NEE) teacher evaluation model are both fully compliant with

the Missouri ESEA Waiver of 2012, differences do exist in terminology, organization,

and nomenclature of specific indicators for the teacher growth standards (NEE, 2013b).

One of the limitations of the MODESE model evaluation system is the traditional paper

and pencil format (MODESE, 2013f). Conversely, the NEE teacher evaluation system

has only an online format and platform (NEE, 2013b). This allows for ease and timely

sharing of evaluation events by the principal with the classroom teachers (NEE, 2013b).

Also, district administrators have access to demographic data generated by hundreds of

NEE-affiliated schools across Missouri which can be securely accessed to provide de-

identified benchmarking for comparisons among teachers and school buildings as a

whole for review and analysis purposes (NEE, 2013b).

Missouri school districts also have the option to develop a local school district teacher evaluation system and not utilize or adopt a system developed by an outside agency or group (Associated Press, 2014). Again, the mandatory requirement for Missouri school districts when complying with the Missouri ESEA Waiver of 2012 would be incorporation and fidelity to the seven essential principals: (a) using research-based practices to measure teacher performance, (b) establishing performance indicators for teachers based on their current performance levels, (c) aligning the evaluation process to the teacher's probationary period, (d) using student performance as a portion of the teacher evaluation process, (e) assessing teacher performance on a regular basis and providing timely feedback to the teacher, (f) ensuring the building administrators are highly trained in the evaluation procedures to be applied to the teachers, and (g) using the evaluation processes to improve student learning over time (MODESE, 2013e). As of September 2014, 50% of districts were utilizing their own self-designed evaluation systems, 28% were utilizing the NEE Evaluation Model, and 22% were utilizing the MODESE evaluation system (Associated Press, 2014).

Overview of the Missouri School Improvement Plan 5 (MSIP 5)

The MODESE modified the existing state-wide system of how school districts were evaluated after the Missouri ESEA Waiver of 2012 was implemented (MODESE, 2014a). The new ESEA Waiver compliance process is known as the Missouri School Improvement Plan 5 (MSIP 5) (MODESE, 2015a). MSIP 5 provides a more complete and comprehensive overview of whether or not a given school district is meeting performance expectations set forth in the ESEA Waiver of 2102 (MODESE, 2015a). The MODESE, along with the Missouri State Board of Education which ultimately approved

the process, publicly stated the MSIP 5 system is valid, accurate, and meaningful in determining a school district's Annual Performance Report (APR) (MODESE, 2014a).

While MSIP 5 is the system by which the MODESE determines school district effectiveness and progress, the APR is the final quantifiable report provided to each public school district in Missouri (MODESE, 2015b). An APR report is provided annually to public school districts in Missouri, usually in August of each calendar year for the preceding academic year (MODESE, 2015b). The APR document is used to generate accreditation determinations for every public school district in Missouri, but it is important to remember the sole final authority on the accreditation status of any school district in the state rests with the Missouri State Board of Education (MODESE, 2015b).

Additionally, the Missouri ESEA Waiver of 2012 accepted by the U.S. Department of Education was supposed to be in full effect and generating accreditation changes based on three-year patterns of data for either improving or failing public school districts in Missouri by the year 2015 (Robertson, 2014). However, in an apparent contradiction of official sources of power, the Missouri Legislature has approved legislation that clearly dictates new test results linked to the Common Core Assessment Plan of which Missouri is a member cannot be utilized by the MODESE under the MSIP 5 system to generate APR scores for public school districts in Missouri (Robertson, 2014). This remains true when the end result for the 2015 academic-year APR indicates a decrease from the APR score of the previous school year for a school district (Robertson, 2014).

Ramifications of MSIP 5 and School Accreditation Levels

While the total number of school districts in Missouri that currently hold accreditations of provisionally accredited or unaccredited is small compared to the total number of school districts in the state, the districts in question have thousands of students enrolled and attending classes (MODESE, 2014a). In 1993, the Outstanding Schools Act allowed parents of children attending an unaccredited Missouri public school district to transfer their children to an accredited Missouri public school district (MODESE, 2014a). The Outstanding School Act of 1993 has been upheld by the Missouri Supreme Court on two separate occasions and remains in effect (MODESE, 2014a).

A significant aspect of the Outstanding Schools Act of 1993 is language that places the financial burden solely with the unaccredited district when paying to educate a student at an accredited Missouri public school district under the parameters of this law (MODESE, 2014a). This financial burden shouldered by the unaccredited school district involves both the payment of tuition to the receiving accredited school district as well as transportation costs incurred by an individual student from the unaccredited school district to gain daily access to the accredited district (MODESE, 2014a). As a result of the Outstanding Schools Act of 1993, many unaccredited public school districts in Missouri are facing financial ruin when forced to pay tuition and transportation costs associated with students living in the unaccredited district transferring to neighboring accredited public school districts (MODESE, 2014a). Additionally, the financial strain of paying the transferring student's incurred tuition and transportation costs is limiting internal improvement initiatives as the unaccredited public school districts attempt to

develop and implement programs and practices to increase achievement for students still attending the unaccredited school district (MODESE, 2014a).

Determining school district accreditation levels. The MODESE has established four accreditation levels to be determined by the APR provided yearly to each school district (MODESE, 2014a). The accreditation levels and criteria include (a) Accredited with Distinction - the district earned a minimum of 90% or more of the possible APR points and met other criteria established by the State Board of Education, (b) Accredited – the district earned at least 70% of the possible APR points; (c) Provisionally Accredited – the district earned at least 50% of the possible APR points; and (d) Unaccredited – the district earned less than 50% of the possible APR points (MODESE, 2014a).

APR status is a single academic-year measure based on a public school district's APR for that year only (MODESE, 2014a). APR status does not represent the accreditation level conferred by the Missouri State Board of Education (MODESE, 2014a). The Missouri State Board of Education complies with the following steps when considering granting or changing a school district's accreditation level: (a) the use of multiple APR cycles, preferably three academic years of continuous data to allow patterns and trends to become identifiable over time; (b) supporting data reduced to the single APR document are analyzed in detail for additional elements in the data sets to be considered; and (c) based on the recommendation of the MODESE officials, the Missouri State Board of Education will determine official accreditation levels for all public school districts in the state (MODESE, 2014a).

Interventions for low-performing school districts. One of the components of the Missouri ESEA Waiver of 2012 is to provide targeted and additional resources and

intervention strategies to school districts classified as provisionally accredited or unaccredited in the Missouri public school system (MODESE, 2014a). The MODESE has the authority and responsibility to offer more supervision, resources, assistance, and even intervention in the governance structure of school districts that fail to show improvement or meet minimal accreditation standards over time. It has become clear over many years that small and incremental change events have not worked in low-performing school districts to alter the culture or to increase student achievement levels of students enrolled there (MODESE, 2014a).

Tier I. A tier system with five steps has been developed in association with MSIP 5 and the ESEA Waiver of 2102 to assist all public school districts in Missouri (MODESE, 2014a). The five tiers include the following: (a) Tier I – all districts rated at the accredited with distinction or accredited level according to the Missouri State Board of Education; (b) Tier II-a – any district with a score below 75% of the possible APR points on the most recent APR or that receives two consecutive years of a 5% or greater decline in APR scores; (c) Tier II-b – all school districts meeting any of the Tier II a criteria for consecutive years; (d) Tier III – all provisionally accredited school districts according to the Missouri State Board of Education; and (e) Tier IV – all unaccredited school districts according to the Missouri State Board of Education (MODESE, 2014a).

Tier I plan requirements for school districts consist of only the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) (MODESE, 2014a). Monitoring requirements for Tier I school districts are minimal, with only the Items not Waived Checklist being required for submittal to the MODESE (MODESE, 2014a). Finally, supports available to Tier I school districts include formative and summative assessment tools for students, a growth

model for individual buildings within a school district, along with teacher and leader evaluation models developed by the MODESE (MODESE, 2014a).

    Tier II-a. Tier II-a plan requirements for school districts consist of only the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) (MODESE, 2014a). Monitoring requirements for Tier II-a school districts are minimal, with only the Items not Waived Checklist being required for submittal to the MODESE (MODESE, 2014a). Finally, supports available to Tier II-a school districts include formative and summative assessment tools for students, a growth model for individual buildings within a school district, teacher and leader evaluation models developed by the MODESE, along with official notification of Tier II-a status and a formal recommendation for the school district to utilize research-based practices when considering program and curriculum changes (MODESE, 2014a).

    Tier II-b. A Tier II-b plan requires school districts to adopt a MODESE-approved Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) (MODESE, 2014a). Monitoring requirements for Tier II-b school districts include the Items not Waived Checklist being required for submittal to the MODESE, along with targeted audits performed by MODESE officials for review of the school district's supporting data used to generate the APR calculation (MODESE, 2014a). Finally, supports available to Tier II-b school districts include formative and summative assessment tools for students, a growth model for individual buildings within a school district, teacher and leader evaluation models developed by the MODESE, as well as official notification of Tier II-b status and targeted audits initiated by the MODESE to determine specific research-based interventions to implement (MODESE, 2014a).

Tier III. A Tier III plan requires school districts to adopt a MODESE-approved CSIP along with individual school building improvement plans as well as a performance contract between the local board of education and the Missouri State Board of Education for school district improvement (MODESE, 2014a). Monitoring requirements for Tier III school districts include the Items not Waived Checklist being required for submittal to the MODESE, targeted audits performed by MODESE officials for review of the school district's supporting data used to generate the APR calculation, and a Regional School Improvement Team (RSIT) chaired by MODESE officials meeting on a monthly basis to provide assistance to the Tier III school district (MODESE, 2014a). Finally, supports available to Tier III school districts include formative and summative assessment tools for students, a growth model for individual buildings within a school district, teacher and leader evaluation models developed by the MODESE, as well as official notification of Tier III status (MODESE, 2014a). Targeted audits initiated by the MODESE to determine specific research-based interventions to implement will continue to be utilized, as well as a community-school district compact being agreed to and executed (MODESE, 2014a).

Tier IV. A Tier IV plan requires school districts to adopt a MODESE-approved CSIP, individual school building improvement plans, as well as a performance contract between the local board of education and the Missouri State Board of Education for school district improvement (MODESE, 2014a). Monitoring requirements for Tier IV school districts include the Items not Waived Checklist being required for submittal to the MODESE, targeted audits performed by MODESE officials for review of the school district's supporting data used to generate the APR calculation, and a Regional School Improvement Team (RSIT) chaired by MODESE officials meeting on a monthly basis to

provide assistance to the Tier IV school district (MODESE, 2014a). Finally, supports available to Tier IV school districts include formative and summative assessment tools for students, a growth model for individual buildings within a school district, teacher and leader evaluation models developed by the MODESE, and official notification of Tier IV status (MODESE, 2014a). Targeted audits initiated by the MODESE to determine specific research-based interventions to implement will continue to be utilized, as well as a community-school district compact being agreed to and executed (MODESE, 2014a). Culminating actions at this point of the process by the MODESE could include the following: (a) the appointment of on-site instructional monitors; (b) the appointment of a transition task force for the school district; (c) the appointment of fiscal monitors; and (d) after review by the Missouri State Board of Education, the Tier IV school district's governance structure is taken over by MODESE-appointed officials (MODESE, 2014a).

APR Calculation Methodology

MSIP 5 has the goal of all Missouri students graduating high school either college or career ready (MODESE, 2014b). To measure progress toward this goal, the MODESE has developed an APR to distinguish among school districts' performance in five key areas for K-12 school districts (MODESE, 2014b). The five performance areas of K-12 school districts include the following: (a) academic achievement in English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies; (b) subgroup achievement in English language Arts, mathematics, science, and social studies; (c) college and career readiness; (d) attendance rate; and (e) graduation rate (MODESE, 2014b). Public school districts in Missouri serving grades K-8 have a different APR scale and performance areas and will not be addressed for this study (MODESE, 2014b).

Point allocations. On the yearly APR document, 140 points are available to K-12 public school districts in Missouri (MODESE, 2014b). APR points are available to school districts in the following format: (a) academic achievement in English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies for 56 total APR possible points; (b) subgroup achievement in English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies for 14 total APR possible points; (c) college and career readiness for 30 total APR possible points; (d) attendance rate for 10 total APR possible points; and (e) graduation rate for 30 total APR possible points (MODESE, 2014b). The level of accreditation assigned to a public school district by the Missouri State Board of Education is based, in part, on the percentage of points earned in the five performance categories on the yearly APR document (MODESE, 2014b).

Fully 70 of the 140 possible points on the yearly APR document are comprised by the first two performance categories, academic achievement and subgroup achievement in English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies (MODESE, 2014b). Officials at the MODESE and the Missouri State Board of Education have been very direct in making the academic achievement components the largest portion of the yearly APR document (MODESE, 2014b). The division of points among the five performance areas should not diminish the importance of the other three performance areas: college and career readiness, attendance rate, and graduation rate (MODESE, 2014b). However, analysis of the point sources in the 140-point APR total indicates a school district can make more APR progress by improving student achievement than the school district can by increasing performance in any other single key performance area of the APR document (MODESE, 2014b).

Progress and growth explanations. More in-depth options exist for school districts to gain points on the yearly APR document as well (MODESE, 2014b). Two of these options are progress measures and growth measures (MODESE, 2014b). Progress measures evaluate the same grade level or content area over several consecutive years (MODESE, 2014b). This type of information and trend data can then be used to look for patterns of low performance regardless of any individual cohorts of students moving through the school system (MODESE, 2014b). Growth measures evaluate the change in an individual student's academic achievement over time (MODESE, 2014b). Essentially, after a baseline year in third grade, the same student can be charted in successive years of standardized testing through eighth grade to identify patterns in performance over time (MODESE, 2014b).

Super-subgroup explanation. Finally, a third more in-depth factor exists for school districts in the yearly APR document, the super subgroup classification (MODESE, 2014b). The super subgroup classification identifies and combines five subgroups that often have a significant achievement difference when compared to the student population at large for a school district (MODESE, 2014b). The five subgroups that become combined into the super subgroup include the following: black students, Hispanic students, low-income students, students with disabilities, and English language learners (MODESE, 2014b). The logic behind creating the super subgroup classification by the MODESE was the fact many school districts in the state did not have an adequate cell size for accountability purposes for some or all of the five individual subgroups listed (MODESE, 2014b). This meant students attended classes in a given school district, and the MODESE had no ability to ensure the school district was held accountable for the

education of each child (MODESE, 2014b). By creating the super subgroup classification, now each school district in Missouri is accountable in some form for every student enrolled (MODESE, 2014b).

