



CENTER ON EDUCATION  
AND LIFELONG LEARNING

INDIANA UNIVERSITY  
Indiana Institute

# EDUCATION POLICY BRIEF

## INDIANA SUPERINTENDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF INDIANA'S TEACHER EVALUATION LAW: A NEW PERSPECTIVE

Hardy Murphy, Cassandra Cole, Jim Ansaldo, and James Robinson

Volume 2, Number 1, Spring 2015

### CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Survey Methods.....	2
Summary Results - Student Achievement.....	4
Summary Results - Student Growth.....	4
Summary Results - Instruction.....	5
Summary Results - Professional Development.....	7
Summary Results - Policy.....	7
Summary Results - Process.....	9
Discussion.....	13
Future Research.....	18
Recommendations.....	18
Acknowledgments.....	19
Authors.....	19
References.....	19

### INTRODUCTION

In 2012, the Center on Education and Lifelong Learning (CELL) at Indiana University partnered with IU's Center on Evaluation and Education Policy (CEEP) to explore the issues facing Indiana school districts as they responded to Indiana's newly passed Senate Enrolled Act 01, (SEA 01). The resulting policy brief (Cole, Robinson, Ansaldo, Whiteman & Spradlin, 2012) detailed the hurdles facing school leaders as they prepared to design and implement the more rigorous and consequential teacher evaluation systems the law mandates. The brief reported the results of a survey of Indiana school superintendents' attitudes and concerns about the law, their own planning and implementation needs, and the factors involved in the selection of an evaluation model for their district.

Superintendents' views on the conceptual and practical underpinnings of teacher evaluation and its relationship to student, teacher, and school performance were also addressed in the brief.

The findings, discussed in the 2012 brief, were that superintendents (a) agreed that the evaluation process in Indiana needed to change, (b) believed that student achievement and growth can be measured, (c) agreed that evaluations should be linked to student learning, (d) were less sure that teacher evaluations should be linked to compensation, (e) believed that evaluations should inform professional development, and (f) were concerned about the implementation of the new system/models. This brief also discussed the features of quality evaluation plans and introduced essential elements of a planning process that ensures equitable, effective, and efficient plans for evaluating educators.

Among the concerns addressed in the 2012 brief were several factors related to plan development and implementation and their impact upon culture, and climate. The authors recommended including the use of a process to engage district stakeholders in plan development and implementation that addressed the creation of internal norms around teacher quality, student learning and quality assessment, the need to develop a shared understanding and acceptance among school personnel, a culture of shared responsibility, and a system of internal accountability (Ansaldo, Robinson, Cole, Whiteman & Spradlin, 2012).

In the 2012 brief, the authors state that a quality evaluation system should have the capacity to reliably identify effective and ineffective teachers. The authors also emphasize the importance of ensuring that evaluation ratings can reliably detect teacher strengths and weaknesses for accurately targeting professional development. They describe the use of evaluation results to identify individual, school, and district-wide needs; target professional learning; gauge teacher growth; and identify potential master teachers who could serve as mentors to new teachers.

The authors indicated that the results from all aspects of the teacher evaluation system should be used to inform the district and school leadership on professional development needs that are individual teacher-focused, and resources and professional development plans should all be linked to the teacher evaluation data.

They also recommend that the state ensures resources are available to districts to provide quality professional development necessary to ensure that teacher evaluation plans are implemented with fidelity and, the development of assessment literacy must be developed among teachers and administrators so that confidence and trust in the system can be established and sustained.

Nearly three years have passed since the publication of those data, and most districts in the state have moved past the design and planning stage and are now implementing their evaluation plans.

The Center on Education and Lifelong Learning (CELL) decided to re-engage with school superintendents to see if their perceptions, attitudes, and beliefs have shifted as they have become more familiar with the requirements of SEA 01, and as they have integrated their evaluation systems into the policy frameworks of their individual schools and communities. This policy brief presents the results of the second survey of superintendent attitudes, beliefs, and perceptions about teacher evaluation in the state, and examines the results within the context of the most current literature and policy iterations. It is intended as a partner product with Part One of this series, *Indiana Teacher Evaluation: At the crossroads of implementation* (Murphy, Cole, Pike, Ansaldo & Robinson, 2014).

The Indiana Department of Education continues to provide guidance and clarification to districts regarding the law's mandates as implementation moves forward. Additionally, teacher evaluation continues to evolve in Indiana as modifications to the law and its requirements are part of an intense legislative and policy agenda, a recurring issue in a statewide discussion at all levels of education, and a topic of continuing concern for local and statewide press. Furthermore, the scholarly literature around teacher evaluation continues to chronicle the impact of changes across the national educational landscapes and differences in the legislative, policy, and governance environment around the topic of teacher evaluation have evolved at the national, state, and local levels. Given the dynamic nature of teacher evaluation in Indiana, and nation-wide, it is appropriate to once again inquire into the attitudes and perceptions of those tasked with the development and implementation of this new generation of teacher evaluation systems in the state's schools.

Superintendent survey responses represent the voices of those charged with broadest leadership responsibilities at the local level in the teacher evaluation discussion.

Having survey responses from superintendents over the two years of implementation presents an opportunity to determine the experiences of those tasked with leading the implementation of changes to the new teacher evaluation systems in the state's schools. For this change in the educational landscape – developing and implementing effective teacher evaluation processes, the unique nature of the superintendent's role in the implementation of the new requirements for teacher evaluation – the intersect of governance, policy, and the leadership of program development and personnel management is worth discussion.

In the current brief we intend to update readers on the consistency of superintendents' responses across the two surveys and to share additional insights gleaned from a comparison of respondent feelings about plan components, development processes, and implementation experiences. Additionally, the analyses of the recent brief reporting on a comparison of the 2014 survey responses of superintendents, principals and teachers enables some comparison of the responses of principals and teachers with those of superintendents on the 2012 brief.

