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2014-15 Implementation of the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness System

Summary Evaluation Findings

Surveys of 11,494 teachers, 110 district administrators, and 632 school administrators along with interviews of district administrators were used to measure the progress that Wisconsin made implementing the Educator Effectiveness (EE) system. The results indicate that:

- **Wisconsin educators have a strong understanding of the EE process.** Ninety-one percent of school administrators reported feeling at least somewhat confident working through the steps of the teacher rating process, 92% felt at least somewhat well prepared to evaluate teachers using the Danielson Framework, and 88% felt that they had a good understanding of the EE system. Sixty-two percent of teachers felt at least somewhat confident working through the teacher rating process.

- **In its first year, the state of Wisconsin successfully met the requirements of WI Act 166, which mandated the implementation of the EE system.** Most educators indicated that they were able to complete the EE process; over 80% of teachers indicated they were able to complete the entire EE process, while only 3% indicated they were not able to. Seventy-four percent of school administrators indicated that they were able to complete the EE process with all teachers who were in their summary year.

In addition to measuring implementation, surveys also explored local conditions that may contribute to the EE process being utilized effectively by schools to inform instructional improvement efforts.

- Administrators and teachers were in disagreement as to whether EE will improve Wisconsin teaching. **Most school administrators felt that EE will improve the quality of teaching in Wisconsin.** School administrators generally felt that EE either improved teacher practice this year (60%) or that it eventually will (69%). **Most teachers, however, felt that EE will not improve teaching.** Specifically, only one-third of teachers at least somewhat agreed with the statement that EE will help them improve as a teacher.

- **Both administrators and teachers felt that EE takes too much time to complete.** Although the majority of educators reported that they completed EE, only 19% of school administrators reported having enough time to implement EE. They estimated that completing EE required about 25% of their time. The majority of teachers (59%) also reported that they did not have enough time to complete EE activities. Open-ended responses revealed that many teachers felt that EE was taking time away from other activities like lesson planning, teaching, and collaborating with other teachers. The amount of time wasted trying to work with the dysfunctional Teachscape platform was a commonly identified partial explanation for why EE took too much time to complete. The amount of time it took for teachers to tag and document evidence was also commonly mentioned as a problem. Lessening the burden on both teachers and administrators, by Teachscape fixing its platform, should partially alleviate frustrations experienced by Wisconsin educators. Even with this change however, it is likely that the EE system will continue to represent a significant time
commitment for teachers and administrators. As such, solutions to this problem will need to be developed that are unique to each local context.

• **For EE to be implemented well locally, it is critical that teachers trust their school administrators.** Although some teachers (35%) indicated that teachers in their school did not expect that they would receive a fair evaluation, teachers who reported that they trusted their principal were more likely to indicate that they would receive a fair evaluation.

• **For EE to be implemented well locally, it is critical that teachers understand how the results of EE will be used.** A majority of teachers were confused and concerned about how their school and district was going to use the results of EE; 62% of teachers expressed concern about how their school was going to use the results of EE, and 65% reported not knowing what their school was going to do with the results. When teachers reported that they understood how the results of EE would be used, they also tended to report feeling less concerned about how results would be used and more positive about the likelihood that the EE system will help them improve as a teacher.
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2014-15 Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness System
Evaluation Brief

This report presents the results of ongoing evaluation work of the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness (EE) system being conducted by the Office of Socially Responsible Evaluation in Education (SREed) at the University of Wisconsin in Milwaukee’s School of Education in collaboration with the Wisconsin Evaluation Collaborative (WEC) at the University of Wisconsin in Madison. The purpose of this report is to summarize progress made toward implementing EE in schools using the state model for teacher evaluation (Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Teaching (FfT)) during the 2014-15 school year.

The implementation of EE across 268 districts during the 2014-2015 school year represented a formidable challenge shared by all of Wisconsin. The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI) led implementation efforts by designing the system with diverse stakeholders, pilot testing system elements with volunteer districts, developing training and informational materials, developing a website, contracting with Teachscape for their online training and evaluation management platform, conducting trainings, and providing support to districts. Throughout the design, testing and implementation effort, DPI partnered with Cooperative Educational Service Agencies (CESAs) and professional associations. The primary goal of the combined efforts was for Wisconsin educators to understand and complete the EE process.