Implementing Educational Change

When change is mandated from outside authorities, it is critical the leadership of an organization systematically choose the appropriate vehicle to facilitate the required change (Fullan, 2011). School leaders cannot think of change as a linear function to be achieved on a set schedule in regular and even time intervals (Fullan, 2011). An organization which utilizes the most innovation is not guaranteed success, and neither is an organization which innovates with the best ideas (Fullan, 2011). However, it is the organization utilizing the best ideas which has the highest probability of achieving the desired outcome of the change process (Fullan, 2011).

School leaders are unable to be experts in every facet of the public education experience (Levin, Glaze, & Fullan, 2008). However, the idea a school leader must be an expert in understanding and managing the change process in the field of education is well-founded (Levin et al., 2008). The school leader must anticipate, prepare for, and overcome the implementation lag associated with the imperfect initial mechanics of starting any new system-wide program (Levin et al., 2008). In addition, an effective leader should embrace resistance and concern from faculty members to the new system-wide program and view those concerns as an opportunity to both learn about and improve the long-range viability of the system change being implemented (Levin et al., 2008). For change to be successful and sustainable, schools as organizations in the macro context must be willing, able, and supported to learn and grow over time (Levin et al., 2008).

This organizational support can be in the form of active leadership at many levels of the school's hierarchy (Levin et al., 2008). One avenue to develop the needed leadership is through concerted and purposeful professional cohorts among administrators and academic coaches (Levin et al., 2008). It is essential leadership development be job-embedded and directly related to the change process undertaken by the cohort (Levin et al., 2008).

Building trust in the educational setting. The type of leadership which fosters successful change initiatives includes treating teachers with respect and dignity and enhances teacher-to-teacher collaboration (Luger, 2012). As a direct result, the school leader builds higher and stronger levels of trust within the organization (Luger, 2012). More trust among school administration and faculty will lead to more collaboration and sharing of ideas among all internal stakeholders, which will lead to an increase in student achievement and success (Luger, 2012).

The most direct avenue a building leader can take to establishing organizational trust is to construct individual relationships with teachers over time (Fullan, 2009). A key component to this end is to systematically and ethically strive to improve working conditions and morale for the teaching staff (Fullan, 2009). While extrinsic factors can play a role in improving teachers' working conditions, the desired outcomes can also be pursued by enhancing intrinsic factors and building cultural dynamics of the everyday work environment (Fullan, 2011). Quality leadership also addresses individual teacher's shortcomings and incompetence directly, fairly, and firmly (Fullan, 2011). In doing so, the school leader sends a message to other faculty members of the depth of the

commitment by the administrator to continual change and improvement of all faculty members for the overall school-wide goal of student achievement (Fullan, 2011).

Methods to improve school buildings. Moving now to the micro view of improving an individual school building, two ideas become imperative: (a) schools must hire well, and (b) schools must improve faculty already in place (Luger, 2012). Developing teacher talent is both time-consuming and labor-intensive on the part of the school administrator (Luger, 2012). The idea of spending more time and monetary resources on improved teacher recruitment tactics as a direct offset to spending the same amount of time and monetary resources on the bottom 20% of a school building's faculty in improvement efforts is a viable option for school leaders to consider (Luger, 2012).

It is not always practical or possible to seek only external answers to personnel issues within a school building (Luger, 2012). Improvement of faculty from within can be a practical and realistic goal for school leaders (Luger, 2012). For this internal improvement to occur, teachers must be willing to develop and grow throughout a career (Luger, 2012). One way for growth in human capital (the individual teacher) to occur is through the school leader fostering and growing the social capital (teacher-to-teacher interaction) to encourage lower-performing teachers to be secure and trusting of the school culture to engage and accept input and help from higher-performing and more experienced peers (Luger, 2012). For efficiency, a clear definition and understanding of roles can help streamline the improvement and growth of all parties (Luger, 2012). The teacher's role is to teach students, improve educational pedagogy, and grow as an educator (Luger, 2012). The principal's role is to support the classroom teacher and to

create and develop many layers of leaders within the hierarchy of the school structure (Luger, 2012).

Teacher Impact on Student Achievement

The importance of the teacher in student achievement has been researched in many formats by numerous individuals and groups. Teachers do matter concerning student achievement, accounting up to one-third of a school's impact on a particular student's achievement on standardized tests (Briggs, Davis, & Rhines-Cheney, 2012). To add depth to the concept of a teacher's impact on student achievement, the areas of content area, subject matter, and grade level are not factors in measuring the teacher's impact on student achievement (Allen et al., 2013). Allen et al. (2013) stated, "Good teaching was good teaching regardless of content or grade level" (p. 91). Not only does the teacher bear the largest impact on student standardized test achievement, but that impact is a better indicator of student academic achievement growth than race, socio-economic level, and class size (Strahan, 2013).

The goal of effective teaching should be two-fold—to provide opportunities for all students to grow academically to their fullest potential while also striving to reduce inequality in student achievement for students from disadvantaged backgrounds (Konstantopoulos & Chung, 2011). Within the concept of effective teaching many skillsets and quantifiable traits exist (Dessoff, 2012). However, the first of these factors to consider is the specific feedback afforded to students by teachers in the classroom setting (Dessoff, 2012). The feedback by effective teachers can take both verbal and written form (Dessoff, 2012). This feedback component is echoed by Hattie (2012) in his statement concerning leading indicators of effective teachers, "Feedback was a common

denominator in many of the top influences" (p. 18). One of the side notes in this vein of thought is to ensure teachers are providing quality feedback to students as opposed to ineffective feedback which tends to be more superficial and impersonal in nature (Hattie, 2012).

Next, to move beyond the single teacher in the single classroom to a more macro-view of the educational process, Haskins and Loeb (2007) have shown students who had not only one, but three consecutive years of instruction provided by teachers determined to be in the top fifth of all teachers showed a gain of approximately 50 percentile points, as compared to students who had three consecutive years of instruction from teachers ranked in the bottom fifth of all teachers in the study. Also, teachers ranked in the top fifth of all teachers produced academic growth among and across all subgroups of students in achievement on standardized tests (Haskins & Loeb, 2007). Continuing in this theme, Haskins and Loeb (2007) deduced when students were nested or grouped based on academic ability, no matter the level of the student groups (high, medium, or low), higher-quality teachers produced more academic achievement growth on standardized tests than lower-quality teachers across all of the student ability grouping tiers. Another study's researchers gauged the importance of having effective teachers during a student's developmental years in grades four through eight (Rebora, 2012). The students who were placed in classes taught by highly effective teachers based on value-added ratings for a larger percentage of time were "more successful in many dimensions" of life after high school (Rebora, 2012, p. 5).

Gaynor (2012) argued teacher quality has a larger singular impact on student achievement than any other single indicator. However, it is important to remember strong

school leadership, in the role of the building administrator, plays a critical role in student achievement success on standardized tests (Gaynor, 2012). This role of the building administrator can manifest in many forms—teacher recruitment, teacher retention, teacher dismissal, instructional vision, and professional development focus and goals of faculty members of the building (Amrein-Beardsley, 2007). This role of the building administrator is even more critical for lower-achieving students and students from disadvantaged backgrounds (Amrein-Beardsley, 2007). Highly effective and expert teachers are less likely to teach in high-poverty and underachieving schools (Amrein-Beardsley, 2007). To this end, three factors are listed as incentives for highly effective teachers to work in underachieving schools: (a) having a high-quality principal in place; (b) higher salary, increased benefits, or a promotion; and (c) knowing the majority of the faculty are also highly effective and committed to improvement (Amrein-Beardsley, 2007).

Administrator impact on student achievement. To continue with the importance of a quality principal being a major factor in student academic achievement success, thought needs to be given to how to develop and foster this type of building principal (Bambrick-Santoyo, 2012). The method described by Bambrick-Santoyo (2012) places the superintendent or assistant superintendent in the facilitator role, with the principal in the position receiving evaluation and then feedback from the superintendent or assistant superintendent. The structure would be equivalent to the principal-teacher or teacher–student relationships in the various formative and evaluative processes and feedback mechanisms (Bambrick-Santoyo, 2012).

Examples of tasks the superintendent or assistant superintendent could undertake with the building principal could include the following: (a) co-observe a teacher in the classroom, (b) role play a feedback meeting from the point of view of the principal with a teacher, (c) review video of teacher performance together and discuss in real time, (d) observe a professional development workshop with the principal and teachers, (e) review lesson plans and curriculum with the principal, and (f) analyze standardized test data together by grade level and building for deeper understanding (Bambrick-Santoyo, 2012). Again, this evaluative role filled by the superintendent, assistant superintendent, or other central office administrator is designed to foster growth and improvement in the building principal to ultimately lead to increased student achievement on standardized test scores (Bambrick-Santoyo, 2012).

Development and Retention of High-Quality Teachers

An essential method to improving the quality of teachers coming into the profession is to increase the knowledge base and skillsets of all undergraduate teachers who complete college degrees in the field of education (Richardson, 2013). Additionally, teacher quality improves with experience no matter the initial starting point of the skills of a given teacher (Hopkins, 2008). Good, or effective, teachers are not evenly or fairly distributed among all schools or districts in states or around the United States as a whole (Haycock & Crawford, 2008). Teachers in the top quartile of effectiveness advance a student five percentile points per year relative to peers provided classroom instruction by any teacher whose effectiveness is ranked in any of the other three quartiles (Haycock & Crawford, 2008).

Many times, the new or less-experienced teacher is placed in a school and classroom setting that can be described as the most challenging teaching environment in which to work (Hopkins, 2008). These less-experienced, and therefore less-prepared, teachers are often placed in teaching assignments in low-income communities with a high percentage of minority students (Hopkins, 2008). Difficult assignments can and do lead to a number of novice teachers leaving the education profession within just a few years of beginning a career in teaching (Hopkins, 2008). Approximately one-third of new teachers leave the profession within three years of beginning a teaching career, and nearly half abandon the education profession completely within five years of entering the teaching field (Hopkins, 2008).

This rapid turnover in the teaching ranks of many struggling schools and districts contributes to a revolving door of continually hiring and training new teachers (Stronge & Hindman, 2003). The paradox presented by this cycle is the demand for highly effective and trained teachers outweighs the supply (Stronge & Hindman, 2003). The end result is then to hire even less-prepared and non-traditionally trained teachers to fill the increased number of openings in the most challenging classrooms and schools with the most disadvantaged students (Stronge & Hindman, 2003). In addition, better-prepared and traditionally credentialed teachers are more than twice as likely to remain in the teaching profession when compared to non-traditionally credentialed peers in the lowest-performing classrooms, schools, and districts (Stronge & Hindman, 2003). Traditionally trained teachers are more likely to meet initial adequacy standards in six key areas as opposed to non-traditionally credentialed teachers: pre-requisites of effective teaching, the teacher as a person, classroom management for effective delivery of instruction,

organizing and planning for instruction, implementing instruction for student success, and monitoring student progress (Stronge & Hindman, 2003).

In order to help teachers who remain in the classroom increase and improve effectiveness, many states have transitioned to overhauling evaluation systems for teachers and principals (Darling-Hammond, 2012). In many cases, this was initiated in response to a particular state obtaining a waiver from the federally mandated No Child Left Behind legislation (Darling-Hammond, 2012). The crux of most of the new evaluation systems for teachers and principals is the dual purpose of both measuring teacher and principal effectiveness as well as developing and enhancing teacher and principal skillsets to become better professionals (Darling-Hammond, 2012). The argument can be proposed nothing is more important for student achievement than hiring effective classroom teachers and dismissing ineffective classroom teachers (Darling-Hammond, 2012). While it is not the focus of this endeavor, teacher tenure laws and union contracts often do make the process of firing ineffective teachers difficult both in terms of time and financial outlay by a school district (Thomas, Wingert, Conant, & Register, 2010).

Improving effectiveness of current teachers. To that end, if the best possible teachers are hired and the teachers who are least effective are dismissed or removed from the classroom setting, then building administrators in the schools are left with a set of teachers with varying and developing skillsets and individual strengths and weaknesses (Marzano, 2013). What is the next step (Marzano, 2013)? The ability to coach existing teachers to become better educators is key (Marzano, 2013).

Concerning teachers already in the profession and likely to remain in the profession, the traditional career path with a college degree in the field of education was not positively associated with an ability to improve as a professional in the classroom (Cruickshank & Haefele, 2001). The improvement mechanism was often a trial-and-error adventure on the part of the individual teacher which occurred in isolation not only from administrative oversight, but also without any peer feedback regarding pedagogy (Cruickshank & Haefele, 2001). As part of the No Child Left Behind waiver initiatives by states, teacher evaluation as a tool in the context of generating teacher improvement in the classroom has been launched in many states across the county (Cruickshank & Haefele, 2001). Some skillsets deemed important to be evaluated and improved upon by classroom teachers include (a) the teacher as a monitor of learning activities; (b) the teacher establishing learning objectives clear to the student; (c) the teacher as accepting, supporting, nurturing, and equitable when interacting with all students; and (d) the teacher being persistent in addressing and improving challenges to the effectiveness of the teacher in the classroom setting (Cruickshank & Haefele, 2001).

Some general examples of methods to support teachers in improving teaching skillsets involve professional development activities where the building principal participates in the actual methodology and training with the classroom teacher (Bambrick-Santoyo, 2013). The building principal also gains first-hand insight into the endeavor to enhance the implementation and feedback component from the supervisor's point of view to the teacher (Bambrick-Santoyo, 2013). An additional strategy is not only for the building principal to provide continual and ongoing evaluation of the teacher with feedback, but to provide feedback in real time during evaluation of the teacher's

performance in the classroom (Bambrick-Santoyo, 2013). While this methodology and delivery of feedback can be awkward at first and should always be respectful in the presence of students, this method can afford the building principal invaluable opportunities for in-the-moment feedback to assist novice or struggling teachers with concepts or situations that, if corrected, can greatly enhance the effectiveness of the teacher in the classroom setting (Bambrick-Santoyo, 2013).

   Enticing effective teachers to work in disadvantaged schools. Administrators should determine methods or incentives to entice experienced and already effective classroom teachers to work in disadvantaged schools (Amrein-Beardsley, 2007). Expert teachers cited three important factors which were persuasive to change jobs to low socio-economic and high-minority student population school districts: (a) the quality of the building principal and the notion of building principal being highly qualified, (b) a higher salary or better benefits for the teacher along with a promotion of additional title, and (c) the teacher knowing a majority of the faculty were like-minded and willing to work at becoming more effective where the expert teacher could coach and mentor other highly motivated but less experienced teachers to improve teaching effectiveness in the classroom setting (Amrein-Beardsley, 2007).