Because the survey questions have a broader emphasis that now includes experience at the local level with teacher evaluation plans responding to the requirements of the law, the development of the survey items is also worth mentioning. The survey items originated from the concepts and guiding principles of the Indiana Teacher Appraisal and Support System (INTASS) processes and the working documents and tools developed to assist districts in developing and implementing effective teacher evaluation plans with fidelity. The INTASS processes and guiding principles of equity in evaluation process requirements, efficiency in its components, procedures, and standards, and effectiveness in its ability to develop teachers through constructive feedback, and improve through the implementation of high quality plans with fidelity as the basis for survey questions.

## SURVEY METHODS

To determine the perceived impact of SEA 01 and the teacher evaluation plans developed in response to this legislation, superintendents were surveyed in 2012 and again in 2014. They were asked to respond to questions concerning their beliefs about teacher evaluation, the legislation mandating changes to the evaluation process, and the local district level impact of changes to their teacher evaluation process to comply with the legislation. Survey items addressed the following best practices in teacher evaluation plan development and implementation:

1. Clearly articulating and justifying the purpose of the changes at hand,
2. Collaborative processes that respect the voices of all,
3. The use of multiple measures to validate student growth,
4. The requirement for effective feedback in the evaluation experience, ongoing and transparent communication in the development and implementation of evaluation instruments,
5. Research validated rubrics to be used as tools in the process, and
6. The use of evaluation outcomes to design professional development experiences.

Questions allowed responses on a 7 point Likert Scale with response values ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The first 11 questions of the survey were included in the 2012 survey of superintendents across Indiana. These questions addressed superintendents' beliefs and perceptions about the teacher evaluation process and the impact of SEA 1 upon the development and implementation of teacher evaluation plans in their districts. The 2014 survey differed from the 2012 survey in that it included principals and teachers. Additionally, there were questions in the second survey that dealt with local plan development and *implementation* experiences that were not in the first survey.

These questions provide important insights into superintendents' experiences with the implementation of teacher evaluation. In particular, gauging the similarities and differences between their experience with implementing teacher evaluation plans and responses to questions inquiring into general perceptions and beliefs about teacher evaluation concepts and practices may be considered a measure of whether their experiences are consistent with expectations.

The 2012 survey instrument was administered during the late winter of 2012. The 2014 survey was administered during the spring of 2014. One hundred and seventy nine (179) superintendents responded to the 2012 survey and 165 superintendents responded to the 2014 survey.

Although the number of superintendents responding was similar to the number that responded in 2012, there was no effort to ascertain how many of the superintendents participating in the 2014 survey were also participants in the 2012 survey. Most superintendents had secondary experience (67.3%) and some (32.1%) had elementary experience. There was a fairly even state geographic distribution with 46.7% from central Indiana, 33.5% from northern, and 20% from southern. Sixty seven percent were from rural districts, 21.2% were from suburban districts and 11.3% were from urban districts. Most superintendents (90.4%) had been implementing their new teacher evaluation plans for at least one year, and nearly 75% had been implementing for at least two years. A little more than half (58.3%) had been a superintendent for more than 4 years. Less than half (42.4%) had taught in an accountability grade.

Only approximately 10% had been teachers of English language learners or special education teachers. Table 1 illustrates the demographics of the respondents.

The survey was administered as a collaborative effort with the Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents (IAPSS). In addition, the survey was distributed through the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) Learning Connections. The request for participation for both surveys was made in the form of a letter explaining the purpose of the survey and an assurance of confidentiality for participants. Although demographic information regarding region, urbanicity, years of experience, content area, role, and grade level was asked for in the survey, district membership was not requested in order to avoid raising participant concerns about anonymity.

**Table 1: My teaching experience is/was at the:**

	Superintendent		Principal		Teacher	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
<b>Elementary</b>	55	32.7	156	60.2%	649	40.8%
<b>Secondary</b>	112	66.7%	103	39.8%	939	59.2%
<b>N/A</b>	1	0.6%				

**The geographic region that best describes my districts:**

<b>Northern Indiana</b>	55	32.7%	93	35.9%	563	35.5%
<b>Southern Indiana</b>	34	20.2%	64	24.7%	633	39.9%
<b>Central Indiana</b>	79	47%	102	39.4%	392	24.7%

**I would describe my district as:**

<b>Rural</b>	113	67.3%	133	51.4%	704	44.3%
<b>Suburban</b>	36	21.4%	64	24.7%	578	36.4%
<b>Urban</b>	19	11.3%	62	23.9%		

**My district has been implementing Indiana's teacher evaluation law for:**

<b>0 years</b>	6	9.5%	26	10%	130	8.2%
<b>1 year</b>	27	16.1%	45	17.4%	373	23.5%
<b>2 years</b>	125	74.4%	188	72.6%	1,085	68.3%

**I have been in my role for:**

<b>Less than 4 years</b>	69	41.1%	73	28.2%	146	9.2%
<b>4-10 years</b>	62	36.9%	84	32.4%	328	20.7%
<b>11-15 years</b>	24	14.3%	50	19.3%	238	15%
<b>16-25 years</b>	12	7.1%	37	14.3%	419	26.4%
<b>More than 25 years</b>	1	0.6%	15	5.8%	456	28.7%

**Table 1 (continued): Were you ever a teacher in a tested area (ISTEP, ECA)?**

<b>Yes</b>	71	42.3%	165	63.7%	827	52.1%
<b>No</b>	97	57.7%	94	36.3%	761	47.9%

**Were you ever a teacher in special education?**

<b>Yes</b>	17	10.1%	32	12.4%	223	14%
<b>No</b>	151	89.9%	227	87.6%	1,365	86%

**Were you ever a teacher of English Language Learners?**

<b>Yes</b>	18	10.7%	55	21.2%	315	19.8%
<b>No</b>	150	89.3%	204	78.8%	1,273	80.2%

**Summary Results – Student Achievement**

Three questions concerning superintendent beliefs about the relationship between student achievement and teacher effectiveness and its measurement were addressed in the survey. The results are in Table 2 below.

Respondents overwhelmingly agreed in both 2012 (98.9%) and 2014 (98.8%) that

teacher effectiveness affects student achievement and most respondents demonstrated strong agreement, despite a small (6.5%) downward shift from 87.7% strongly agreeing in 2012 to 81.2% strongly agreeing in 2014. Although superintendents have a generally high level of agreement (98.2%) with the idea that student achievement can be validly measured, there is much more of a distribution across the positive response categories that is worth noting.