Ultimately, the success of implementation relies on the engagement and commitment of school districts, schools, and educators. The findings presented here explore the following three questions about the progress these groups made toward this goal and identify possible next steps for implementing EE at a deeper level moving forward:

- Q1: How well did teachers and administrators understand aspects of the EE process?
- Q2: How much of the EE process were educators able to complete?
- Q3: In what ways can EE implementation be improved so that it is a more effective tool for informing local improvement efforts?

In addition to these three questions, future reports will focus on analyses of the ratings assigned to educators and on identifying specific district and school practices that promote the effective implementation of EE.
Methods

Surveys were e-mailed, using Qualtrics, to approximately 33,400 teachers, 1,602 school administrators, and 294 district administrators. E-mails were sent to all participants included in the on-line EE data tracking platform, Teachscape, except that no emails were sent to educators from the Milwaukee Public Schools. A number of email addresses were found to be invalid and automated email responses from districts indicated that many were no longer working in their district. It is estimated that approximately 31,000 teachers received the survey. It is less clear how many district administrators received the survey. For emails sent to district administrators, there was some indication that emails were screened by district staff before being reviewed by district administrators, which likely affected the number who received the survey invitation.

Ultimately, at least partially completed surveys were received from 11,494 teachers\(^1\), indicating a 37% response rate, 110 district administrators (~37% response rate), and 632 school administrators (~39% response rate). Follow-up interviews were then conducted with 14 district administrators who volunteered to speak with the evaluation team, to clarify and elaborate on their survey responses.

Participants

Responding teachers represented all grade levels, subject areas, and levels of experience. Forty-two percent were elementary school, 23.5% middle school, and 34.3% high school teachers. Figure 1 presents the subject areas taught and Figure 2 presents their experience as teachers. Fifty-four percent reported being in a supporting year in the EE process, suggesting that they were not going to receive evaluation ratings this year, while 42% reported being in a summary year, and thus would receive final ratings.

Responding school administrators were primarily principals (64%) or assistant principals (24%). Nearly all (96%) indicated they participated in the evaluation of teachers this year. They reported being in their current role an average of 6.7 years. They were responsible for doing evaluations for an average of 10.8 teachers during the past year and 28.8 teachers across all years. The evaluation cycle for most (non-beginners or those new to a district) teachers is 3 years. Thus, in

\(^1\) Due to the length of the survey, each teacher was only asked to respond to a random sample of half of the questions.
any specific year, all new teachers plus approximately one-third of veteran teachers would be evaluated.

Figure 1: Teacher subject areas

Figure 2: Teacher experience
Results

Q1: How well did teachers and administrators understand aspects of the EE process?

The results suggest that Wisconsin educators have a strong understanding of the Framework for Teaching (FfT) and the EE process. Nearly all school administrators (99%) reported that they completed the Teachscape Certification training, which is designed to promote inter-rater agreement among evaluators and limit bias in evaluation judgments. In addition, 91% reported feeling at least somewhat confident working through the steps of the rating process; 92% at least somewhat agreed that they were well prepared to evaluate teachers using the Danielson Framework, and 88% that they had a good understanding of the EE system. Further, 87% reported that they at least somewhat agreed with the statement that they understood how to develop rigorous student learning objectives.

Teachers generally agreed with self-assessments of school administrators, indicating they perceived that administrators understood both the ratings process, the Danielson Framework, and the Student Learning Objectives (SLO) process (Figure 3; Figure 4; Figure 5). Further, the majority of teachers indicated that they themselves understood the Danielson Framework (Figure 4) the SLO process (Figure 5) and were at least somewhat confident working through the steps of the teacher practice rating and SLO processes (Figure 6; Figure 7).

The strong understanding of EE and confidence in working through the system are the product of both local and state-wide training and communication initiatives that have focused on preparing administrators and teachers to implement EE. Ninety percent of district administrators reported that their district had provided guidance to all teachers on how to collect evidence that will support their evaluation. Eighty-two percent also reported that all principals had gone through training on system implementation using the DPI training modules.
Figure 3: Teacher perceptions of how well evaluators understand the rating process

- My evaluator understands the teacher ratings process.
- My evaluator understands how to rate the Danielson FFT components.

Figure 4: Teacher understanding of Danielson Framework

- I have a good understanding of the Danielson Framework.
- My evaluator understands the Danielson Framework.

- I understand the Student Learning Objectives process.
- My evaluator understands the Student Learning Objectives process.
Q2: How much of the EE process were teachers and school administrators able to complete?