   While not a direct focus of this researcher, salary and performance-based pay is worth noting in the context of effective teaching as the single-most important factor in student achievement (Niels, 2012). A macro-view of salary differences among professions is not a decisive factor for an individual to choose or not choose a career in education, but once an individual graduates, the beginning salary difference among different school districts does play a role in applying for and accepting employment as a

teacher (Niels, 2012). By neither advocating for or against merit pay for classroom teachers, it has been proposed by Toch (2009) if a merit pay system were put into place, the methodology should go beyond a small sample size of standardized test scores for students. Other factors should be deliberated when consideration is given to implementing a merit pay system for teachers including teacher classroom interactions with students, delivery of instruction by the teacher to students, teacher planning for the teaching process, motivation of the students by the teacher, and classroom management of the learning environment by the teacher (Morice & Murray, 2003). Monetary incentives, including salaries and benefits, do play a larger role in teacher retention in the district than in initial recruitment of the teacher to the district (Morice & Murray, 2003). Concerning teachers who change jobs but who stay in the field of education, moving from a lower-paying school district to a higher-paying school district is a major consideration (Morice & Murray, 2003).

Teacher Evaluation as a Tool for Improvement

Marzano (2012b) offered the following concerning more traditional teacher evaluation models, "Teacher evaluation systems have not accurately measured teacher quality and have not aided in developing a highly skilled teacher workforce" (p. 15). He further added, "An evaluation system that fosters teacher learning will differ from one whose aim is to measure teacher competence" (Marzano, 2012b, p. 14). Following up on the goal of this new type of teacher growth evaluation, Marzano (2012b) espoused the following, "Measuring teachers and developing teachers are different purposes with different implications" (p. 16). Furthermore, Marzano (2012b) advocated for a teacher

evaluation system designed to reward teacher growth and instill a desire for all teachers, no matter the current level of performance, to strive to get better at the craft of teaching.

An approach that is commonplace in the private sector, referred to as human capital management (HCM), aligns workers (teachers) to organizational goals (student achievement) (Hua, 2010). In this vein, classroom observations are more than a binary meets or does not meet checklist (Hua, 2010). The classroom observation is a tool to improve teacher performance in the classroom setting (Hua, 2010). The written formal summative evaluation as an annual all-encompassing document should only be one component of an overall teacher performance program that in the larger context is designed to both coach and mentor the classroom teacher to foster improvement in classroom performance (Hua, 2010).

Administrative roles in teacher evaluation. Principals play a critical role in the teacher evaluation process (Marzano, 2012a). Human error is part of any educational evaluation system; however, the impact of reducing the amount of error present in teacher evaluation systems is critical if the most accurate data possible are going to be generated (Marzano, 2012a). There are two main types of errors in the teacher evaluation process. Measurement error occurs when the administrator has not been properly trained to use the tool or does not implement the tool according to standard procedure (Marzano, 2012a). The other error type is sampling error which involves a very limited number of exposures by the principal to the teacher and classroom (Marzano, 2012a). A minimum number of classroom observations is not provided, but the implication is that more is better concerning classroom visits by a principal for the purpose of formative teacher evaluation (Marzano, 2012a).

Evaluation instruments rely on subjective observations of teaching (Barile et al., 2011). The evaluation instruments are applied by other members of the education community, usually administrators or other teachers serving as peer coaches (Barile et al., 2011). Building principals are rarely trained in the actual use and implementation of the evaluation instrument when discussing historical teacher evaluation models (Barile et al., 2011). In Missouri, as part of the ESEA Waiver of 2012, administrators are required to undergo both comprehensive initial training in the use and understanding of the evaluation instrument and must participate in annual refresher training sessions to maintain professional credentials as a trained teacher evaluator (MODESE 2013b). The annual refresher trainings were mandated to help minimize rater drift over time by administrators when using the evaluation instrument (MODESE, 2013b).

The teacher evaluation process can no longer be thought of in the context of being a fringe component of a building principal's job duties (Donaldson & Donaldson, 2012). In the private sector, it is uncommon for a supervisor to have a caseload of more than 15 supervisees (Donaldson & Donaldson, 2012). In the public education realm, a supervisor's caseload is often much higher (Donaldson & Donaldson, 2012). In the new view of teacher evaluation, the sole responsibility for evaluating and observing all classroom teachers in a given building no longer resides with only the building principal (Moss & Brookhart, 2013). Assistant principals, curriculum directors, academic coaches, and even central office personnel are working as a team and varying individual schedules and duties so that the number of classroom observations is increased; therefore, in theory the quality of teacher effectiveness is also improving leading to higher student achievement (Moss & Brookhart, 2013).

The next concept to consider endorses the idea of a hierarchical evaluation process for an entire district, from the top down (Marzano, 2013). This hierarchical method ensures all levels of leadership from district superintendent to building principal to classroom teacher use the following: (a) a common evaluation tool; (b) a common and scaled rubric; and (c) clear, concise, and universal verbiage in the evaluation process of all personnel (Marzano, 2013). The superintendent and other central office personnel can assist and build capacity in building-level administrative teams for success in the teacher evaluation process (Corda, 2012). This capacity building involves identifying the context and elevating the work to be done to a high status in the district, as well as framing the professional conversations of building administrative team members and classroom teachers concerning the feedback portion of the evaluation system (Corda, 2012).

Feedback to teachers about evaluations. Marzano (2011) advocated debriefing or feedback from principals to teachers after each evaluation event. The idea of peer observation of teachers was also discussed, and again the debriefing and feedback portion of this event was stressed as to its importance in the ultimate goal of improved performance in the classroom (Marzano, 2011). New teachers enter the profession with either limited classroom experience (traditional certification programs) or almost no classroom experience (nontraditional certification programs) (Marzano, 2011). For both groups, the historical way to improve classroom teacher performance was in isolation from other teachers and administrators and by a trial-and-error methodology (Marzano, 2011).

A critical focus of this new and more frequent teacher observation approach is the use of timely and frequent feedback to teachers by principals of what is observed in

multiple and ongoing classroom observations (Marshall, 2009). Suggestions by Marshall

(2009) in the area of teacher feedback include checklists, handwritten notes, or email as a

better alternative than no feedback. However, the best practice in this domain is face-to-

face dialogue between the principal and the teacher when each observation cycle is

completed (Routman, 2013). If the ultimate goal is to improve teacher performance in the

classroom, the actual verbal dialogue between the principal and the teacher is an integral

component of achieving that goal (Routman, 2013). The feedback component of any

teacher evaluation system is critical in establishing a culture where fear and mistrust are

minimized (Routman, 2013). Historically, traditional teacher evaluation systems were not

well-designed in the area of productive feedback from the administrator to the teacher

(Routman, 2013).

Teacher evaluation systems and instruments must be implemented and utilized

with integrity and fidelity to obtain valid and reliable data (Eisenbach, 2014). However,

the feedback portion of the process can be framed by the building principal so as to

encourage development, growth, and reflection by the individual classroom teacher

(Eisenbach, 2014). Choosing positive words or phrases on the part of the building

principal, even when discussing shortcomings or negative outcomes from a teacher

observation event, will drive the teacher to engage in productive conversations with other

professional educators about methods and ideas to improve performance in the classroom

environment (Eisenbach, 2014). Continuing the focus of feedback and debriefing, even

highly skilled and veteran teachers can show anxiety in this multiple observations format

(Marshall, 2012a). To combat this, it is recommended even for these already highly

skilled teachers, the administrator should offer both positive and frequent reassurances of

improvement and doing a good job (Marshall, 2012a). This also demonstrates an aspect

of genuineness by the administrator and keeps the administrator from only offering

constructive criticism (Marshall, 2012a).

Drop-in evaluation events. Marshall (2012b) subscribed to the point of view that

in general, preannounced or scheduled teacher observations sessions do not, for the most

part, give an accurate view of everyday activities in the classroom by either teachers or

students when principals perform those observations (Marshall, 2012b). The expected

goal of frequent, unannounced, and ongoing teacher observation would be to gain a more

accurate picture, albeit in smaller pieces, of what is going on in the classroom (Marshall,

2012b). The ultimate goal is for the principal's presence in a classroom to become so

familiar evaluations only minimally change the actions of the students or the teacher.

Marshall (2009) advocated for a series of short, unannounced classroom observations by

principals as the most effective way to accurately observe teachers. Marshall (2009)

wrote, "I found that if I stayed less than five minutes, my impressions were superficial,

but if I stayed 10 or 15 minutes, I wasn't able to fit in as many visits. Five minutes

yielded surprisingly rich information on each classroom, so that became my default" (p.

1).

Successful teacher observation systems employ multiple classroom observations

ranging the entire academic year (Darling-Hammond et al., 2012). The teacher evaluation

tool is implemented and utilized by expertly trained evaluators (Darling-Hammond et al.,

2012). The evaluators then provide timely and meaningful feedback to the classroom

teacher (Darling-Hammond et al., 2012). Additionally, guidance is provided for the

number of total visits per classroom per year as well as the total time commitment per

teacher per year by administrators (Marshall, 2009). The minimum number of

observations per teacher to have viable data would be 10 (Marshall, 2009). Additionally,

between the time allotted for the observation and then a short follow-up feedback session

between the principal and teacher for each observation event, around 300 total minutes

will be spent by an administrator per teacher per year (Marshall, 2009).

Remaining with the time component, Marshall (2009) offered advice to principals

on how to schedule and manage the time requirements with this format of teacher

observation. It is recommended to have a goal of five mini-observations per day on

routine or normal school days (Marshall, 2009). In a building with an administrator-to-

teacher ratio of approximately 40:1, this ratio would roughly average to the principal or

assistant principal seeing each teacher every two to three weeks and a total of 450 mini-

observations per year per administrator (Marshall, 2009). Another aspect to assist

building principals and other evaluators in maximizing the classroom visit-to-time ratio

would be pre-evaluation meetings on a regular basis to clarify the following: (a) what

teaching criteria will be focused on; (b) what evidence, or lack of evidence, will be

looked for by the evaluator; and (c) how the data collected will be utilized (Marshall,

2009).

Marc Doss (personal communication, December 18, 2014) confirmed Dr. Kim

Marshall's work was a major influence in the development of the NEE parameters for

conducting a drop-in evaluation as part of the NEE protocol. Formal steps of properly

executing a NEE drop-in teacher evaluation include the administrator completing the

NEE certification workshop, along with central office oversight as to the number and

frequency of the drop-in events by the building principal (NEE, 2013b). A random

scheduling process by the building principal is needed to ensure all teachers are evaluated fairly and ethically over the course of the school year, in addition to participation in professional cohorts to conduct evaluation events in the field in administrative teams for feedback and normalization purposes (NEE, 2013b). Continual follow-up by central office administration to ensure the building principal is on target for total number of teacher evaluation visits at various calendar dates during the school year is essential, as is fidelity by the building principal to the paperwork and teacher feedback component within 24 hours of the evaluation event (NEE, 2013b).

Features of the NEE Teacher Evaluation System

Under the Missouri ESEA Waiver of 2012, all Missouri public school districts are mandated to evaluate teachers on certain predetermined criteria (NEE, 2014). The Missouri Model Teacher and Leader Standards produced by the MODESE and approved by the Missouri State Board of Education include nine standards and 36 indicators that if utilized by public schools districts will comply with the Missouri ESEA Waiver of 2012 requirements (NEE, 2014). However, the NEE teacher evaluation system possesses the same nine overriding standards while sub-dividing the standards differently to produce 38 indicators (NEE, 2014). The nine standards common to both teacher evaluation formats include the following:

>…Standard 1-Teacher uses content knowledge and perspectives aligned with appropriate instruction, Standard 2-Teacher understand and encourages student learning, growth, and development, as well as Standard 3-Teacher implements curriculum effectively, Standard 4-Teacher provides instruction for critical thinking by the student, Standard 5-Teacher creates positive classroom

environment for learning, along with Standard 6-Teacher uses effective

communication, Standard 7-Teacher uses student assessment data to analyze and

modify instruction, Standard 8-Teacher develops professional practices, and

Standard 9-Teacher participates in professional collaborations and commitments.

(NEE, 2013d, pp. 33-35)

The nine standards which compose the NEE teacher evaluation system are based

on research-based criteria (NEE, 2013d).

Thirty-eight specific NEE indicators. In the NEE teacher evaluation system,

Standard 1 (the teacher uses content knowledge and perspectives aligned with appropriate

instruction) is divided into five indicators (NEE, 2013d). The five indicators include the

following: (a) Indicator 1.1-Teacher displays and communicates content knowledge and

academic language; (b) Indicator 1.2-Teacher cognitively engages students in the subject;

(c) Indicator 1.3-Teacher uses interdisciplinary research and inquiry methodologies and

teaches the tools of inquiry used in the specific content areas; (d) Indicator 1.4-Teacher

uses interdisciplinary instruction as appropriate; and (e) Indicator 1.5-Teacher

incorporates diverse social and cultural perspectives on content (NEE, 2013d).

In the NEE teacher evaluation system, Standard 2 (the teacher understands and

encourages student learning, growth, and development) is divided into six indicators

(NEE, 2013d). The six indicators include the following: (a) Indicator 2.1-Teacher

supports cognitive development of all students; (b) Indicator 2.2-Teacher sets and

monitors student goals; (c) Indicator 2.3-Teacher incorporates various theories of

learning; (d) Indicator 2.4-Teacher promotes the emotional development and competence

of students; (e) Indicator 2.5-Teacher builds on students' prior experiences, learning

strengths, and needs; and (f) Indicator 2.6-Teacher builds on students' language, culture, family, and community (NEE, 2013d). Additionally, in the NEE teacher evaluation system, Standard 3 (teacher implements curriculum effectively) is divided into three indicators (NEE, 2013d). The three indicators include the following: Indicator 3.1-Teacher implements curriculum standards in the classroom; (b) Indicator 3.2-Teacher develops lesson for diverse learners; and (c) Indicator 3.3-Teacher analyzes instructional goals and differentiated instructional strategies for all students (NEE, 2013d).

In the NEE teacher evaluation system, Standard 4 (teacher provides instruction for critical thinking by the student) is divided into three indicators (NEE, 2013d). The three indicators include the following: (a) Indicator 4.1-Teacher uses instructional strategies leading to student problem-solving and critical thinking skill development; (b) Indicator 4.2-Teacher appropriately uses instructional resources to enhance the learning of all students; and (c) Indicator 4.3-Teacher employees cooperative in the classroom setting (NEE, 2013d). Furthermore, in the NEE teacher evaluation system, Standard 5 (teacher creates positive classroom environment for learning) is divided into five indicators (NEE, 2013d). The indicators include the following: (a) Indicator 5.1-Teacher motivates and affectively engages all students; (b) Indicator 5.2-Teacher manages time, space, transitions, and activities within the school setting; (c) Indicator 5.2b-Teacher uses effective discipline and promotes student self-control in the school setting; (d) Indicator 5.3-Teacher uses strategies that promote social competence in the classroom setting, school at-large, within the community, and between students; and (e) Indicator 5.3b-Teacher establishes secure teacher-child relationships in the school environment (NEE, 2013d).