In both 2012 and in 2014 the response selections in the Agree and Somewhat Agree categories indicate less strength of agreement in the ability to measure achievement with validity than with the idea that teacher effectiveness has an impact upon it. Nearly twenty percent of the respondents in 2012 (19.6%) and almost a third (27.3%) in 2014 only Somewhat Agree with this statement.

**Table 2: I believe that teacher effectiveness affects student achievement:**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<b>2012</b>	87.7%	10.6%	0.6%	0	0	0	0.6%
<b>2014</b>	81.2%	16.4%	1.2%	0	0.6%	0	0.6%

**I believe that student achievement can be validly measured:**

<b>2012</b>	24%	50.8%	19.6%	1.7%	3.4%	0	0.6%
<b>2014</b>	23.6%	47.3%	27.3%	0	1.2%	0.6%	0

A new question in the 2014 survey assessed respondents’ beliefs regarding the degree to which their district evaluation plan measures student achievement with validity. Again, most respondents (91.5%) demonstrate affirmative beliefs with responses split between the Agree and Somewhat Agree categories.

However, as with the belief about the capability of measuring achievement with validity, the responses to this statement about local plans are dispersed notably across the response options, with more than 40% of the superintendents choosing Somewhat Agree with the belief that their plans measure student achievement with validity.

**Summary Results – Student Growth**

As with the beliefs and perceptions concerning plans, teacher effectiveness, and the measurement of student achievement, a set of questions also addressed similar beliefs and perceptions about student growth, its relationship with teacher effectiveness, and the extent to which respondents believe that it can be and is measured with validity.

**Table 3: Our district evaluation plan measures student achievement with validity:**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<b>2014</b>	10.3%	40%	41.2%	3%	3%	2.4%	0 %

Respondents' beliefs and perceptions concerning these questions are presented in Table 4 below.

Respondents from 2012 and 2014 remain consistent in their overall agreement that student academic growth can be validly measured. However, the strength of respondents' convictions seems to have waned, as a notable portion of responses (13.1%) shifted from the Agree to Somewhat Agree categories. In 2012, 54.7% of the superintendents felt that student academic growth can be measured with validity and 19.6% somewhat agreed with this statement. This changed to 42.4% and 32.7% in their responses to this question in the 2014 survey.

Superintendents' responses in 2012 and 2014 are nearly identical in their overall agreement that teacher evaluation should be linked to student growth, and the vast majority (90.2%) affirm that their district evaluation plan links teaching with student growth. Superintendents' responses were also consistent in 2012 and 2014 with a relatively high level of agreement that teacher evaluation should be linked to student growth, 89% and 88% respectively.

However, these responses share a consistent pattern with other questions in that these percentages represent the sum of all agreement options.

As with the previous questions concerning the measurement of achievement, only 12% of the superintendents strongly agreed with this statement. There seems to be less conviction that academic growth can be validly measured in 2014 than 2012 with nearly a third of the respondents (32.7%) choosing Somewhat Agree in 2014, whereas twenty percent (19.6%) chose this response in 2012. Moreover, fully one third of the superintendents in both 2012 and 2014 chose Somewhat Agree in response to the statement that teacher evaluation should be tied to student growth.

**Table 4: I believe that student academic growth can be validly measured:**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<b>2012</b>	17.3%	54.7%	19.6%	3.4%	4.5%	0	0.6%
<b>2014</b>	18.2%	42.4%	32.7%	1.2%	5.5%	0	0

**I believe that teacher evaluation should be linked to student growth:**

<b>2012</b>	14.5%	40.8%	33.5%	2.8%	3.4%	5%	0
<b>2014</b>	15.2%	39.4%	33.3%	1.8%	3.6%	3.6%	3%

It appears that there is notable uncertainty in both superintendents' beliefs concerning the assessment of growth and its link to teacher evaluations in their local plans.

Only 45.4% of the superintendents in 2014 Agree or Strongly Agree that their district measures student growth with validity and 75% Agree or Strongly Agree that their district links student growth with evaluation.

Nearly 40% (38.8%) only Somewhat Agree that their district plans measure growth with validity, and nearly twenty five percent (24.2%) only Somewhat Agree that their plans link teaching with student growth (see Table 5 below).

**Table 5: Our district assessments measure student growth with validity:**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<b>2014</b>	12.1%	33.3%	38.8%	8.5%	4.2%	2.4%	0.6%

**Our district evaluation plan links teaching with student growth:**

<b>2014</b>	21.1%	53.9%	24.2%	4.2%	1.8%	3.6%	0
-------------	-------	-------	-------	------	------	------	---

**Summary Results – Instruction**

A set of questions assessed superintendent beliefs concerning instruction and the possibility of fairly and accurately rating it in an evaluation experience as well as whether their plans do so. These results are presented in Tables 6 and 7 below.

There is an overall (97.7% in 2012 and 97% in 2014) agreement that instruction can be accurately and fairly evaluated and judged, although little more than only a fourth of the respondents in both years strongly agreed with this statement and nearly one in five superintendents in both years indicated that they only somewhat agreed.

Although the differences between 2012 and 2014 in the Strongly Agree response is only slightly more than 2% (24% in 2012 versus 26.7% in 2014) the difference in the Agree category rose from something more

than 49% (49.7) to slightly more than 53% (53.9) in 2014, with most of the change coming from the Somewhat Agree category which fell more than six points from 22.9% to 16.4%. This is a slightly different directional shift than what is seen in the other response patterns.

As with other questions addressing features of their local district plans, the new question concerning the accurate rating of instruction at the local level showed that although overall there is agreement, it is expressed with less conviction.

Nearly one in 5 or 18.8% of respondents only somewhat agreed with the statement. Conversely, those who strongly agreed responded at a rate of 18.2%. Again, overall, nearly all respondents (97%) demonstrated affirmative beliefs, with most of these affirmative responses (60%) in the Agree category.