Since it is clear that most educators felt they understood EE, the next question focuses on how much of it they were able to complete. To that end, most educators indicated that they were able to complete all necessary EE activities. Over 80% of summary year teachers indicated they were able to complete the entire EE process (Figure 8), while only 3% indicated they were not able to. In addition, 74% of school administrators indicated that they were able to complete all of the EE activities with all of the teachers they evaluated this year.

Among summary year teachers, nearly all indicated that they had at least one announced observation in their classroom (97%), at least one mini-observation (94%), and met for pre and post observation conferences (88%) (Figure 9). Further, almost all teachers (99%) indicated that
they did at least one SLO, for which they both collected data and scored (Figure 10). Given these results, it is clear that schools were mostly successful in coordinating and scheduling the meetings and observations necessary for completing EE activities.

Figure 8: Summary year teacher reports of participation in general EE activities

Figure 9: Summary year teacher reports of participation in EE observation activities
Figure 10: Percentage of summary year teachers indicating they completed SLO processes

Q3: In what ways can EE implementation be improved so that it is a more effective tool for informing local instructional improvement efforts?

Given that the primary goals for the first year of EE implementation were met, in that Wisconsin educators understood and implemented the EE process, this section focuses on the next steps for EE. Specifically, we explore state and local factors that promote and inhibit the ability of schools and educators to use the EE process to inform their improvement efforts.

Probably the most important determinant of how well the EE system is used by schools and educators to inform instructional efforts is the attitudes of educators toward EE. The evaluation found that there was disagreement between school administrators and teachers in their perceptions of how much the EE process would impact the quality of teaching in Wisconsin. School administrators generally felt that the EE process either improved teacher practice this year (60%) or that it eventually will (69%) (Figure 11). Teachers expressed lower expectations however, with two-thirds at least somewhat disagreeing that EE will help them improve as a teacher (Figure 12).
The Educator Effectiveness process will improve teacher practice this year.

The Educator Effectiveness process will improve the quality of teaching across Wisconsin.

The Educator Effectiveness process will improve the quality of teaching in your school.

Student Learning Objectives will improve teacher practice.

Student Learning Objectives will improve student learning outcomes.

The Educator Effectiveness process provides teachers with useful tools to improve their practice.

The Educator Effectiveness process improved teacher practice this year.

Figure 11: Principal perceptions of the impact of EE on instruction
Figure 12: Teacher perceptions of the impact of EE on instruction

The finding that the majority of teachers expressed low agreement in the statement that EE will positively impact the quality of their teaching represents a challenge for DPI, CESAs, district administrators and school administrators. If the EE system is going to meet the goal of improving the quality of teaching in Wisconsin, there is a need to address the reasons why many Wisconsin teachers do not see how EE will help them improve. It is, therefore, important that we understand the conditions that promote teachers viewing the EE process as useful. The following findings suggest possible ways that the implementation of EE could be modified to make EE more useful for Wisconsin Educators.
Teachers who believed they would receive a fair evaluation had higher expectations of the impact that EE will have on the quality of their teaching.

About one-third of teachers (35.2%) indicated that teachers in their school do not trust their administrators to provide them with fair evaluations (Figure 13). Clearly, teachers who do not trust in the fairness of the process are not as likely to see the value in it or use it to inform their efforts to grow as a teacher. However, it is important to note that the converse is also true: teachers who do trust the process are more likely to expect that EE will help them grow as teachers. Appendix B presents teacher ratings of the impact that EE will have on their teaching, broken down by a number of teacher characteristics. It is interesting to note that summary year teachers held slightly higher expectations of EE, suggesting that going through the EE process may help educators see the value in it. It is also worth noting that more experienced educators saw less value in EE. However, regardless of teacher background, when teachers expected to receive a fair evaluation, their perceptions of the impact that EE will have on their teaching were considerably higher.