In the NEE teacher evaluation system, Standard 6 (teacher uses effective communication) is divided into four indicators (NEE, 2013d). The four indicators include the following: Indicator 6.1-Teacher uses effective verbal and nonverbal communication in the school setting; (b) Indicator 6.2-Teacher communications with students are sensitive to cultural, gender, intellectual, and physical differences; (c) Indicator 6.3-Teacher supports effective student expression and communication in speaking, writing, and other forms of media; and (d) Indicator 6.4-Teacher uses technology and media tools, when available and appropriate, for communication with students and parents (NEE, 2013d). Standard 7 (teacher uses student assessment data to analyze and modify instruction) is divided into six indicators (NEE, 2013d). The six indicators include the following: Indicator 7.1-Teacher uses effective, valid, and reliable assessments; (b) Indicator 7.2-Teacher uses assessment data to improve student learning; (c) Indicator 7.3-Teacher promotes student-led assessment strategies; (d) Indicator 7.4-Teacher monitors the effect of instruction on individual and class learning; (e) Indicator 7.5-Teacher communicates student progress and maintains appropriate records; and (f) Indicator 7.6-Teacher participates in the collaborative data analysis process incorporated at the building level (NEE, 2013d).

In the NEE teacher evaluation system, Standard 8 (teacher develops professional practices) is divided into three indicators (NEE, 2013d). The three indicators include the following: Indicator 8.1-Teacher engages in self-assessment and improvement; (b) Indicator 8.2-Teacher seeks and creates professional learning opportunities for personal improvement; and (c) Indicator 8.3-Teacher observes, promotes, and supports professional rights, responsibilities, and ethical practices in the field of education (NEE,

2013d). Finally, in the NEE Teacher evaluation system, Standard 9 (teacher participates

in professional collaborations and commitments) is divided into three indicators (NEE,

2013d). The indicators include the following: Indicator 9.1-Teacher participates in

collegial activities to build relationships and encourages growth within the educational

community; (b) Indicator 9.2-Teacher collaborates within the historical, cultural,

political, and social contexts to meet the needs of all students; and (c) Indicator 9.3-

Teacher cooperates in partnerships to support student learning (NEE, 2013d).

   Data sources for indicators. Of the 38 individual indictors in the NEE teacher

evaluation system, many data sources exist for teachers to demonstrate an acceptable

level of performance on the various indicators (NEE, 2013d). Examples of data sources

to demonstrate NEE indicator mastery include classroom observation of the teacher by

the building administrator and student survey of the teacher's classroom performance,

which are two of the most influential data sources (NEE, 2013d). Also, the teacher's

personal professional development plan being satisfactorily completed and the teacher's

personal unit of instruction being followed as presented to the building principal are key

components of the process as well (NEE, 2013d).

   In the NEE teacher evaluation system for Standard 1 (the teacher uses content

knowledge and perspectives aligned with appropriate instruction), all five indicators

utilize classroom observation by the building administrator as a data source for teachers

to demonstrate satisfactory performance (NEE, 2013d). Concerning Standard 2 (the

teacher understands and encourages student learning, growth, and development), all six

indicators utilize classroom observation by the building administrator as a data source for

teachers to demonstrate acceptable performance (NEE, 2013d). When considering

Standard 3 (the teacher implements curriculum effectively), only Indicator 3.1 can be evaluated based on classroom observations by the building principal (NEE, 2013d). When the NEE teacher evaluation system is reviewed for Standard 4, Standard 5, and Standard 6, all 12 combined indicators can be successfully measured using classroom observations by the building principal (NEE, 2013d). Standard 7 only has two indicators that can be judged by classroom observations by the building administrator, Indicator 7.3 and Indicator 7.4 (NEE, 2013d). Finally, in the NEE teacher evaluation system, none of the six total indicators for Standard 8 or Standard 9 are measurable by the building principal utilizing only the classroom observation tool (NEE, 2013d).

NEE Indicator Rubrics

The NEE teacher evaluation system employed industry-standard scientific controls in developing rubrics for use by building principals when performing classroom observations of teachers on each of the 38 indicators (NEE, 2013d). Six major components were a guiding force in developing the needed rubrics (NEE, 2013d). The six components include the indicator being readily measurable as well as concrete and simple (NEE, 2013d). In addition, each indicator is unique within the collection of 38 indicators (no overlap with more than one indicator), and scoring rubrics are progressive for each indicator so clear differences in performance exist from minimal expectations to exceptional performance (NEE, 2013d). Finally, rubrics are clear with examples and non-examples included as a guide for building administrators, along with the rubrics being teacher-based and focused on the teachers' actions (NEE, 2013d).

NEE indicator rubric scoring scales. Scoring rubrics for classroom observation data sources within the NEE teacher evaluation system are on a scale of zero to seven for

each applicable indicator (NEE, 2013d). In contrast, more traditional and truncated

scoring scales for teacher performance provided a scoring range of one to three or one to

four (NEE, 2013d). A seven-point scale has the ability to document more precise

information for providing feedback to the teacher by the building principal at the

conclusion of the observation event (NEE, 2013d). The additional precision in the scoring

rubrics provides a better opportunity to quantify and capture the complexity and nuance

of the teaching process (NEE, 2013d).

Each of the indicators which compose the NEE teacher evaluation system and can

be observed utilizing the classroom observation data source are calibrated to scientifically

anchored descriptors for scores of zero, one, three, five, and seven, respectively (NEE,

2013d). Intermediary rubric scores for the NEE teacher evaluation system of two, four,

and six provide additional levels of refinement to the tool, but no additional anchored

descriptors are provided to assist the building principal (NEE, 2013d). To further assist

the building administrator in the real-time challenge of properly conducting a classroom

observation for a specific indicator, the NEE teacher evaluation system also includes

"look-fors" (NEE, 2013d, p. 13). The "look-fors" are less scientific in the verbiage

utilized and are not meant to be substituted for the anchored descriptors (NEE, 2013d, p.

13). The reason for inclusion of "look-fors" in the NEE teacher evaluation system is to

provide practical examples of classroom activities and teacher involvement for building

principals to notice and to then connect to the more formal, anchored descriptors during

the authentic classroom observation event (NEE, 2013d, p. 13).

Finally, the recommended methodology for building administrators to follow

when conducting classroom observations within the NEE teacher evaluation system for a

given indicator is to enter the classroom and mentally start with a rubric score of three (NEE, 2013d). The evaluator begins with a rubric score of three and then utilizes the anchored descriptors and "look-fors" to adjust the rubric score for the indicator to either a higher score, a lower score, or to maintain the initial score of three (NEE, 2013d, p. 13). The seven-point scale of the NEE teacher evaluation system is designed and calibrated to make a score of either zero or seven an unusual event, and mean scores of between three and five are to be expected for most teachers on all indicators (NEE, 2013d).

Building administrators can be expected to observe up to six different indicators during a single classroom observation utilizing the NEE teacher evaluation system (NEE, 2014). However, depending on the building administrator's capacity of understanding for specific NEE teacher evaluation system indicators, as well as the amount of experience the administrator has with the overall NEE teacher evaluation system, observing fewer than six indicators in a single observation event is common (NEE, 2014). Best practice for building administrators is to observe two to four indicators per classroom observation event (NEE, 2014).

NEE Indicators of Greatest Importance

Of the 38 NEE teacher evaluation system indicators, 26 indicators are measurable with the classroom observation tool when utilized by the building administrator (NEE, 2013d). Within this set of 26 indicators, NEE officials have determined through analysis of data eight indicators are very relevant to increasing teacher performance in the classroom and ultimately increasing student achievement (NEE, 2013d). The eight indicators are inclusive of the following: Indicator 1.1-Teacher displays and communicates content knowledge and academic language; Indicator 1.2-Teacher

cognitively engages students in the subject; Indicator 4.1-Teacher uses instructional

strategies leading to student problem-solving and critical thinking skill development;

Indicator 4.2-Teacher appropriately uses instructional resources to enhance the learning

of all students; Indicator 5.1-Teacher motivates and affectively engages all students;

Indicator 5.2-Teacher manages time, space, transitions, and activities within the school

setting; Indicator 5.3b-Teacher establishes secure teacher-child relationships in the school

environment; and Indicator 7.4-Teacher monitors the effect of instruction on individual

and class learning (NEE, 2013d).

NEE indicator 1.1. NEE teacher evaluation system Indicator 1.1 (the teacher

displays and communicates content knowledge and academic language) can be scored by

the building administrator on a zero to seven scale (NEE, 2013a). Relevance is given to

this standard based on research that indicates a teacher must have an academically sound

foundation of knowledge in the content area being taught (NEE, 2013a). Anchored

descriptions are provided for the scale scores of zero, one, three, five, and seven,

respectively (NEE, 2013a, p. 7). A teacher would be scored a zero if the teacher "does not

communicate the key concepts of the discipline(s), nor use academic language" (NEE,

2013a, p. 7). The teacher would be awarded a one on this rubric if the teacher

"demonstrates limited depth and/or breadth of key knowledge and rarely communicates

the meaning of academic language" (NEE, 2013a, p. 7). A score by the administrator of

three would be granted when the teacher "demonstrates some depth and breadth of

knowledge and communicates the meaning of academic language less than half of the

time" (NEE, 2013a, p. 7). The teacher could garner a score of five on the rubric when it

could be observed the teacher "demonstrates solid depth and breadth of key content

knowledge and communicates the meaning of academic language more than half of the time" (NEE, 2013a, p. 7). The highest rubric score of seven could be earned if the classroom teacher "demonstrates excellent depth and breadth of key content knowledge and communicates the meaning of academic language almost all of the time" (NEE, 2013a, p. 7).

NEE indicator 1.2. NEE teacher evaluation system Indicator 1.2 (the teacher cognitively engages students in the subject) can be scored by the building administrator on a zero to seven scale (NEE, 2013a). Relevance is given to this standard based on research that indicates cognitive interaction is a key component of student learning (NEE, 2013a). Anchored descriptions are provided for the scale scores of zero, one, three, five, and seven, respectively (NEE, 2013a). A teacher would be scored a zero if the teacher "does not cognitively engage students in the content" (NEE, 2013a, p. 1). The teacher would be awarded a one on this rubric if the teacher "seldom cognitively engages students in content" (NEE, 2013a, p. 1). A score by the administrator of three would be granted when the teacher "occasionally cognitively engages students in the content, less than half of the time, or less than half of the students" (NEE, 2013a, p. 1). The teacher could garner a score of five on the rubric when it could be observed the teacher "occasionally cognitively engages students in the content, more than half of the time, or more than half of the students" (NEE, 2013a, p. 1). The highest rubric score of seven could be earned if the teacher "almost always cognitively engages the students in the content, or engages almost all of the students" (NEE, 2013a, p. 1).

NEE indicator 4.1. NEE teacher evaluation system Indicator 4.1 (the teacher uses instructional strategies leading to student problem-solving and critical thinking skill

development) can be scored by the building administrator on a zero to seven scale (NEE, 2013a). Relevance is given to this standard based on research that indicates problem-solving skills and higher-order thinking skills are a key component of student achievement (NEE, 2013a). Anchored descriptions are provided for the scale scores of zero, one, three, five, and seven, respectively (NEE, 2013a). A teacher would be scored a zero if the teacher "does not promote student problem-solving or critical thinking skills" (NEE, 2013a, p. 2). The teacher would be awarded a one on this rubric if the teacher "seldom requires students to problem-solve and think critically" (NEE, 2013a, p. 2). A score by the administrator of three would be granted when the teacher "uses strategies that require students to problem-solve and think critically less than half of the time, or less than half of the students" (NEE, 2013a, p. 2). The teacher could garner a score of five on the rubric when it could be observed the teacher "uses strategies that require students to problem-solve and think critically more than half of the time, or more than half of the students" (NEE, 2013a, p. 2). The highest rubric score of seven could be earned if the classroom teacher "engages almost all students in learning activities that promote problem-solving and critical thinking skills continuously through almost all the lesson" (NEE, 2013a, p. 2).

NEE indicator 4.2. NEE teacher evaluation system Indicator 4.2 (the teacher appropriately uses instructional resources to enhance the learning of all students) can be scored by the building administrator on a zero to seven scale (NEE, 2013a). Relevance is given to this standard based on research that indicates instructional resources do play a role in student achievement (NEE, 2013a). Anchored descriptions are provided for the scale scores of zero, one, three, five, and seven, respectively (NEE, 2013a). A teacher

would be scored a zero if the teacher "does not appropriately use instructional resources to enhance learning" (NEE, 2013a, p. 8). The teacher would be awarded a one on this rubric if the teacher "seldom uses instructional resources to enhance learning" (NEE, 2013a, p. 8). A score of three would be granted when the teacher "uses some developmentally appropriate instructional resources to enhance learning less than half of the time, or for less than half of the students" (NEE, 2013a, p. 8). The teacher could garner a score of five on the rubric when it could be observed the teacher "uses some developmentally appropriate instructional resources to enhance learning more than half of the time, or for more than half of the students" (NEE, 2013a, p. 8). The highest rubric score of seven could be earned if the teacher "almost always effectively uses developmentally appropriate instructional resources to enhance learning for almost all students" (NEE, 2013a, p. 8).

NEE indicator 5.1. NEE teacher evaluation system Indicator 5.1 (the teacher motivates and affectively engages all students) can be scored by the building administrator on a zero to seven scale (NEE, 2013a). Relevance is given to this standard based on research that indicates student engagement in classroom activities plays a key role in student learning (NEE, 2013a). Anchored descriptions are provided for the scale scores of zero, one, three, five, and seven, respectively (NEE, 2013a). A teacher would be scored a zero if the teacher "does not use research-based motivation strategies" (NEE, 2013a, p. 5). The teacher would be awarded a one on this rubric if the teacher "seldom uses research-based motivation strategies" (NEE, 2013a, p. 5). A score by the administrator of three would be granted when the teacher "uses research-based motivation strategies effectively less than half of the time, or for less than half of the

students" (NEE, 2013a, p. 5). The classroom teacher could garner a score of five on the rubric when it could be observed the teacher "uses research-based motivation strategies effectively more than half of the time, or for more than half of the students" (NEE, 2013a, p. 5). The highest rubric score of seven could be earned if the teacher "almost always uses research-based motivation strategies effectively with most all of the students" (NEE, 2013a, p. 5).