**Table 6: I believe that instruction can be accurately and fairly evaluation and judged:**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<b>2012</b>	24%	49.7%	22.9%	1.1%	0	2.2%	0
<b>2014</b>	26.7%	53.9%	16.4%	0.6%	1.8%	0.6%	0

**Table 7: Our district evaluation plan allows for an accurate and fair evaluation of instruction:**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<b>2014</b>	18.2%	60%	18.8%	1.2%	1.2%	0.6%	0.6%

This pattern of dispersed confidence in Superintendent positive responses in both surveys is also observed when looking at their beliefs about applying the relationship between teaching and learning to an evaluation of teaching.

More superintendents agreed overall (68% agreed or strongly agreed) in 2014 that the relationship between teaching and learning could be accurately applied to an evaluation of teaching than in 2012 (63% strongly agreed or agreed). However, 29.6% in 2012 and 26.7% in 2014 only somewhat agreed with this question.

Their responses to a new question concerning local plans and the relationship between teaching and learning indicated less confidence that local plans reflected this relationship. Fully one third (33.3%) of the responding superintendents in the 2014 survey only somewhat agreed that their local plans accurately reflect the relationship between teaching and learning (See Table 8 and 9 below).

**Table 8: I believe that the relationship between teaching and learning can be accurately applied to an evaluation of teaching:**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<b>2012</b>	14.5%	48.6%	29.6%	2.2%	1.1%	2.2%	1.7%
<b>2014</b>	16.4%	51.5%	26.7%	1.8%	3.6%	0	0

**Table 9: Our district evaluation plan effectively reflects the relationship between teaching and learning:**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<b>2014</b>	12.1%	46.1%	33.3%	3.6%	3.6%	1.2%	0

**Summary Results – Professional Development**

Professional development is one of the strategies used to develop teacher capacity and ensure continued growth. The degree to which superintendents use the data from their district’s teacher evaluation plan implementation into their district’s professional development was asked of the participating superintendents.

These results are presented in Table 10 below.

Regarding their belief that an effective teacher evaluation system drives professional development, responding superintendents were nearly identical in their overall agreement in 2012 (92.1%) and 2014 (92.7%).

However, the strength of respondents’ conviction appears to have lessened, with notably more respondents choosing the Somewhat Agree category in 2014 (20.6%) than in 2012 (12.8%). The relationship of teacher evaluation and professional development is even less clearly linked in the local plans of the respondents where nearly 29.7% only agreed somewhat with the accuracy of this statement and only 12% strongly agreed.

**Table 10: An effective teacher evaluation system drives professional development:**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<b>2012</b>	34.6%	44.7%	12.8%	3.9%	1.1%	0.6%	2.2%
<b>2014</b>	29.1%	43%	20.6%	3.6%	0.6%	3%	0

**Table 11: Our district evaluation plan drives out professional development:**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<b>2014</b>	12.1%	42.4%	29.7%	7.3%	4.9%	3.6%	0

**Summary Results – Policy**

Because the new law has implications for policy at the state and local level, questions were included to determine superintendent beliefs about policy issues including the new teacher evaluation requirements and teacher compensation, their potential and actual impact upon student learning, and the impact upon the quality of teacher evaluation in their districts. Their responses are presented in Tables 12 and 13 below.

There was not any change in superintendents’ response patterns concerning tying evaluation to compensation. A bare majority of respondents articulate a belief that teacher evaluation should be tied to merit/compensation in both 2012 (59.7%) and 2014 (60%). It is also worth noting that less than ten percent of the superintendents responding in both surveys strongly agreed with this statement (6.7% and 7.3% respectively between 2012 and 2014).

And, nearly one third of the superintendents in both survey administrations only agreed somewhat. Disagreement with this belief statement nearly doubled over the two-year period increasing from 7.8% to 13.3%. Similarly, only 65.5% of respondents to a new question in 2014 affirmed the belief that their district evaluation plans fairly tie teacher performance to compensation, and most responses were split between the Agree and Somewhat Agree categories.

**Table 12: I believe that teacher evaluation should be tied to merit/compensation:**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<b>2012</b>	6.7%	21.2%	31.8%	10.1%	7.8%	7.8%	14.5%
<b>2014</b>	7.3%	23.6%	29.1%	8.5%	6.7%	13.3%	11.5%

**Table 13: Our district evaluation plan fairly ties teacher performance to compensation:**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<b>2014</b>	6.7%	37.6%	21.2%	14.6%	5.5%	12.1%	2.4%

A strong majority of respondents in both 2012 (87.2%) and 2014 (88.6%) affirmed the idea that, prior to the new law, the teacher evaluation processes in Indiana needed improvement. Additionally, there appears to be a shift with even more feeling that there was a need for improvement prior to the law (See Table 14 below).

The responses in the Strongly Agree option increased by nearly 25% from 35.2% to 44.9. A similar majority (84.3%) of respondents to a new question in 2014 demonstrated belief that the new law has improved teacher evaluation processes in their districts. This is interesting since on several of the other local plan questions there are decidedly more negative response patterns.

However, as table 15 indicates, it appears that superintendents are less certain that the changes that have occurred are what is needed. Only 26.1% strongly agree that this law has improved evaluation in their district.

**Table 14: Prior to the new law, the teacher evaluation processes in Indiana needed improvement:**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<b>2012</b>	35.2%	34.1%	17.9%	6.1%	2.2%	1.7%	2.8%
<b>2014</b>	44.9%	29.1%	14.6%	1.2%	5.5%	4.9%	0

**Table 15: The new law has improved teacher evaluation processes in my district:**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<b>2014</b>	26.1%	44.9%	13.3%	4.9%	4.2%	6.1%	0.6%

Although a higher percentage of 2014 respondents (73.3%), compared with 2012 respondents (64.8%), espoused a belief that Indiana’s law regarding teacher evaluation will result in improved teaching and learning, the distribution of certainty (or lack of) is consistent with the previous set of questions concerning the need for

changes in the evaluation process and whether the law will result in improvement. Their responses to the new question concerning whether or not it has improved teacher evaluation in their district also reflect this lack of certainty. A majority of 2014 respondents (79.4%) affirmed the idea

that teaching and learning in their districts has improved because of their district evaluation plans. However, only 12.1% strongly agree with this statement and slightly more than one in four (28.5%) only somewhat agree.