Figure 13: Teachers in our school trust school administrators to carry out fair evaluations

To improve perceptions of fairness, it is critical that principals explore ways to improve the level of trust between themselves and teachers. As part of the evaluation of EE, teachers were asked a series of questions about their trust in their principal (Appendix C).² Responses to these questions were combined into one Principal/Teacher Trust factor score, such that a score of zero is average and one represents one standard deviation. By comparing Principal/Teacher Trust

---

² 12 questions were pulled from the 5Essentials school climate survey (https://illinois.5-essentials.org), published by the Consortium of School Research at the University of Chicago, which is currently used to measure school climate in several school districts across the US.
factor scores between teachers that do and do not believe EE will produce fair evaluations, it is clear that EE is going to be viewed more favorably in schools where teachers and administrators have trusting relationships. Figure 14 shows that Principal/Teacher Trust is 2.2 standard deviations higher when teachers believe that they will receive a fair evaluation. A trusting relationship must exist between teachers and administrators before teachers are going to expect that administrators will conduct fair evaluations. Still, given that nearly two-thirds of teachers expected that principals would provide them with a fair evaluation, while only one-third reported feeling that EE would help improve their instruction, Teacher/Principal Trust is a necessary but not sufficient condition for teachers viewing the EE process as a tool that will help them grow professionally.

Figure 14: Teacher/Principal Trust factor scores broken down by whether teachers agree administrators will carry out fair evaluations

*Teachers who understood how their district was planning to use the results of EE had higher expectations for the impact that EE will have on their teaching.*

Another factor that appears to contribute to the value teachers place in the EE system is whether they understand how their school and district plans to use the results. Many teachers (62%) expressed concern for how their school may use the results of EE. This concern is related to the finding that 65% of teachers reported not knowing how their school was planning to use the results. The concern is likely based on a fear that the district may decide to use the results to compare teachers, make high stakes decisions, and/or that the results of EE will not be kept private. As two teachers noted:
“I have asked my district what will happen with this information and how it is tied to improvement plans with no answer. This information will be used to fire people that they no longer want. People are scared. Please get rid of this system.”

“EE is one more thing that takes away from teaching. It is cumbersome and a tool for the public to criticize teachers. It is being used to deny raises to teachers, and evaluators have bias in their observations.”

For many teachers, EE may represent the first time they have been evaluated and this cultural change can be frustrating. As one teacher noted:

“In 45 years, I have never had to waste my time documenting the thinking processes that guide my planning and teaching. Observation of my teaching made it clear that I had planned thoroughly, considering a multitude of learning styles, with a clear objective in my lesson. I was therefore able to use my time effectively to meet the needs of my students.”

There are a number of ways that schools may choose to use the results. These range from using results solely to inform professional development to using them to inform higher stakes decisions like non-renewal or promotion. District administrators indicated that they mostly wanted to use the results to inform instructional improvement efforts (90%), school improvement efforts (59%), and district improvement efforts (43%). However, many district administrators also indicated that they were not sure exactly how they would use the results of EE (Figure 15).

District administrators indicated that they are waiting to see what the results of EE look like before deciding how their district will use the data. The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI) has cautioned districts that it may not be appropriate to use teacher practice ratings to compare teachers. This was partially based on the results of the pilot EE evaluation, which found that practice ratings were highly correlated with school free/reduced lunch participation rates, suggesting that student characteristics may impact how teachers are rated. So while the “wait-and-see approach” taken by many districts may be reasonable, teachers seem to want a clearer articulation of how districts will use the results and more assurances that they will not be used to compare teachers.

---

One way that districts could mitigate the anxiety of teachers is to transparently communicate their status on determining the use of EE results and engage teachers in the process of deciding how and under what conditions they will use them. It will also be important for districts to be clear about how teachers can obtain support and challenge results they do not agree with. Doing these things should lessen the anxiety that teachers feel about EE. In fact, knowledge of use was negatively correlated with anxiety about how the results would be used ($r = -.34$), and positively correlated with perceptions of the impact EE will have on the quality of teaching ($r = .37$). Teachers who understood how the results would be used reported being less concerned about how they would be used, and had higher expectations about how EE would impact their teaching.

Although communication seems to be an important factor regarding whether teachers believe EE will be useful to them, few districts seem to have communicated their planned use of the results to teachers. Although 31% of district administrators indicated that they had developed a communication plan specific to EE and 71% indicated that they were working to communicate to all stakeholders, the content of that communication focused mostly on implementation and understanding. Little was done to communicate to teachers how they were going to use the results. Twenty-nine district administrators provided additional detail about what their district
was doing to communicate to stakeholders and none mentioned anything about communicating how their district was going to use the results.

Based on the ambiguous plans districts have for how they will ultimately use the results of EE and on their lack of communication and teacher engagement on this issue, it is not surprising that so few teachers reported understanding what their school was going to do with the results and that so many expressed concerns about the possibilities.