     NEE indicator 5.2 NEE teacher evaluation system Indicator 5.2 (the teacher manages time, space, transitions, and activities within the school setting) can be scored by the building administrator on a zero to seven scale (NEE, 2013a). Relevance is given to this standard based on research that indicates maximizing student time on task plays a key role in student learning (NEE, 2013a). Anchored descriptions are provided for the scale scores of zero, one, three, five, and seven, respectively (NEE, 2013a). A teacher would be scored a zero if the teacher "does not manage time, space, or transitions well. Almost all students are on task less than 10% of the time" (NEE, 2013a, p. 6). The teacher would be awarded a one on this rubric if the teacher "seldom manages time, space, or transitions well and most students are on task less than 25% of the time" (NEE, 2013a, p. 6). A score by the administrator of three would be granted when the teacher "manages time, space, and transitions well less than half of the time with most students are on task 25-40% of the time" (NEE, 2013a, p. 6). The classroom teacher could garner a score of five on the rubric when it could be observed the teacher "manages time, space, and transitions well more than half of the time and almost all students are on task 60-75% of the time" (NEE, 2013a, p. 6). The highest rubric score of seven could be earned if the classroom teacher "almost always organizes, allocates, and manages time, space and

transitions well when almost all students are on task more than 75% of the time" (NEE, 2013a, p. 6).

NEE indicator 5.3b. NEE teacher evaluation system Indicator 5.3b (the teacher establishes secure teacher-child relationships in the school environment) can be scored by the building administrator on a zero to seven scale (NEE, 2013a). Relevance is given to this standard based on research that indicates positive teacher-student relationships play an important role in student learning (NEE, 2013a). Anchored descriptions are provided for the scale scores of zero, one, three, five, and seven, respectively (NEE, 2013a). A teacher would be scored a zero if the teacher "has a neutral or negative relationship with students" (NEE, 2013a, p. 3). The teacher would be awarded a one on this rubric if the teacher "seldom has positive interactions, or has a positive relationship with only a few students" (NEE, 2013a, p. 3). A score by the administrator of three would be granted when the teacher "has positive interactions less than half of the time, or has a positive relationship with less than half of the students" (NEE, 2013a, p. 3). The teacher could garner a score of five on the rubric when it could be observed the teacher "has positive interactions more than half of the time, or has a positive relationship with more than half of the students" (NEE, 2013a, p. 3). The highest rubric score of seven could be earned if the teacher "almost always interacts very positively with students, and conveys a strong, positive relationship with almost all students encouraging risk-taking and enjoyment of learning" (NEE, 2013a, p. 3).

NEE indicator 7.4. NEE teacher evaluation system Indicator 7.4 (the teacher monitors the effect of instruction on individual and class learning) can be scored by the building administrator on a zero to seven scale (NEE, 2013a). Relevance is given to this

standard based on research that indicates ongoing formative assessment in the classroom plays a critical role in student learning (NEE, 2013a). Anchored descriptions are provided for the scale scores of zero, one, three, five, and seven, respectively (NEE, 2013a). A teacher would be scored a zero if the teacher "does not check the effect of instruction on while class or individual learning" (NEE, 2013a, p. 4). The teacher would be awarded a one on this rubric if the teacher "seldom conducts formative, on-the-spot assessment of learning for either the whole class or individual students or does not take needed corrective action" (NEE, 2013a, p. 4). A score by the administrator of three would be granted when the teacher "conducts formative, on-the-spot assessment of learning less than half of the time, or for less than half of the students and takes corrective action as needed" (NEE, 2013a, p. 4). The teacher could garner a score of five on the rubric when it could be observed the teacher "conducts formative, on-the-spot assessment of learning more than half of the time, or for more than half of the students and takes corrective action as needed" (NEE, 2013a, p. 4). The highest rubric score of seven could be earned if the teacher "almost always conducts formative, on-the-spot assessment of learning for both the whole class and almost all individual students and takes corrective action as needed" (NEE, 2013a, p. 4).

The rural Missouri school district in this case study utilizing the NEE teacher evaluation system rated all teachers in the district on two of the identified eight indicators of greatest importance (NEE, 2013a). The indicators selected were (a) Indicator 4.1-Teacher uses instructional strategies leading to student problem-solving and critical thinking skill development; and (b) Indicator 7.4-Teacher monitors the effect of instruction on individual and class learning (NEE, 2013a).

Student Perspectives

A new component to the classroom teacher evaluation process is the use of student survey data concerning teacher performance. According to the Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) Project, well-crafted student surveys do provide reliable and valid data in determining the effectiveness of a classroom teacher on student achievement (MODESE, 2013d). The data indicate the majority of the variation among student survey results for individual classroom teacher surveys occurs within school buildings and not among school buildings (Ferguson, 2012). In other words, most schools will have both highly rated and lowly rated classroom teachers based on student surveys of classroom teacher performance data (Ferguson, 2012).

The concept for including student survey data of a classroom teacher's performance is simple; the more data points included in the summative evaluation process for the classroom teacher, the more accurate the final tabulation of performance should be (Sawchuk, 2014). Administrators still need to be cognizant of the fact student survey data should not drive classroom teachers to teach or manage the classroom environment in a manner to try and circumvent or manipulate the student survey data (Sawchuk, 2014). The student survey data are a tool to guide and enhance classroom teacher performance and growth, not to be seen as an end result unto itself (Sawchuk, 2014). Finally, while not a part of the Missouri ESEA Waiver of 2012, a national contingent is beginning to develop and advocate for a parental feedback portion in the summative evaluation process for classroom teachers (Sawchuk, 2014).

NEE Teacher Evaluation System Student Survey

A major influence for including a student survey component into the NEE teacher evaluation system was the research sponsored by the Gates Foundation's Measures of Effective Teaching (METS) Project (NEE, 2014). The METS Project's researchers determined, "Information from students' surveys, when combined with other sources of data, improved the reliability of teacher effectiveness data" (NEE, 2014, p. 16). The MODESE developed ESEA-compliant teacher evaluation system does not possess a student feedback or student survey component (NEE, 2013d).

Student feedback has not been a common practice in K-12 public education in the United States at any point up to the present (NEE, 2014). It has been determined students in grades four through 12 have the capacity to accurately report classroom experiences and teacher performance (NEE, 2014). The focus of the student surveys are the Missouri Model Teacher and Leader Standards approved by the Missouri State Board of Education (NEE, 2014). It is important for teachers to understand and respect the criteria which implies the student survey data should not be viewed as a popularity contest among faculty members nor a referendum on whether or not a student likes or does not like the subject matter the educator teaches (NEE, 2014).

The NEE teacher evaluation system student survey incorporates multiple statements scientifically normed to each indicator that is measurable by student perception data (NEE, 2014). The fact multiple data points are measured for each relevant indicator and then averaged raises the validity for the overall tool (NEE, 2014). The NEE teacher evaluation system student survey is evaluated on a five-point scale (NEE, 2014). Students are asked to read a relevant statement prepared for a specific

indicator and then choose from one of five applicable answers concerning the student's experience in the teacher's classroom concerning the relevant statement (NEE, 2014). The five quantifiable answers include the following: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, and 5 = Strongly Agree (NEE, 2014).

The NEE Evaluation System requires administrators to discuss the student survey portion of the system early and often with both students and teachers (NEE, 2014). Evidence suggests when administrators provide support for the student survey component of the NEE teacher evaluation system and emphasize the importance of this event, accuracy and validity of data increase (NEE, 2014). Additional protocols to adhere to when providing students the opportunity to complete the student survey of teacher performance would be to prepare for an online administration of the tool by students with the survey to be administered at the midway point of the class which allows students sufficient experience with the teacher to provide a valid assessment of the indicators (NEE, 2014). The survey should be administered by someone other than the target teacher so students feel free to be honest in the responses provided to the survey statements concerning the target teacher, and an adequate number of students should be surveyed to ensure reliability in the results (preferably 25 students or greater per teacher) (NEE, 2014). Always consider the student survey tool may not be appropriate for all teachers, especially teachers who have a very limited number of students, such as deaf educators or teachers of self-contained special education classrooms (NEE, 2014). Finally, patterns are best considered across multiple classes or multiple years rather than overtly weighting a single student survey data set for a single class of students (NEE, 2014).

A contributing factor in the development of the NEE teacher evaluation system student survey was the Missouri School Improvement Plan (MSIP) Advanced Questionnaire, a survey of students, parents, and school staff to determine perceptions at the building and district levels (NEE, 2013d). The student survey statements produced by the NEE teacher evaluation system are more comprehensive and more targeted than those constructed for the MSIP Advanced Questionnaire (NEE, 2013d). It is also very important to maintain the view of the NEE teacher evaluation system student survey being specific to one classroom teacher, as opposed to the MSIP Advanced Questionnaire macro-perspective with the focus at the building and district levels (NEE, 2013d).

NEE officials have provided different guidelines for the use of student surveys by elementary-aged students and secondary-aged students (NEE, 2014). Elementary-aged students are not at risk of survey fatigue if students are provided the opportunity to survey the homeroom teacher annually and any one of the specialty teachers annually (NEE, 2014). To limit the possibility of survey fatigue among secondary students, administrators may need to develop a rotation pattern to limit the number of surveys any one student participates in while guaranteeing each teacher is the subject of at least one survey set by students (NEE, 2014). NEE officials acknowledge no single format or rotation schedule produced by the NEE teacher evaluation system would be practical or applicable for the variety and sizes of schools subscribing to the NEE Consortium (NEE, 2014).

Data sources for indicators. Many data sources exist for teachers to demonstrate an acceptable level of performance on the 38 individual indicators in the NEE teacher evaluation system (NEE, 2013d). Examples of data sources for teachers to demonstrate

NEE indicator mastery include classroom observation of the teacher by the building administrator, student surveys of the teacher's classroom performance, the teacher's personal professional development plan being satisfactorily completed, and the teacher's personal unit of instruction being followed as presented to the building principal (NEE, 2013d). In the NEE teacher evaluation system for Standard 1 (teacher uses content knowledge and perspectives aligned with appropriate instruction), all five indicators utilize student surveys as a data source for teachers to demonstrate satisfactory performance (NEE, 2013d). Concerning Standard 2 (teacher understand and encourages student learning, growth, and development), all six indicators utilize student surveys as a data source for teachers to demonstrate acceptable performance by the classroom teacher (NEE, 2013d). When considering Standard 3 (teacher implements curriculum effectively), only Indicator 3.2 can be evaluated based on student survey data (NEE, 2013d). When the NEE teacher evaluation system is reviewed for Standard 4 (teacher provides instruction for critical thinking by the student) and Standard 5 (teacher creates positive classroom environment for learning), all eight combined indicators can be successfully measured using student survey data (NEE, 2013d).

In reviewing Standard 6 (teacher uses effective communication), Indicator 6.1 and Indicator 6.3 can be scored utilizing student survey data (NEE, 2013d). For Standard 7 (teacher uses student assessment data to analyze and modify), only three indicators can be judged by classroom observations by the building administrator - Indicator 7.2, Indicator 7.3, and Indicator 7.4 (NEE, 2013d). Finally, in the NEE teacher evaluation system, none of the six total indicators for Standard 8 (teacher develops professional practices) and

Standard 9 (teacher participates in professional collaborations and commitments) are

measurable by analyzing the student survey tool (NEE, 2013d).

NEE Teacher Evaluation System Student Survey Indicator Report

After student surveys have been completed by students for individual teachers of

a building and district, administrators have the ability to review the student survey

indicator level report (NEE, 2014). The student survey indicator level report provides

quantitative data aggregated by teacher, building, and district for any data applicable to

the district 38 NEE indicators (NEE, 2014). This data table includes the maximum score

a teacher received on each indicator, the minimum score a teacher received on each

indicator, the mean score each teacher received on each indicator, and the number of

respondents by teacher for each indicator (NEE, 2014). Additionally, administrators may

access other aggregate data sorted by demographic parameters for other similar school

districts in Missouri that subscribe to the NEE Network for comparison to the

administrator's home district (NEE, 2014).

Survey statements by indicator. The NEE teacher evaluation system student

survey questionnaire consists of 38 statements (NEE, 2013c). The NEE student survey

for Indicator 1.1 (teacher displays and communicates content knowledge and academic

language) includes four statements (NEE, 2013c). NEE student survey Indicator 1.2

(teacher cognitively engages students in the subject) is comprised of five statements

associated to this indicator (NEE, 2013c). Moving to NEE student survey Indicator 4.1

(teacher uses instructional strategies leading to student problem-solving and critical

thinking skill development), five statements can be directly linked to this indicator (NEE,

2013c). Next, NEE student survey Indicator 4.2 (teacher appropriately uses instructional

resources to enhance the learning of all students) affords students five opportunities to provide feedback on teacher performance (NEE, 2013c).

Standard 5 (teacher creates positive classroom environment for learning) provides three indicators to be reflected on by students (NEE, 2013c). The indicators include the following: (a) Indicator 5.1-Teacher motivates and affectively engages all students; (b) Indicator 5.2-Teacher manages time, space, transitions, and activities within the school setting; and (c) Indicator 5.3b-Teacher establishes secure teacher-child relationships in the school environment (NEE, 2013c). In total, 13 statements are connected to Standard 5 (teacher creates positive classroom environment for learning) for students to answer (NEE, 2013c). Additionally, Indicator 7.4 (teacher monitors the effect of instruction on individual and class learning) is allotted four statements for students to consider in the NEE student survey (NEE, 2013c). Finally, two validity item statements are included in the context of the NEE student survey (NEE, 2013c).

NEE Indicator 4.1 (teacher uses instructional strategies leading to student problem-solving and critical thinking skill development) and NEE Indicator 7.4 (teacher monitors the effect of instruction on individual and class learning) are the specific indicators utilized in the statistical analysis of this dissertation (NEE, 2013c). Statements specific to the NEE teacher evaluation system student survey for Indicator 4.1 (teacher uses instructional strategies leading to student problem-solving and critical thinking skill development) include the following:

...the teacher wants me to explain my answers – why I think what I think, the teacher pushes me to become a better a better thinker and problem solver, the teacher makes us think first, before he / she answers of questions, the teacher

makes us apply what we learn to real world problems, and the teacher waits a

while before letting us answer questions, so we have time to think. (NEE, 2013c,

pp. 2-3)

The ability to engage students in critical thinking is an integral component of the

NEE teacher evaluation system (NEE, 2013c).

The statements specific to the NEE teacher evaluation system student survey for

Indicator 7.4 (teacher monitors the effect of instruction on individual and class learning)

include the following:

…the teacher checks to make sure we understand what he / she is teaching, the

teacher asks questions to be sure we are following along when he / she is

teaching, the teacher welcomes questions if anyone gets confused, and the teacher

knows when the class understands, and when we do not. (NEE, 2013c, pp. 2-3)

The ability to monitor the effect of instruction is an integral component of the

NEE teacher evaluation system (NEE, 2013c).