**Table 16: Indiana’s law regarding teacher evaluation will result in improved teaching and learning:**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<b>2012</b>	13.4%	28.5%	22.9%	16.8%	5.6%	7.3%	5.6%
<b>2014</b>	12.1%	32.7%	28.5%	7.3%	7.3%	9.7%	2.4%

**Table 17: Teaching and learning in my district has improved because of our district evaluation plan:**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<b>2014</b>	12.7	38.2%	28.5%	12.1%	4.2%	3.6%	0.6%

**Summary Results – Process**

A number of questions in both surveys dealt with superintendent beliefs concerning factors that impacted process issues concerning the legislation and the development and implementation of their plans in response to the legislation. These questions inquired into the ways that superintendents learned about the law and the model chosen, whether or not they were concerned about

resources to implement their plans, how they accomplished the observations required in their model, factors that influenced their model choice (including validity and reliability of growth measures), the degree to which teacher buy in was important, whether support for teacher professional development was a concern, and other issues pertinent to the development and implementation process. These results are presented below.

Fewer district/leadership and staff have spoken with IDOE officials or reviewed information on the IDOE website in 2014 (73.9%), compared to 2012 (82.7%). Similarly, in 2014, as Table 18 shows, 7% fewer educators attended workshops, 5.2% fewer participated in webinars, and 3% fewer read the legislation. Holding discussions with staff and discussing the requirements of the law with other superintendents held relatively steady across both years.

**Table 18: How have your district/leadership and staff become familiar with the requirements of SEA 001?**

	Read the Legislation	Attended Workshops	Participated in Webinars	Held Discussions with Staff	Discussed Requirements	Spoken with IDOE Officials
<b>2012</b>	92.7%	96.1%	74.3%	92.2%	92.2%	82.7%
<b>2014</b>	89.7%	89.1%	69.1%	92.1%	91.5%	73.9%

A notable change occurred in the evaluation model chosen in the districts of responding superintendents.

Where 92.2% of 2012 respondents indicated that they had chosen the RISE evaluation model, or a modification thereof, only 72.1% of 2014 respondents indicated the same choice.

The percentage of respondents indicating that their district has developed its own evaluation model nearly quintupled from 2012 (3.5%) to 2014 (15.2%).

**Table 19: Which model have you selected?**

	Rise of Modified RISE	Danielson	Marzano	TAP	MCREL	Developed Our Own	Other
<b>2012</b>	92.2%	2.1%	0	0	2.1%	3.5%	0
<b>2014</b>	72.1%	1.8%	2.4%	3.6%	3%	15.2%	1.8%

A series of questions asked superintendents the extent to which certain factors may have influenced the selection of a particular teacher evaluation model. Effects were evaluated on a 5-point Likert scale with “Major Effect” and “No Effect” as anchors (See Table 20 below).

Overall, in 2012, 61.7% of the superintendents felt that ease of use had an impact on their model selection. In 2014, two years of experience elevated the importance 23% to 84.85% of the respondents acknowledging that ease and flexibility had an effect upon model choice.

Moderate Effect attributable to this factor rose by 7.1%, and the indication of Minor Effect rose by 5.9%.

The ease of use of the system showed a marked increase in terms of its importance to superintendents after two years of implementation. Some of the most dramatic growth can be seen in the impact of ease of use and flexibility of evaluation systems; in 2014, the ease of use Major Effect category of influence in choosing an evaluation model showed a 4.7% increase and Moderate Effect rose by 18.4% from 2012.

These responses to the impact of a variety of plan development and implementation factors showed other similarities and differences between the two survey administrations worth mentioning. Regarding the impact of sufficient support for teacher evaluation system development and adoption (state and locally), the percentage of respondents citing this factor as having a major effect dropped by 4.1% from 2012 to 2014, while the attribution of

Teacher support for adoption of the evaluation system seems to have become a more salient factor, as 2014 responses show a 5.3% increase in the Major Effect category and an 8.6% increase in Moderate Effect. More superintendents in 2014 after 2 years of implementation feel that teacher support has an impact upon the adoption of the system (74.2% in 2012 and 86.1% in 2014).

Likewise, sufficient training for implementation increased in salience; with 2014 responses demonstrating a 2.9% increase in the Major Effect category and a 7% increase in Moderate Effect.

More superintendents in 2014 (91.5%) feel that training has an impact upon implementation than in 2012 (80.6%)

Meanwhile, respondents seem more ambivalent about the impact of the cost of evaluation systems; responses in the Major and Moderate Effects categories fell by 12.3% from 2012 to 2014, while Neutral responses rose by 13.1%.

Transparency of the system also increased in its reported impact on evaluation plan development in 2014, with 12.3% more respondents indicating that this factor has had a Major Effect and 6.2% more choosing Minor Effect

Respondents were less neutral, however, regarding the perceived impact of reliability and relevance of the system to improve student achievement. Attributions of Moderate Effect rose by nearly 20% from 2012 to 2014, while Neutral responses fell by 13%. Similarly, respondents affirmed the importance of reliability and relevance of the system to judge teachers fairly; attributions of Moderate Effect rose by 8.4% from 2012 to 2014, while Neutral responses fell by 9.6%. This response pattern holds in regard to the assessed impact of reliability and relevance of the system to improve teacher effectiveness. The Moderate Effect category saw a 12.5% rise from 2012 to 2014, while Neutral responses to survey questions declined by 9.2%.

Similarly, the ability of the system to judge teachers fairly also showed a shift towards more importance with fewer superintendents choosing the neutral response option and more selecting the Moderate Effect of a reliable and relevant evaluating system as important. As with the previous questions concerning plan functions, the reliability and relevance of the plan in improving teacher effectiveness also showed an overall shift towards more importance. Again, this is explained for the most part because fewer superintendents were non-committal and chose the moderate effect option.