Engaging teachers more in the process of deciding how to use the results could reduce teacher feelings of anxiety about how the results will be used, improve their understanding of how to use the process to inform improvement efforts, and result in more teachers seeing the value in EE. Figure 16 shows that 90% of teachers who fully agreed that they understood what the results of EE would be used for at least somewhat agreed that they would receive a fair evaluation. Conversely, less than half of teachers (44.7%) who did not understand what the results would be used for felt they would receive a fair evaluation.

Figure 16: Percentage of teachers believing they will receive a fair evaluation according to their understanding of how EE will be used
Teachers who were provided enough time to complete EE had higher expectations of the impact that EE will have on their teaching.

Perhaps the single biggest factor that determined whether a teacher held high or low expectations for the impact that EE would have on their teaching is whether they felt they had enough time to complete the process. Although the majority of district administrators stated that school administrators and teachers were provided enough time to complete EE (Figure 17), this perception was not shared by either school administrators or teachers.

When asked if their district had freed up enough time for them to complete EE, only 19% of school administrators responded yes. School administrators estimated that completing EE required about 25% (SD = 17) of their time. As previously mentioned, given that school administrators indicated that they were responsible for evaluating an average of 10.8 teachers, their perceptions of the amount of time EE takes were somewhat expected. An analysis of an open-ended question on the school administrator survey found 114 of 247 (46%) school administrators who answered the question specifically attributed part of the problem to the Teachscape platform, which often did not function well. This suggests that Teachscape could greatly reduce the frustrations of school administrators if it is able to correct the technical problems that have plagued it.

Figure 17: Percent of district administrators responding “yes” to questions about allocating enough time and resources to EE
The majority of teachers (59%) also felt that they did not have enough time to complete EE activities (Figure 18). An analysis of an open-ended question on the teacher survey found that many teachers partially attributed the lack of time to the amount of time spent trying to use the Teachscape platform and to the time it took to complete the evidence gathering and documentation process. Most, however, were less specific and simply indicated that the overall EE system took too much time away from other, what were viewed as more important activities, such as lesson planning, collaborating with other teachers, working with students, and, in general, teaching. Sixty-four percent (2,170) of the 2,406 teachers who responded to the open-ended question expressed frustration about the amount of time the overall system took. As one teacher noted:

“I know the results of a survey like this will only reinforce the public's maligned view of educators, but people do need to understand how much time this has taken away from classroom planning, student conferencing, and communicating with parents.”

These findings suggest that improving the Teachscape platform and finding ways to streamline the evidence gathering and documentation process may help educators feel less burdened by the EE system. However, even with significant improvements to these EE components, it is likely that EE will still represent a significant amount of work for school administrators and teachers. Solutions to this issue are likely going to need to be developed locally.

![Figure 18: Summary year teacher agreement about whether they were provided enough time and support to complete EE](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I had enough time to receive an accurate evaluation of my professional practice.</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had enough time to complete the Student Learning Objectives process.</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had enough time to complete EE activities.</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had enough support from my evaluator to receive an accurate evaluation of my professional practice.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 18: Summary year teacher agreement about whether they were provided enough time and support to complete EE
The Wisconsin political climate is negatively impacting educators’ attitudes toward the EE system.

Although this issue was not directly assessed in our surveys, the perceptions of EE summarized in this report are likely affected by other issues experienced by teachers across Wisconsin. This somewhat complicates the interpretation of how to move forward with the implementation of EE and help more educators more effectively use it to inform improvement efforts. The time that teachers spend on EE may represent a bigger issue than just the evaluation of teachers. As some teachers noted, the teaching profession in Wisconsin has changed considerably since the passing of Act 10. Many of these changes have made the teaching profession less attractive to teachers and have resulted in some teachers retiring or changing professions. Some school districts in Wisconsin have faced a teacher shortage as a result. In response to this, in the spring of 2015, the state legislature considered loosening teacher licensure standards so that non-certified persons without college degrees could teach. Not surprisingly, teachers across Wisconsin reacted strongly against this idea. The surveys presented in this report were administered during the debate about licensure requirements and, in the minds of many teachers, EE seems to be added to, and associated with, a growing list of issues affecting the education system in Wisconsin. As two teachers noted:

“Serving our students is a fascinating and rewarding job, but it is a very tiring job. Added to all the stress we have to deal with because of the uncertainty of our positions, it (EE) is very depressing.”