Summary

The goal of any educational system, school district, or school building should be

to employ highly effective classroom teachers (Strahan, 2013). No other factor plays a

larger role in a student's academic achievement on standardized tests than the quality of

the classroom teacher (Strahan, 2013). Teachers in the upper echelons of effectiveness

when compared to peers do not achieve high levels of classroom performance as an

accident or in a vacuum (Donaldson & Donaldson, 2012). Preparatory and novice

teachers need support from administrators and peers to grow and develop desirable

skillsets for effective classroom delivery of instruction to students (Donaldson &

Donaldson, 2012). A new approach with building principals as proactive educational

leaders is needed to foster this vision for classroom teacher improvement, along with

planned and structured professional development activities (Donaldson & Donaldson,

2012). Central to this point are frequent classroom evaluation events and timely and

meaningful feedback to the teacher from the building principal to influence change and

cause growth in the classroom teacher (Marshall, 2009).

Chapter Three: Methodology

The case study involved student MAP ELA data compiled by the MODESE along with archival data resulting from instruments that were a portion of the NEE Evaluation Model format utilized by a rural Missouri school district. The subjects included were students and teachers at one rural Missouri school district. All data were de-identified by a third party to protect privacy of all individuals involved in the case study. The Pearson product-moment coefficient, known as *r,* was the statistical treatment, as all data sets consisted of quantitative scores, and this treatment was appropriate for interval or ratio data (Fraenkel et al., 2015).

Problem and Purpose Overview

The purpose of this research was to conduct a case study to determine the correlation between classroom teachers' NEE Evaluation Model data and archival MAP ELA data for students who were provided ELA instruction by the same teachers. Data from the NEE Evaluation Model student surveys of classroom teacher performance were compared to administrative evaluations of the same teachers' performance to determine whether a relationship exists between the two metrics for discerning teacher effectiveness.

Research Questions The following research questions were used in this study:

1. What is the correlation between teachers' NEE Evaluation data generated by the building administrator of specific teacher performance for the 2014-2015 school year and the archival data of classroom students' MAP ELA data for the school years 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014?

H1₀: There is no correlation between teachers' NEE Evaluation data generated by

the building administrator of specific teacher performance for the 2014-2015 school year

and the archival data of classroom students' MAP ELA data for the school years 2011-

2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014.

2. What is the correlation between archival data of classroom students' MAP

ELA data for the school years 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014 and the NEE

Evaluation student survey data on the classroom performance of the specific teachers for

the 2014-2015 school year?

H2₀: There is no correlation between archival data of classroom students' MAP

ELA data for the school years 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014 and the NEE

Evaluation student survey data on the classroom performance of the specific teachers for

the 2014-2015 school year.

3. What is the correlation between teachers' NEE Evaluation data generated by

the building administrator of specific teacher performance for the 2014-2015 school year

and the NEE Evaluation student survey data on the classroom performance of the

teachers for the 2014-2015 school year?

H3₀: There is no correlation between teachers' NEE Evaluation data generated by

the building administrator of specific teacher performance for the 2014-2015 school year

and the NEE Evaluation student survey data on the classroom performance of the

teachers for the 2014-2015 school year.

Research Design

The format utilized in the quantitative research was the collective case study. The

researcher studied multiple cases (or classrooms) at the same time as part of an overall

larger study. The ability to generalize results is greater for a collective case study as opposed to a single-case case study (Fraenkel et al., 2015). All data collected in this case study were quantitative in nature. The data from the MODESE were statistically sound and produced on a state-wide scale. The teacher evaluation data and student survey data provided by the NEE Evaluation Model also meet validity and reliability thresholds (NEE, 2013b). The dependent variable in the study was student MAP ELA scores. The independent variables in the study were the building administrator evaluations of teacher classroom performance along with the student survey data of the same teachers' classroom performance.

The study was conducted in the following chronological steps. A three-pronged approach was utilized in this case study. First, correlations were determined among factors in the following combinations: (a) building administrator archival evaluations of teacher performance using the NEE Evaluation Model system as compared to archival MAP ELA data for students provided instruction by the same teachers; (b) student survey data related to the classroom performance of teachers as compared to archival MAP ELA data for students provided instruction by the same teachers; and (c) building administrator evaluations of teacher performance using the NEE Evaluation Model system to collect data compared to student survey data related to the classroom performance of the same teachers.

The subjects included students and teachers at one rural Missouri school district. The sample for this study was selected in the following manner. The purposive student population utilized in this study included elementary students at the rural Missouri school district and consisted of approximately 150-200 individuals. The purposive student subset

was determined based on students who had participated in grades three through six MAP ELA testing during the school years of 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014. Also, students enrolled for the 2014-2015 school year in grades three through six comprised the purposive sample for participation in the student survey of teacher classroom performance. The purposive teacher population utilized in this study consisted of elementary teachers at one rural Missouri school district and included eight individuals. The purposive teacher subset was determined to be any teacher who delivered ELA instruction to grades three through six students during the 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014 school years.

All data were de-identified by a third party to protect the privacy of all individuals involved in the case study. The dependent variable of student MAP ELA scores was measured by accessing archival data for the school district for the 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014 school years. These archival data were directly reported by the MODESE to the school district. The independent variables were analyzed using the NEE Evaluation System instruments. The rural Missouri school district was an active subscriber to the NEE Evaluation System. Building administrators used the teacher evaluation instrument provided through the NEE Evaluation System, and students participated in the survey of teacher classroom performance provided by the NEE Evaluation System.

The Pearson product-moment coefficient, known as *r,* was the statistical treatment, as all data sets consisted of quantitative scores, and this treatment was appropriate for interval or ratio data (Fraenkel et al., 2015). The data sets were then triangulated to compare the relationships between archival student MAP ELA

performance, building administrator evaluation data of classroom teachers, and student survey data of the same teachers' classroom performance.

Population and Sample

The participants were inclusive of students enrolled at one rural Missouri school district in grades three through six for the school years 2011-2012, 2012-2013, 2013-2014, and 2014-2015. Archival MAP ELA data, NEE Evaluation Model archival teacher evaluation data, and NEE Evaluation Model archival student survey data of the same classroom teachers' performance were used for this study. The purposive student population utilized in this study included 150-200 elementary students at one rural Missouri school district. The purposive student sample was determined based on students who had participated in grades three through six MAP ELA testing during the school years of 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014.

The purposive teacher population utilized in this study included elementary teachers at one rural Missouri school district and consisted of eight individuals. The purposive teacher sample was determined to be any teacher who delivered ELA instruction to grades three through six students in the 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014 school years. Additionally, students enrolled for the 2014-15 school year at the school district in grades three through six comprised the purposive sample for participation in the student survey of teacher performance. Any student with an IEP who then received some or all ELA instruction from any special education teacher was omitted from the case study. The omitted students were those with an IEP who received additional ELA instruction from another teacher, which incurred an outside variable to the study.

Current year archival teacher evaluation results from the building administrator, along with current year archival student surveys of teacher performance, were analyzed in comparison to archival student achievement data for the classroom sets of students to whom each teacher in the case study provided instruction during the 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014 school years. Cluster random samples including students from the purposive population were then randomly assigned to classroom teachers as the format for this study. The study utilized a two-stage purposive sample (Fraenkel et al., 2015).

Instrumentation

The potential participants included students enrolled at one rural Missouri school district in grades three through six for the school years 2011-2012, 2012-2013, 2013-2014, and 2014-2015. Archival MAP ELA data, NEE Evaluation Model archival teacher evaluation data for specific teachers gathered by the building principal, as well as NEE Evaluation Model archival student perception data of classroom performance of specific teachers were used for this study. The MODESE archival data for the rural Missouri school district over the last three years were aggregated by student performance associated with each classroom teacher and were arranged into a frequency distribution table. The building principal of the rural Missouri school district gathered archival teacher evaluation data from administering the NEE Evaluation instrument during the current school year, and the data sets were arranged into a frequency distribution table. Archival student survey data of teacher performance results from administering the NEE Evaluation student survey instrument during the current school year were arranged into a frequency distribution table.

Data Collection

All data collected for the case study were archival data. Permission was obtained from the elementary principal of the rural Missouri school district to allow access to archival student MAP ELA data for the 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014 school years (see Appendix A). Also, an associate research professor at the University of Missouri provided documentation the NEE Evaluation Model teacher data and student survey data were to be considered archival data for the purposes of this case study (see Appendix B).

The elementary principal of the rural Missouri school district served as the third party to de-identify all MAP ELA student data as well as data from the NEE Evaluation System related to teacher evaluation results and student survey reports. Historical MAP ELA data organized by classroom teacher for 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014 were grouped for evaluation. Also, archival teacher evaluation results and student survey reports were de-identified and processed by specific classroom teachers. All data were stored on password-protected computers and tablets.

Data Analysis

The Pearson product-moment coefficient, known as *r,* was the statistical treatment as all data sets consisted of quantitative scores, and this treatment was appropriate for interval or ratio data (Fraenkel et al., 2015). When data from both the independent variable and the dependent variable can be expressed in a quantitative format, the Pearson *r* is the appropriate correlation coefficient to be utilized (Fraenkel et al., 2015). The data sets were then triangulated to compare the relationships between archival student MAP ELA performance, building administrator evaluation data of the same teachers'

classroom performance, and student survey data of the same teachers' classroom performance. Each of the three combinations of variables were then ranked from the most significant correlation to the least significant correlation after the Pearson product-moment coefficient was applied to the data sets.

Ethical Considerations

Letters of consent for utilization of archival data were obtained from the elementary principal of the rural Missouri school district and an associate research professor at the University of Missouri for use of relevant archival data. A third party, the elementary principal at the rural Missouri school district, de-identified and grouped the student MAP ELA data by classroom teacher for the relevant years. The third party also de-identified, processed, and grouped NEE Evaluation Model reports of teacher performance and student surveys. All data were stored on secure password-protected computers and tablets.

Summary

The case study resulted in relevant data to conduct a scientific inquiry into the correlation of the NEE Evaluation Model teacher evaluation system results for teacher performance when compared to historical student MAP ELA results. Also, the relevant teacher performance results were compared to student survey data to evaluate the correlation of those data sets as well. The goal of this case study was to inform school administrators of the reliability and validity of relying on the NEE Evaluation System data as a way to drive improved instruction of teachers with the ultimate goal of increased student achievement.

The chronological steps of the case study included the following:

1. Obtained written permission from the school board president of one Missouri rural school district to obtain student archival MAP data and teacher archival evaluation data (see Appendix A). No data were collected until Lindenwood University approved the IRB (see Appendix C).

2. Obtained written permission from Dr. Christi Bergin, Associate Research Professor for the Network for Educator Effectiveness (NEE), to obtain archival student survey perception data of teacher performance from one rural Missouri elementary school(see Appendix B).

3. Collected archival student Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) English language arts (ELA) data from one rural Missouri elementary school for the years 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014.

4. Collected archival teacher evaluation data from one rural Missouri elementary school generated and recorded by the building-level administrator for the 2014-2015 school year.

5. Collected archival student perception data for classroom teacher performance generated by students from one rural Missouri elementary school for the 2014-2015 school year.

6. All data were de-identified by a third party to protect privacy, and all recommended safeguards were properly implemented.

7. The data were analyzed utilizing the Pearson product-moment coefficient. The data sets were triangulated to compare the relationships between archival student MAP ELA performance, building administrator evaluation data of specific teacher

classroom performance, and student perception data of specific teacher classroom

performance.

Chapter Four: Analysis of Data

The purpose of this research was to conduct a case study to determine the

correlation between classroom teachers' NEE Evaluation Model data and archival MAP

ELA data for students who were provided ELA instruction by the same teachers. Data

from the NEE Evaluation Model student surveys of classroom teacher performance were

compared to administrative evaluations of the same teachers' performance to determine

whether a relationship exists between the two metrics for discerning teacher

effectiveness.

Research Questions

Data were analyzed for two different performance indicators within the NEE

Evaluation instrument. Each of the research questions was evaluated in relation to

Missouri Teacher Standard Indicators 4.1 and 7.4.

1. What is the correlation between teachers' NEE Evaluation data generated by

the building administrator of specific teacher performance for the 2014-2015 school year

and the archival data of classroom students' MAP ELA data for the school years 2011-

2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014?

H1$_0$: There is no correlation between teachers' NEE Evaluation data generated by

the building administrator of specific teacher performance for the 2014-2015 school year

and the archival data of classroom students' MAP ELA data for the school years 2011-

2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014.

2. What is the correlation between archival data of classroom students' MAP

ELA data for the school years 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014 and the NEE

Evaluation student survey data on the classroom performance of the specific teachers for the 2014-2015 school year?

$H2_0$: There is no correlation between archival data of classroom students' MAP ELA data for the school years 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014 and the NEE Evaluation student survey data on the classroom performance of the specific teachers for the 2014-2015 school year.

3. What is the correlation between teachers' NEE Evaluation data generated by the building administrator of specific teacher performance for the 2014-2015 school year and the NEE Evaluation student survey data on the classroom performance of the teachers for the 2014-2015 school year?

$H3_0$: There is no correlation between teachers' NEE Evaluation data generated by the building administrator of specific teacher performance for the 2014-2015 school year and the NEE Evaluation student survey data on the classroom performance of the teachers for the 2014-2015 school year.

Results

Research question one. As seen in Table 1, question one involved examination of the correlation between teachers' NEE Evaluation data for Indicator 4.1 as generated by the building administrator of specific teacher performance for the 2014-2015 school year and the archival data of classroom students' MAP ELA data for the school years 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014.

Table 1

Results of Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient and Descriptive Statistics
for Principal Evaluation 4.1 and Student ELA MAP Performance

| Outcome | Principal Eval. 4.1 | | ELA Performance | | | | | | |
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*r*	*t*	*df*	*p*
	2.87	0.39	2.60	0.19	20	0.41	3.22	19	0.07

Note. Statistical significance is noted at $p \leq .05$.

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (Pearson *r*) was calculated to assess the relationship between the mean principal evaluation score on standard 4.1 ($M = 2.87$, $SD = 0.39$) and the mean student MAP ELA performance ($M = 2.60$, $SD = 0.19$). The Pearson *r* determines the strength of a straight linear fit closest to $r = 1.0$ (Fraenkel et al., 2015). There was a positive correlation between the two variables [$r = .41$, $n = 20$]. However, the relationship was not statistically significant [$p = .07$].

Table 2 represents data for question one which examines the correlation between teachers' NEE Evaluation data for Indicator 7.4 as generated by the building administrator of specific teacher performance for the 2014-2015 school year and the archival data of classroom students' MAP ELA data for the school years 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014.