**Table 20: Sufficient support for teacher evaluation system development and adoption (state and locally):**

	Major Effect	Moderate Effect	Neutral	Minor Effect	No Effect
<b>2012</b>	39.9%	42%	14%	1.4%	2.8%
<b>2014</b>	35.8%	49.1%	7.3%	7.3%	0.6%

**Teacher support for adoption of system:**

<b>2012</b>	30.1%	44.1%	17.4%	3.5%	4.9%
<b>2014</b>	36.4%	49.7%	9.1%	4.8%	0

**Sufficient training for implementation:**

<b>2012</b>	40.1%	41.5%	12%	3.5%	2.8%
<b>2014</b>	43%	48.5%	6.1%	2.4%	0

**Transparency of system:**

<b>2012</b>	33.8%	38%	21.1%	3.5%	3.5%
<b>2014</b>	46.1%	44.2%	8.5%	1.2%	0

**Ease of use/flexibility of system:**

<b>2012</b>	26.2%	35.5%	23.4	7.8%	7.1%
<b>2014</b>	30.9%	53.9%	9.7%	4.2%	1.2%

**Cost of system:**

<b>2012</b>	38.5%	35%	15.4%	6.3%	4.9%
<b>2014</b>	21.8%	39.4%	28.5%	7.3%	3%

**Reliability and relevance of the system to improve student achievement:**

<b>2012</b>	34.3%	40.6%	20.3%	2.8%	2.1%
<b>2014</b>	28.5%	60%	7.3%	3.6%	0.3%

**Reliability and relevance of system to judge teachers fairly:**

<b>2012</b>	37.8%	41.3%	15.4%	2.8%	2.8%
<b>2014</b>	39.4%	49.7%	4.8%	5.5%	0.6%

**Reliability and relevance to improve teacher effectiveness:**

<b>2012</b>	39.2%	42%	14.7%	2.1%	2.1%
<b>2014</b>	35.8%	54.5%	5.5%	4.2%	0

Superintendents were asked which stakeholder groups have been or will be a part of the plan development process. Survey participants could select any applicable stakeholders from the supplied list.

Stakeholder involvement remained steady across both survey years, with parents, students, and community members participating least in the plan development process.

Superintendents were asked about concerns with teacher evaluation plan development and implementation. The questions were posed by asking, “What level of concern do you have regarding each of the following items on a 5-point Likert Scale?” (See Table 22 below).

**Table 21: Which stakeholder groups have been or will be a part of your plan development process?**

	Parents	Students	Teachers	Association Leaders	Principals	Central Office Staff	Data Management/ IT	Community
<b>2012</b>	9.5%	6.7%	97.2%	92.7%	100%	96.6%	53.6%	10.1%
<b>2014</b>	12.1%	6.7%	94.6%	91.5%	99.4%	95.8%	58.2%	10.9%

For this series of questions, there appears to be an overall and consistent lessening of concern and apprehension about plan development and implementation. There is less concern expressed for resources for training, collecting observation data, communicating with stakeholders, and increasing staff understanding. After two years of implementation, it appears that there is less apprehension among responding superintendents with the development and implementation of plans complying with the new law. However, respondents in 2014 expressed the same level of concern as respondents in 2012 on the question concerning financial resources for increased compensation.

Respondents were also asked to rate their level of concern regarding the availability of resources to carry out key evaluation processes. Superintendents continue to feel that sufficient support for teacher evaluation system development and adoption is important (82% in 2012 and 84.9% in 2014).

Overall, respondents remain concerned about resource availability, though the intensity of this concern has declined. For example, the percentage of respondents reporting only slight concern regarding resources to conduct classroom observations rose by 10.4% from 2012 to 2014, and those reporting no concern rose by 7%. Similarly, slight concern around resources to collect student performance data rose by 8.1%, and responses demonstrating no concern rose by 4%.

This pattern is repeated when assessing respondents’ concerns around resources to provide training for staff; the category of Somewhat Concerned rose by 9.1%, and responses demonstrating no concern increased by nearly 8%. Concerns around communication to key stakeholders also reduced in severity, with a nearly 5% increase in the Somewhat Concerned category, a 4.1% increase in the Slightly Concerned category, and an 8.5% increase in the Not At All Concerned category. These patterns were mirrored by even greater decreases in the Extremely Concerned response options.

Concern regarding resources for the increased compensation component of new evaluation systems remained consistently high, with 89.7% of 2014 respondents reporting that they are extremely or very concerned.

**Table 22: Resources to conduct classroom observations:**

	Extremely Concerned	Very Concerned	Somewhat Concerned	Slightly Concerned	Not At All Concerned
<b>2012</b>	33%	34.6%	20.7%	7.8%	3.9%
<b>2014</b>	23.6%	24.8%	22.4%	18.2%	10.9%

**Resources to collect student performance data:**

<b>2012</b>	25.7%	33.5%	26.8%	10.1%	3.9%
<b>2014</b>	24.8%	26.7%	22.4%	18.2%	7.9%

**Resources to provide training for evaluators:**

<b>2012</b>	31.8%	27.9%	21.2%	13.4%	5.6%
<b>2014</b>	17%	23.6%	30.3%	15.8%	13.3%

**Resources to provide training for staff:**

<b>2012</b>	29.6%	31.3%	23.5%	11.7%	3.9%
<b>2014</b>	18.2%	32.7%	22.4%	17.6%	9.1%

**Table 22 (continued): Resources for the increased compensation component:**

<b>2012</b>	69.3%	20.7%	5.6%	2.2%	2.2%
<b>2014</b>	70.3%	19.4%	6.1%	3%	1.2%

**Building the capacity for understanding among school personnel:**

<b>2012</b>	24.6%	35.2%	25.7%	10.6%	3.9%
<b>2014</b>	12.1%	27.3%	35.8%	15.8%	9.1%

**Communications to key stakeholders:**

<b>2012</b>	15.6%	30.2%	26.8%	20.7%	6.7%
<b>2014</b>	6.7%	21.8%	31.5%	24.8%	15.2%

**On-going support for professional development:**

<b>2012</b>	39.1%	38.5%	10.6%	8.9%	2.8%
<b>2014</b>	30.9%	29.1%	26.7%	9.7%	3.6%

**Clear guidance concerning the interpretation of Indiana’s teacher evaluation law:**

<b>2012</b>	40.8%	29.6%	18.4%	7.3%	3.9%
<b>2014</b>	24.2%	26.1%	21.2%	19.4%	9.1%

**Alignment of Indiana’s law with policy:**

<b>2012</b>	26.3%	27.9%	27.9%	11.2%	6.7%
<b>2014</b>	26.1%	22.4%	21.2%	17%	13.3%

Concern regarding resources for the increased compensation component of new evaluation systems remained consistently high, with 89.7% of 2014 respondents reporting that they are extremely or very concerned.