“I witnessed first-hand colleagues crying daily, suffering from work related depression, getting ill, questioning if they should continue teaching, and quitting. I believe the education environment in Wisconsin is getting even more toxic for teaching with these unnecessary bureaucratic EE plans.”

Introducing EE to schools during this tumultuous time has likely diminished educator attitudes toward EE. As such, regardless of the improvements made to the system, there is likely going to continue to be some number of educators who will not see EE as a useful tool for informing their professional growth.

Summary findings

These results suggest that the primary goal of implementing EE across Wisconsin has been met; the great majority of teachers and school administrators reported that they understand the various
aspects of EE, the Danielson Framework, and SLOs. Educators also indicated that they were able to complete the EE process. In this way, the efforts of DPI, CESAs, district administrators, school administrators, and teachers were successful. However, moving forward, to promote its use in informing instructional improvement efforts, more teachers need to believe that EE results and the process are useful to them.

The evaluation identified a numbers of ways that EE implementation may be improved so that more teachers more effectively use the EE process to inform their growth as educators. Fixing the Teachscape platform, involving teachers in district processes of deciding how to use the results of EE, ensuring that educators have enough time and resources to complete EE activities, and promoting trust in schools between teachers and administrators should result in improved perceptions of the EE system and help encourage its use for informing instructional improvement efforts.

Moving forward, the evaluation will focus more on local efforts to implement EE. Ultimately, the overall usefulness of the EE process for informing instructional improvement efforts will be mostly determined by the aggregate effectiveness of local policies and practices. To accomplish this, we will work to identify specific district and school policies and practices that are associated with more effective implementation outcomes. We will also engage local districts in the evaluation by helping them process and use the information that we collect about their efforts to implement EE. Further, we will explore with districts the possibility of collecting additional information that would inform their efforts. The primary goal of engaging districts in the evaluation will be to make what is learned from the evaluation more salient and useful to schools.
### Appendix A – Correlations of Teacher Survey Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I understand what my school is planning to do with the results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the EE process.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am concerned about what my school is going to do with the</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>results of EE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I had enough time to complete EE activities.</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>-0.315</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The Educator Effectiveness process will help me improve as a</td>
<td>0.374</td>
<td>-0.263</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The Educator Effectiveness process has improved my</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>-0.205</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teachers in our school trust school administrators to carry out</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>-0.374</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair evaluations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I trust my evaluator to provide me fair feedback on my</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>-0.322</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>0.669</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The rating of professional practice using the Danielson</td>
<td>0.291</td>
<td>-0.272</td>
<td>0.324</td>
<td>0.557</td>
<td>0.519</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework is a fair method for partially determining the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effectiveness of teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 5Essentials Teacher/principal trust subscale</td>
<td>0.334</td>
<td>-0.281</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>0.637</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All correlations significant at the .01 level.
Appendix B – Teacher Perceptions of EE Improving Teaching

The EE process will help me improve as a teacher
0 – Disagree, 1 – Somewhat Disagree, 2 - Somewhat Agree, 3 - Agree

• Although most teachers generally did not believe EE would help improve their instruction, under certain conditions teachers were more positive.
• Summary year teachers, having completed the EE process, were slightly more likely to believe EE would help them improve their teaching.
• Newer teachers (< 10 years of experience) were more likely to feel that EE would help them improve than more experienced teachers.
• Elementary and middle school teachers are more likely to feel that EE will help them improve than high school teachers.
• One of the most important factors for whether or not teachers believed EE will improve their teaching, was that they believed the EE process is fair. When school administrators were viewed as carrying out fair evaluations, teachers were more likely to feel EE would improve their teaching.
Appendix C – 5Essentials Principal/Teacher Trust items

How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

- It’s OK in this school to discuss feelings, worries, and frustrations with my principal.
- The principal looks out for the personal welfare of the staff.
- I trust the principal at his or her word.
- The principal at my school is an effective manager who makes the school run smoothly.
- The principal places the needs of children ahead of personal and political interests.
- The principal has confidence in the expertise of staff.
- The principal takes a personal interest in the professional development of staff.
- Staff feel respected by the principal.
- My principal makes clear to the staff his or her expectations for meeting instructional goals.
- My principal understands how children learn.
- My principal sets high standards for student learning
- My principal communicates a clear vision for our school.