Table 2

Results of Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient and Descriptive Statistics for Principal Evaluation 7.4 and Student ELA MAP Performance

	Principal Eval. 7.4		ELA Performance						
Outcome	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*r*	*t*	*df*	*p*
	3.12	0.29	2.60	0.19	20	0.21	7.28	19	0.37

Note. Statistical significance is noted at *p* ≤ .05.

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (Pearson *r*) was calculated to assess the relationship between the mean principal evaluation score on standard 7.4 (*M* = 3.12, *SD* = 0.29) and the mean student MAP ELA performance (*M* = 2.60, *SD* = 0.19). There was a correlation between the two variables [*r* = .21, *n* = 20]. However, the relationship was not statistically significant [*p* = .37].

Research question two. As seen in Table 3, question two examines the correlation between archival data of classroom students' MAP ELA data for the school years 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014 and the NEE Evaluation student survey data for Indicator 4.1 on the classroom performance of the specific teachers for the 2014-2015 school year.

Table 3

Results of Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient and Descriptive Statistics
Student Survey 4.1 and Student ELA MAP Performance

	Student Survey 4.1		ELA Performance						
Outcome	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*r*	*t*	*df*	*p*
	3.11	0.25	2.60	0.19	20	0.38	9.10	19	0.10

Note. Statistical significance is noted at $p \le .05$.

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (Pearson *r*) was calculated to

assess the relationship between the mean score for student survey for standard 4.1 (*M* =

3.11, *SD* = 0.25) and the mean student MAP ELA performance (*M* = 2.60, *SD* = 0.19).

There was a correlation between the two variables [*r* = .38, *n* = 20]. However, the

relationship was not statistically significant [*p* = .10].

Table 4 displays the data for question two and the correlation between archival

data of classroom students' MAP ELA data for the school years 2011-2012, 2012-2013,

and 2013-2014 and the NEE Evaluation student survey data for Indicator 7.4 on the

classroom performance of the specific teachers for the 2014-2015 school year.

Table 4

Results of Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient and Descriptive Statistics
Student Survey 7.4 and Student ELA MAP Performance

| | Student Survey 7.4 | | ELA Performance | | | | | | |
Outcome	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*r*	*t*	*df*	*p*
	3.27	0.26	2.60	0.19	20	0.46	12.40	19	0.43

Note. Statistical significance is noted at $p \leq .05$.

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (Pearson *r*) was calculated to

assess the relationship between the mean score for student survey for standard 7.4 (*M* =

3.27, *SD* = 0.26) and the mean student MAP ELA performance (*M* = 2.60, *SD* = 0.19).

There was a correlation between the two variables [*r* = .46, *n* = 20]. However, the

relationship was not statistically significant [*p* = .43].

Research question three. As seen in Table 5, question three examines the

correlation between the NEE Evaluation student survey data and principal evaluation for

Indicator 4.1 on the classroom performance of the specific teachers for the 2014-2015

school year.

Table 5

Results of Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient and Descriptive Statistics
for Student Survey and Principal Evaluation Indicator 4.1

| | Student Survey 4.1 | | Principal Evaluation | | | | | | |
Outcome	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*r*	*t*	*df*	*p*
	3.11	0.25	2.87	0.39	20	0.63	3.57	19	0.00

Note. Statistical significance is noted at $p \leq .05$.

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (Pearson *r*) was calculated to

assess the relationship between the mean score for student survey for Indicator 4.1 (*M* =

3.11, *SD* = 0.25) and the mean principal evaluation for Indicator 4.1 (*M* = 2.87, *SD* = 0.39). There was a positive correlation between the two variables [*r* = .63, *n* = 20]. The relationship was statistically significant [*p* < .01]. On average students scored teachers 0.24 mean points higher than principals scored teachers on standard 4.1.

Table 6 displays the data for question three which examines the correlation between the NEE Evaluation student survey data and principal evaluation for Indicator 7.4 on the classroom performance of the specific teachers for the 2014-2015 school year.

Table 6

Results of Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient and Descriptive Statistics for Student Survey and Principal Evaluation Indicator 7.4

	Student Survey 7.4		Principal Evaluation						
Outcome	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*r*	*t*	*df*	*p*
	3.27	0.26	3.12	0.29	20	-0.67	1.70	19	0.77

Note. Statistical significance is noted at *p* ≤ .05.

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (Pearson *r*) was calculated to assess the relationship between the mean score for student survey for Indicator 7.4 (*M* = 3.27, *SD* = 0.26) and the mean principal evaluation for Indicator 7.4 (*M* = 3.12, *SD* = 0.29). There was a negative correlation between the two variables [*r* = - .67, *n* = 20] which was not statistically significant [*p* = .77]. On average students scored teachers 0.15 mean points higher than principals scored teachers on Indicator 7.4.

Summary

In Chapter Four, demographics, data analyses, data sources, data collection, research questions, and findings for the data analyses were presented. The results from Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient and descriptive statistics were presented

in tables. Chapter Five includes a summary of findings, limitations of the study,

conclusions, recommendations for future research, implications for practice, and a final

summary.

Chapter Five: Summary and Conclusions

The focus of the case study was to determine if a significant correlation exists between archival student MAP performance data when compared to NEE evaluation of classroom teachers by building principals or NEE evaluation data of classroom teachers by students. Archival data regarding student ELA MAP performance were compared to NEE data for the following teacher evaluation indicators: (a) Indicator 4.1-Teacher instructional strategies leading to student problem-solving and critical thinking; and (b) Indicator 7.4-Teacher monitors effect of instruction on individual and class learning (NEE, 2013d).

Research Questions

Data were analyzed for two different performance indicators within the NEE Evaluation instrument. Each of the research questions was evaluated in relation to Missouri Teacher Standard Indicators 4.1 and 7.4.

This case study was undertaken to provide scientifically valid and reliable data to assist school district administrators in assessing the effectiveness of the NEE teacher evaluation system. Additionally, this case study provided an initial dataset and baseline point for evaluation of the local school district's teachers over time as to the quantifiable determination of classroom effectiveness as compared to changes in annual standardized test scores by classroom sets of students.

Findings

In response to research question one, with a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient of $r = .41$, the data reveal there is a positive correlation between the NEE Evaluation Indicator 4.1 principal's evaluation and student performance on the MAP

grade-level ELA test. However, because $p = .07$, which is greater than the required

statistical significance of $p < .05$, the correlation is not statistically significant.

In response to research question one, with a Pearson product-moment correlation

coefficient of $r = .21$, the data reveal there is a positive correlation between the NEE

Evaluation Indicator 7.4 principal's evaluation and student performance on the MAP

grade-level ELA test. However, because $p = .37$, which is greater than the required

statistical significance of $p < .05$, the correlation is not statistically significant.

The results reveal a positive correlation for both indicators; therefore, the null

hypothesis $H1_0$ must be rejected. However, a stronger linear fit between principal's

evaluations for Indicator 4.1 exists than for Indicator 7.4 when compared to how students

performed on the MAP grade-level ELA assessment.

In response to research question two, with a Pearson product-moment correlation

coefficient of $r = .38$, the data reveal there is a positive correlation between the student

survey data for Indicator 4.1 and student performance on the MAP grade-level ELA test.

However, because $p = .10$, which is greater than the required statistical significance of p

$< .05$, the correlation is not statistically significant.

In response to research question two, with a Pearson product-moment correlation

coefficient of $r = .46$, the data reveal there is a positive correlation between the student

survey data for Indicator 7.4 and student performance on the MAP grade-level ELA test.

However, because $p = .43$, which is less than the required statistical significance of $p <$

$.05$, the correlation is not statistically significant.

The results reveal a positive correlation for both indicators; therefore, the null

hypothesis $H2_0$ must be rejected. However, the results indicate a statistically significant

and more positive linear fit between student survey results for Indicator 7.4 than Indicator 4.1 when compared to how students performed on the MAP grade-level ELA assessment.

In response to research question three, with a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient of $r = .63$, the data reveal there is a positive correlation between the NEE Evaluation Indicator 4.1 principal's evaluation and student survey data for Indicator 4.1. The correlation of $p = .00$ is less than the required statistical significance of $p < .05$; therefore, the correlation is statistically significant.

In response to research question three, with a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient of $r = - .67$, the data reveal there is a negative correlation between the NEE Evaluation Indicator 7.4 principal's evaluation and student survey data for Indicator 7.4. A correlation of $p = .77$ is greater than the required statistical significance of $p < .05$ and therefore not statistically significant.

The results indicate a statistically significant and more positive linear fit between the NEE Evaluation Indicator 4.1 principal's evaluation and student survey data for Indicator 4.1. Therefore, the null hypothesis $H3_0$ must be rejected for Indicator 4.1.

However, the null hypothesis $H3_0$ for Indicator 7.4 is not rejected as there is no correlation between teachers' NEE Evaluation data for Indicator 7.4 generated by the building administrator of specific teacher performance for the 2014-2015 school year and the NEE Evaluation student survey data for Indicator 7.4 on the classroom performance of the teachers for the 2014-2015 school year.

Conclusions

Of the six research questions included in the case study, the data generated for question three concerning data with a bivariate correlate for the Pearson product-moment

correlation coefficient for the NEE Evaluation Indicator 4.1 principal's evaluation and student survey data for Indicator 4.1 revealed the most best line of fit with $r = .63$. The significance output of $p \leq .05$ is the greatest significant correlation of the study. These data indicate both the students and the principal recognize the teacher's level of implementation for Indicator 4.1 (teacher instructional strategies leading to student problem-solving and critical thinking).

However, no significant correlation was found to exist when the same question was evaluated for Indicator 7.4, where results revealed a negative correlation between the NEE Evaluation Indicator for principal's evaluation and student survey data. The data would indicate both principals and students believe teachers to be more effective when using teacher instructional strategies leading to student problem-solving and critical thinking.

When interpreting the data for question two, a positive line of fit was noted for student perceptions of teachers for both Indicators 4.1 and 7.4 when correlated to student MAP grade-level ELA performance. Student perceptions were only statistically significant for Indicator 7.4, teacher monitoring of effect of instruction on individual and class learning, when correlated with student MAP grade-level ELA performance.

No other correlates were found to be significant for this study.

Implications for Practice

The correlational data generated by this case study of teacher performance based on the principal's evaluation utilizing the NEE model for Indicators 4.1 and 7.4 when compared to students' MAP performance can be used to facilitate the goal of improvement in teacher performance in the area of classroom instruction. For

comparison, the correlational data generated for teacher performance based the students' perception data of the teacher for Indicators 4.1 and 7.4 when compared to students' MAP performance can be used to determine if improvement in teacher performance in the area of classroom instruction occurred over time. The results of this study may be used as a baseline performance score for individual teachers. The baseline score becomes relevant as the reference point from which future growth can be measured in a quantifiable manner for individual teachers by district administrators.

A direct product of the specific, individualized teacher baseline data may be used for professional development plans to improve documented areas of weakness in the teacher's skillset and pedagogy which have been quantifiably determined by use of the NEE model by properly trained administrators. An examination of quantifiable, successive years of performance data may allow administrators to identify established patterns to utilize in making teaching assignments and decisions on teacher employability.

Concerning decision-making in a macro context for the local school district, administrators may develop building-wide improvement plans guided by NEE data and students' MAP performance. A main benefit of a building improvement plan may be the collection of quantifiable data on teacher performance by specific NEE indicator for a grade level, content area, or entire building's faculty. The macro data sets may then play an integral part in a professional development focus for an entire building or district for one or more years.

Other points to consider for the improvement of teacher performance and students' MAP achievement would be trajectory data analysis over multiple years by

specific teachers, grade-level groupings of teachers, and content areas. Individual buildings within a district may be compared to other, similar buildings, and district analyses may be conducted on a state-wide scale comparing the local district to other similar demographic districts which also implement the NEE model. Finally, greater depth and scope could be added by evaluating for significance compared to students' MAP performance on all eight of the main NEE model indicators for teacher performance or nine Missouri Teacher Standards. Any of the other main NEE model indicators could be examined with the same format and parameters as indicators evaluated for correlation to students' MAP performance in this case study.

Recommendations for Future Research

Additional recommendations for future research components may include expanding examination of Indicators 4.1 and 7.4 as they correlate to other content areas at both the elementary and secondary levels. Evaluation of grade-level assessments for grades three through eight mathematics (MA) and English language arts (ELA) in addition to secondary biology, government, algebra I, and English II end-of-course exams, may provide more statistically relevant results. Multi-aged level correlates may more readily inform policy and curricular decisions for the purpose of improving district instructional strategies toward student growth.

Finally, only two of the eight main NEE indicators of teacher performance were utilized for correlation to students' MAP performance in this case study. The other six main NEE indicators could be evaluated for correlations to students' MAP or EOC performance as compared to the principal's evaluation or the students' evaluation of the teacher for the following indicators which include the following: Indicator 1.2-Teacher

cognitively engages students in subject matter; Indicator 5.2-Teacher manages time, space, transitions, and activities; and Indicator 5.1-Teacher motivates and affectively engages students (NEE, 2013d). Also included are Indicator 5.3b-Teacher establishes secure teacher-student relationships; Indicator 1.1-Teacher displays and communicates content knowledge and academic language to students; and Indicator 4.2-Teacher appropriately uses instructional resources to enhance student learning (NEE, 2013d).

Summary

The importance of the teacher for student achievement has been researched in many formats by numerous individuals and groups (Briggs et al., 2012). Teachers do matter concerning student achievement, accounting up to one-third of a school's impact on a particular student's achievement on standardized tests (Briggs et al., 2012). Gaynor (2012) argued teacher quality has a larger singular impact on student achievement than any other single indicator. Not only does the teacher bear the largest impact on student standardized test achievement, but that impact is a better indicator of student academic achievement growth than race, socio-economic level, and class size (Strahan, 2013).

Haskins and Loeb (2007) have shown students who had not only one, but three consecutive years of instruction provided by teachers determined to be in the top fifth of all teachers for this given study, showed a gain of approximately 50 percentile points as compared to students who had three consecutive years of instruction from teachers ranked in the bottom fifth of all teachers in the given study. Also, classroom teachers ranked in the top fifth of all classroom teachers in the given study produced academic growth and improvement among and across all subgroups of students in achievement on standardized tests (Haskins & Loeb, 2007).

The goal of the NEE teacher evaluation system is to improve teacher performance no matter the initial baseline ability of the teacher (NEE, 2013d). Therefore, when teachers' classroom performance is changed in a positive direction, then the corresponding positive change should be anticipated in students' achievement on standardized tests (NEE, 2013d). Of the six research questions included in the case study, the data generated for question three with a bivariate correlate for the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient for the NEE Evaluation Indicator 4.1 principal's evaluation and student survey data for Indicator 4.1 revealed the most best line of fit with $r = .63$. The significance output of $p < .01$ is the greatest significance of the study. These data indicate both the students and the principal recognize the teacher's level of implementation for Indicator 4.1 (teacher instructional strategies leading to student problem-solving and critical thinking).