While concern regarding clear guidance concerning the interpretation of Indiana’s teacher evaluation law remained, the Slightly Concerned category saw a 12.1% jump, and responses indicating Not At All Concerned raised by 5.2%. Alignment of Indiana’s law with policy seemed less of a concern, as well, with the Slightly Concerned category growing by 5.8% and the Not At All Concerned category increasing by 6.6%.

Respondents’ concerns were lessened between 2012 and 2014 to a smaller degree regarding the availability of resources to provide training for evaluators, with the Somewhat Concerned category seeing the largest jump (9.1%) and responses demonstrating no concern increasing by nearly 8%. This pattern holds in responses around building the capacity for understanding among school personnel; the Somewhat Concerned category rose by 10.1%, the Slightly Concerned Category increase by nearly 5%, and the Not At All Concerned Category rose by 5.2%. Again, respondents’ concern regarding on-going support for professional development lessened; the Somewhat Concerned category rose by 10.1%. It appears that more districts are training their leadership staff now than in 2012.

Fewer districts appear to be relying upon IDOE staff, webinars and published documents associated with the law.

Superintendents were asked about the allocation of human resources for plan implementation. Fewer respondents indicated that they were contracting with external evaluators, revising job descriptions, or re-classifying staff to take on the responsibility. While there was a 3.7% rise in reports of hiring additional personnel, the greatest change (7.1%) was in the Other category. Thus, it is unclear as to how some school districts are meeting the demands of the new law in this area.

**Table 23: How have the requirements of annual teacher/evaluations through classroom observations been achieved?**

	Hiring Additional Personnel	Contracting Externally	Revising Job Descriptions	Re-Classifying Staff	Other
<b>2012</b>	15.1%	10.1%	54.7%	28.5%	40.2%
<b>2014</b>	18.8%	4.2%	37%	20.6%	47.3%

Survey participants were asked about plans for data management required of a new teacher evaluation system, there was a small (3.8%) increase in responses indicating that Indiana districts have or will implement data management infrastructure changes to help manage the teacher evaluation process.

Overall, respondents in the 2014 survey affirmed the importance of consistent, clear and accurate communications regarding the law's implementation, clear guidelines and criteria for plan development and

implementation, and professional development and training of evaluators to ensure fidelity of implementation (See Table 26 below). This question was not asked in the 2012 survey.

**Table 24: Have you or will you implement data management infrastructure changes to help manage the teacher evaluation process?**

	Yes	No
<b>2012</b>	80.4%	19.6%
<b>2014</b>	84.2%	15.8%

**Table 25: What changes have you or will you implement?**

	Supplement Existing Data Management Software Packages	Purchase New Data Management Software as the Primary Data System	Contract with External Data Management Service Providers	Share Data Management and Data Storage Responsibilities with Another District or Districts	Other
<b>2012</b>	61.8%	52.1%	22.9%	11.1%	10.4%
<b>2014</b>	50.9%	39.4%	25.5%	4.9%	12.1%

**Table 26: Please rate the importance of the following in your implementation of teacher evaluations:**

	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important
<b>Consistent, clear and accurate communications regarding the law's implementation</b>	70.9%	25.5%	3%	0.6%
<b>Clear guidelines and criteria for plan development and implementation</b>	72.7%	26.7%	0.6%	0
<b>Professional development and training of evaluators to ensure fidelity of implementation</b>	76.4%	23%	0.6%	0

## DISCUSSION

After three years of implementing the requirements of SEA 01, the comparison of superintendents' responses over the two surveys administered in 2012 and 2014 offers a perspective on the possible impact of these implementation experiences upon their beliefs and perceptions concerning teacher evaluation in general and individual experiences at the local level.

However because many of the questions were answered by principals and teachers and reported out in an earlier brief (Murphy, Cole, Pike, Ansaldo & Robinson, 2014), it is also possible to interpret superintendent responses within the context of the beliefs and perceptions of others responsible for and impacted by the law.

The overall attitudes and beliefs of superintendents toward Indiana's teacher evaluation law have remained positive between 2012 and 2014. This conclusion can be drawn if the responses across the positive response options of Strongly Agree, Agree, and Somewhat Agree are combined. However, when looking within the positive response category at the individual agreement options, there are some differences in response patterns worth mentioning.

In general, there appear to be more superintendents choosing the Somewhat Agree option in the 2014 survey than in the 2012 survey, suggesting perhaps that there is less agreement and confidence in the required changes after three years of implementation.

Further, comparing the response selections across the two surveys compelled viewing the responses of the first survey from a new perspective. Just as with the 2014 survey, the Strongly Agree response was chosen far less frequently in the 2012 survey than other Agree response options. Although the first brief highlighted the overall favorable views of superintendents regarding the new legislation and the changes to teacher evaluation that it required, it did so in the general sense of grouping the superintendent responses across the Agree selection options. However, as stated above, when looking at the distribution of response frequencies within the possible agreement options, a somewhat different picture emerges.

It is worth noting that even though the response patterns are similar in their general rate of agreement, the Strongly Agree category response rate is rarely the response of choice in either survey, and even less so in the 2014 survey. It is quite possible that this is an artifact of the survey experience. Yet, the fact that there are instances where the Strongly Agree option is consistent across surveys suggests that this is not the case. This response pattern could represent something more, and may have implications for addressing the requirements of the new law in plan features, implementation fidelity, and stakeholder commitment. Superintendent responses more firmly represented in the Strongly Agree category for their beliefs or the degree to which they believe that their local plans meet their expectations for the evaluation process could have an impact upon how both principals and teachers view their commitment to the new plans.