However, no significant correlation was found to exist when the same question was evaluated for Indicator 7.4 where results revealed a negative correlation between the NEE Evaluation Indicator for principal's evaluation and student survey data. Data would indicate both principals and students believe teachers to be more effective when using instructional strategies leading to student problem-solving and critical thinking.

When interpreting the data for question two, a positive line of fit was noted for student perceptions of teachers for both Indicators 4.1 and 7.4 when correlated to student MAP grade-level ELA performance. Student perceptions were only statistically significant for Indicator 7.4, teacher monitoring of effect of instruction on individual and class learning when correlated student MAP grade-level ELA performance. No other correlates were found to be significant for this study.

Appendix A

Site Permission Letter

December 11, 2014

Dear Mr. Allen:

I will grant permission for use of archival data involving ███████ student achievement for the 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14 school years for grades 3-6 MAP ELA scores.

Also, permission is granted for use of ███████ archival teacher evaluation data as conducted by the building administrator utilizing the MU Teacher Evaluation Model as well as ███████ archival student survey data concerning teacher performance in the classroom for the 2014-15 school year.

Respectfully,

President, ███████ Board of Education

Appendix B

Assessment Resource Center
University of Missouri

College of Education
2800 Maguire Blvd.
Columbia, MO 65211-3290

PHONE (573) 882-4694
FAX (573) 882-8937

August 26, 2014

Eric Allen, Superintendent of Schools
█████████████████

Dear Mr. Allen:

NEE will grant permission for your use of all aspects of the MU Model teacher evaluation tools and student survey tools through the █████████ District membership for the 2014-15 school year.

Respectfully,

Christi Bergin

Christi Bergin, Ph.D.
Associate Research Professor
Network for Educator Effectiveness

Assessment Resource Center: Meeting Missouri's Assessment Needs for 75 Years

An equal opportunity/ADA institution

Appendix C

LINDENWOOD

LINDENWOOD UNIVERSITY   ST. CHARLES, MISSOURI

DATE:	January 30, 2015
TO:	Eric Allen
FROM:	Lindenwood University Institutional Review Board
STUDY TITLE:	[693851-1] Teacher Evaluation and Student Achievement in Elementary Education
IRB REFERENCE #:	
SUBMISSION TYPE:	New Project
ACTION:	APPROVED
APPROVAL DATE:	January 30, 2015
EXPIRATION DATE:	January 30, 2016
REVIEW TYPE:	Expedited Review

Thank you for your submission of New Project materials for this research project. Lindenwood University Institutional Review Board has APPROVED your submission. This approval is based on an appropriate risk/benefit ratio and a study design wherein the risks have been minimized. All research must be conducted in accordance with this approved submission.

This submission has received Expedited Review based on the applicable federal regulation.

Please remember that informed consent is a process beginning with a description of the study and insurance of participant understanding followed by a signed consent form. Informed consent must continue throughout the study via a dialogue between the researcher and research participant. Federal regulations require each participant receive a copy of the signed consent document.

Please note that any revision to previously approved materials must be approved by this office prior to initiation. Please use the appropriate revision forms for this procedure.

All SERIOUS and UNEXPECTED adverse events must be reported to this office. Please use the appropriate adverse event forms for this procedure. All FDA and sponsor reporting requirements should also be followed.

All NON-COMPLIANCE issues or COMPLAINTS regarding this project must be reported promptly to the IRB.

This project has been determined to be a   project. Based on the risks, this project requires continuing review by this committee on an annual basis. Please use the completion/amendment form for this procedure. Your documentation for continuing review must be received with sufficient time for review and continued approval before the expiration date of January 30, 2016.

Please note that all research records must be retained for a minimum of three years.

If you have any questions, please contact Robyne Elder at (314) 566-4884 or relder@lindenwood.edu. Please include your study title and reference number in all correspondence with this office.

If you have any questions, please send them to relder@lindenwood.edu. Please include your project title and reference number in all correspondence with this committee.

This letter has been electronically signed in accordance with all applicable regulations, and a copy is retained within Lindenwood University Institutional Review Board's records.

References

Allen, J., Gregory, A., Mikami, A., Lun, J., Hamre, B., & Pianta, R. (2013). Observations of effective teacher-student interactions in secondary school classrooms: Predicting student achievement with the classroom assessment scoring system--secondary. *School Psychology Review*, *42*(1), 76-98.

American Psychological Association. (2010). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Amrein-Beardsley, A. (2007). Recruiting expert teachers into hard-to-staff schools. *Education Digest*, *73*(4), 40-44.

Associated Press. (2014, September 4). *Most Missouri schools using own evaluation systems*. Retrieved from

http://www.connectmidmissouri.com/news/story.aspx?id=1092235

Bambrick-Santoyo, P. (2012). Leading leaders. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *94*(3), 70-71.

Bambrick-Santoyo, P. (2013). Giving and getting feedback in real time. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *95*(4), 72-73.

Barile, J. P., Donahue, D. K., Anthony, E. R., Baker, A. M., Weaver, S. R., & Henrich, C. C. (2011). Teacher-student relationship climate and school outcomes: Implications for educational policy initiatives. *Journal of Youth Adolescence, 41*(3), 256-267.

Briggs, K., Davis, J., & Rhines-Cheney, G. (2012). Teacher effectiveness, yes. But what about principals? *Education Week*, *31*(30), 38-39.

Cavanagh, S. (2011). Race to top winners feel heat on evaluations. *Education Week*, *31*(3), 20-21.

Corda, S. J. (2012). Super teachers. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *93*(6), 26-28.

Cruickshank, D., & Haefele, D. (2001). Good teachers, plural. *Educational Leadership*, *58*(5), 26-30.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2012). The right start. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *94*(3), 8-13.

Darling-Hammond, L., Amrein-Beardsley, A., Haertel, E., & Rothstein, J. (2012). Evaluating teacher evaluation. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *93*(6), 8-15.

Dessoff, A. (2012). Robert J. Marzano. *District Administration*, *48*(3), 79-84.

Donaldson, M. A., & Donaldson, G. A. (2012). Strengthening teacher evaluation: What district leaders can do. *Educational Leadership*, *69*(8), 78-82.

Eisenbach, B. B. (2014). Words that encourage. *Educational Leadership*, *71*(5), 70-72.

Exstrom, M. (2013). Do teachers make the grade? *State Legislatures*, *39*(10), 24-27.

Ferguson, R. F. (2012). Can student surveys measure teaching quality? *Phi Delta Kappan*, *94*(3), 24-28.

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2015). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (9th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Education.

Fullan, M. (2009). Leadership development: The larger context. *Educational Leadership*, *67*(2), 45-49.

Fullan, M. (2011). *Change leader learning to do what matters most.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gaynor, A. (2012). Different students: How typical schools are built to fail and need to change: A structural analysis. *Journal of Education*, *192*(2/3), 13-27.

Haskins, R., & Loeb, S. (2007). A plan to improve the quality of teaching. *Education Digest*, *73*(1), 51-56.

Hattie, J. (2012). Know thy impact. *Educational Leadership*, *70*(1), 18-23.

Haycock, K., & Crawford, C. (2008). Closing the teacher quality gap. *Educational Leadership*, *65*(7), 14-19.

Heitin, L. (2013). Teacher-evaluation policies becoming more rigorous. *Education Week*, *33*(11), 4.

Hopkins, M. (2008). A vision for the future: Collective effort for systemic change. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *89*(10), 737-740.

Hua, V. (2010). A strategy worth watching. *T H E Journal*, *37*(5), 26-31.

Katnik, P. (2013, August). ESEA waiver compliance and teacher evaluation. Symposium conducted at the DESE Annual Conference for Administrators, Columbia, MO.

Konstantopoulos, S., & Chung, V. (2011). Teacher effects on minority and disadvantaged students' grade 4 achievement. *Journal of Educational Research*, *104*(2), 73-86.

Levin, B., Glaze, A., & Fullan, M. (2008). Results without rancor or ranking Ontario's success. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *90*(4), 273-280.

Luger, B. J. (2012). Professional capital: Transforming teaching in every school. *Journal of Education, 192*(3), 112-114.

Marshall, K. (2009). Mini-observations. *Education Week, 28*(20), 1-4.

Marshall, K. (2012a). Fine tuning teacher evaluation. *Educational Leadership, 70*(3), 50-53.

Marshall, K. (2012b). Let's cancel the dog-and-pony show. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *94*(3), 19-23.

Marzano, R. J. (2011). Making the most of instructional rounds. *Educational Leadership, 68*(5), 80-81.

Marzano, R. J. (2012a). Reducing error in teacher observation scores. *Educational Leadership, 70*(3), 82-83.

Marzano, R. J. (2012b). The two purposes of teacher evaluation. *Educational Leadership, 70*(3), 14-19.

Marzano, R. J. (2013). The principal's role in hierarchical evaluation. *Educational Leadership, 70*(7), 82-83.

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2012). Statutory authority. Retrieved from https://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/eq-ees-statutory-authority.pdf

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2013a). Essential principles of effective evaluation. Retrieved from http://dese.mo.gov/educator-quality/educator-effectiveness/essential-principles-effective-evaluation

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2013b). Evaluator training. Retrieved from http://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/EvaluatorTraining-July2013.pdf

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2013c). Overview of essential principles of effective evaluation. Retrieved from http://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/EssentialPrinciplesOverview-July2013.pdf

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2013d). Providing meaningful feedback. Retrieved from https://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/MeaningfulFeedback-June2013.pdf

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2013e). State board

    approves Missouri's model educator evaluation system. Retrieved from

    http://dese.mo.gov/communications/news-releases/state-board-approves-

missouris- model-educator-evaluation-system

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2013f). Teacher

    evaluation: Missouri's educator evaluation system. Retrieved from

    http://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/00-TeacherEvaluation-CompleteDoc.pdf

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2014a). Missouri school

    improvement program: Support and intervention. Retrieved from

    http://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/MissouriSchoolImprovementPlan.pdf

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2014b). MSIP 5:

    Preparing every child for success in school and in life. Retrieved from

    http://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/MSIP-5-comprehensive-guide.pdf

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2015a). Missouri's

    ESEA flexibility waiver: What it means for education in Missouri. Retrieved from

    http://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/qs-esea-waiver-flier.pdf

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2015b). MSIP 5:

    Missouri school improvement program. Retrieved from

    http://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/msip5-flyer.pdf

Moe, T. M. (2014). An education in politics: The origin and evolution of No Child Left

    Behind. *Political Science Quarterly (Wiley-Blackwell)*, *129*(2), 333-336.

Morice, L. E., & Murray J. E. (2003). Compensation and teacher retention: A success

    story. *Educational Leadership*, *60*(8), 40-43.

Moss, C. M., & Brookhart, S. M. (2013). A new view of walk-throughs. *Educational Leadership*, *70*(7), 42-45.

Network for Educator Effectiveness. (2013a). *Classroom observation scoring rubric.* Columbia, MO: Curators of the University of Missouri.

Network for Educator Effectiveness. (2013b). *Features of NEE.* Columbia, MO: Curators of the University of Missouri.

Network for Educator Effectiveness. (2013c). *Student survey report: Guide to interpreting results.* Columbia, MO: Curators of the University of Missouri.

Network for Educator Effectiveness. (2013d). *Teacher growth and evaluation training manual: Summer 2013.* Columbia, MO: Curators of the University of Missouri.

Network for Educator Effectiveness. (2014). *Teacher growth and evaluation training manual: Summer 2014.* Columbia, MO: Curators of the University of Missouri.

Niels, G. J. (2012). Summative evaluation or formative development? *Independent School*, *72*(1), 58-63.

Personnel—Teachers and Others, Mo. Stat. §§168-128-285 (2013).

Posey, L. (2014). No waiver left behind. *State Legislatures*, *40*(6), 25-27.

Rebora, A. (2012). Good teachers. *Education Week*, *31*(18), 5.

Richardson, J. (2013). The Finnish way. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *94*(5), 76-77.

Robertson, J. (2014, June 25). New state standards, prompted by common core, complicate school accreditation, teacher evaluations. *The Kansas City Star.* Retrieved from http://www. kansascity.com/news/government-politics/article612687.html

Routman, R. (2013). To raise achievement, let's celebrate teachers before we evaluate them. *Reading Today*, *30*(6), 10-12.

Sawchuk, S. (2013). Multiple gauges best for teachers. *Education Week*, *32*(17), 1-16.

Sawchuk, S. (2014). Lawmaker wants parent involvement included in teachers' evaluations. *Education Week*, *33*(26), 14.

Singer, D. (2012, June 29). Missouri wins waiver from no child left behind rules. *St. Louis Beacon.* Retrieved from https://www.stlbeacon.org/#!/content/25822/mo_gets_nclb_waiver_062912

Sparks, S. D. (2011). Evaluation reforms put partnerships to the test. *Education Week*, *31*(12), S8-S11.

Strahan, D. (2013). General patterns and particular pictures: Lessons learned from reports from "beating the odds" schools. *Journal of Curriculum & Supervision*, *18*(4), 296-305.

Stronge, J. H., & Hindman, J. L. (2003). Hiring the best teachers. *Educational Leadership*, *60*(8), 48-52.

Thomas, E., Wingert, P., Conant, E., & Register, S. (2010). Why we can't get rid of failing teachers. *Newsweek (Pacific Edition)*, *155*(11), 30-33.

Toch, T. (2009). The perils of merit pay. *Phi Delta Kappan, 91*(2), 99-100. United States Government Accountability Office. (2013). Race to the top states implementing teacher and principal education systems despite challenges. Retrieved from http://www.gao.gov/assets/660/657936.pdf

U.S. Department of Education. (2012*).* State of Missouri elementary and secondary

    education act request. Retrieved from https://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/qs-

    esea-waiver-mo-flexibility-request.pdf

Valentine, J., & Harting, R. (1986). Performance-based teacher evaluation in Missouri: A

    three-year report. *Missouri University, Department of Educational*

    Administration, 1- 9.

Webley, K. (2012). Why it's time to replace No Child Left Behind. *Time*, *179*(3), 40-43.

Williams, J. C., & Engel, L. C. (2012). How do other countries evaluate teachers? *Phi*

    Delta Kappan, *94*(4), 53-57.

Vita

Eric Allen has been an educator for 19 years. Eric served seven years as a science teacher and coach before moving to secondary-level administration for 10 years. The last two years Eric has served in the capacity of superintendent of schools.

Eric holds a Bachelor of Science degree from Southeast Missouri State University, a Master of Arts degree from the University of Southern Mississippi, and a Specialist's degree from Southeast Missouri State University. Additionally, Eric has served as an adjunct professor at the university level for the last seven years.