Inconsistency and contention in the plan development and implementation process, and a lack of confidence at the local level where the changes have the greatest impact may occur as a result of perceived or actual lack of certainty at the leadership level.

Superintendents have the ultimate leadership responsibility in leading change in school districts, and they do so within established cultures. Managing the impact upon the culture and climate of their districts and its schools is part of a superintendent's responsibility (Waters & Marzano, 2006). Not recognizing either or both can create resistance, inhibit the implementation of the desired changes, and result in an erosion of the trust necessary for effective working relationships. Poor morale resulting from this disruption of trust can have a negative impact upon students and their learning as well, thus defeating the very purpose of the desired changes (Bryk & Schneider, 2003).

The survey results should also be viewed within the context of a state accountability system that is undergoing revision as a result of questions concerning a number of implementation issues. Questions concerning the validity of the state test used to measure student performance and forthcoming changes to the test are presently part of legislative and policy discussions. Other aspects under review include 1) the lack of appropriate high school measures for non-accountability grades and content, 2) the system for recognizing schools and districts through the awarding of grades that do not recognize the differential challenges for schools based upon their demographics, 3) the fact that some schools and districts are perennially ranked low in this system, and 4) the perception that teacher evaluation ratings in the state of Indiana appear to be unrelated to student and school academic performance. Each of these were identified in the list of concerns in the recent findings and recommendation presented by TNTP to the State Board of Education after its review of teacher evaluation in the state (TNTP, 2014).

These concerns and their debate at the legislative and state policymaking levels add to the uncertainty, lack of consensus, and inconsistencies in the development and implementation of teacher evaluation plans at the local level. It is possible that this environment is reflected in the survey responses of superintendents, teachers and principals, and should be factored in to this discussion and interpretation of the identified response patterns. For instance, if a responding superintendent did not feel that the measures used for determining student growth were valid or reliable, this could impact the superintendent's belief in the ability to accurately rate a teacher's instructional quality. This lack of confidence in the plan's capability could lead to questions concerning its fairness in the supervision and evaluation process.

Concerns about the legislated plan requirements could lead to resistance evidenced by publicly stated opposition in state professional organizations at the level of advocacy, and climate problems resulting in low morale at the local level. Similarly, moving forward without resolution of key issues could lead to lack of clarity in guidance and interpretation, confusion and inconsistency, and a lack of fidelity in plan development and implementation. As we have seen from the earlier brief in this series (Murphy, Cole, Pike, Ansaldo & Robinson, 2014), teachers have considerable concerns about a number of plan features including the valid measurement of growth and achievement, the capabilities of their evaluators to effectively rate instruction, linking student growth to evaluation ratings, and linking student growth for evaluation ratings and compensation. The fact that superintendents have expressed these same concerns in their responses to two surveys is an indication that there is work to be done in addressing this critical feature of teacher evaluation policy.

Approaching an interpretation of the survey analyses in this way could help to inform our understanding of the relationship between the design and implementation process of evaluation systems in Indiana as the state and its districts and schools move forward to address the concerns about the legislation and implementing its requirements. It may be strategically advisable to account for conditions in the environment that have an impact upon leadership, school culture and climate, political and legislative events, and how the purpose and need for change are communicated as policymakers move forward with implementation of the changes to teacher evaluation required by the law. Moving forward with resolve is necessary for change. However, doing so without buy in could erode the relationships necessary for the effective implementation of change (Bryk & Schneider, 2004). How the need for change is communicated is one example of how the implementation process can be facilitated by the development of trust or impaired by its erosion. (Coggshall, 2007).

Part of a superintendent's responsibility includes communicating the vision and the standards for success (ECRA Group, 2012). If district leadership communicates anything less than commitment and belief in the change, something short of acceptance and implementation with fidelity may occur. The role of superintendents in this change process is an example that can shed some insight upon this relationship between changes and how the need is communicated. Superintendents, in particular, bear the brunt of failure and realize the acclaim of success in the state's school and district letter grade accountability system (this system has been undergoing significant change as a response to dissatisfaction with its criteria for success). Even though in their survey responses there is a general overall agreement with the basic features of the law's requirements for teacher evaluation, the consistent lack of strong agreement across the survey questions may be the result of the lack of trust that they have in the overall accountability processes and criteria (Forsyth, Adams, & Hoy, 2011).

This discussion of the meaning and implications of the results should also be viewed within the overall body of research in the field that identifies leadership practices that are associated with effective implementation of initiatives and student achievement. For instance, Waters and Marzano (2006) identified a list of more than 60 leadership behaviors associated with student achievement. Among the strategies they identified are a number specifically related to the development and implementation of high quality teacher evaluation plans including developing a shared vision, communicating expectations, modeling an understanding of instructional design, monitoring and evaluating the implementation of the district instructional program and its impact upon student achievement, insuring that principals talk with teachers about results, and using resources for professional development.

Clearly, this list shows that the characteristics of an effective superintendent include managing the change process successfully. Further, many of the items on the list represent the components identified in the literature as being essential to the development and implementation of an effective teacher evaluation system (Curtis & Wiener, 2012; Daley & Kim, 2010; Goe, Holdheide & Miller, 2011). The implication is that effectively implementing a teacher evaluation process is critical to achieving district goals and objectives including student-learning outcomes. This being so, the interaction between leadership beliefs and confidence in the system designed to evaluate, ensure, and promote high quality teaching is inextricably related to school improvement.

The set of questions in the 2014 survey related to the superintendents attitudes and beliefs about their local teacher evaluation plan also sheds light on this concern. It appears that superintendents' responses to some of these questions are not as favorable as their feelings about teacher evaluation in general.

For example, superintendents' responses are not as strong when asked about the impact of local plans upon the teaching and learning processes in their districts and the capabilities of their local plans to address the essentials of the evaluation process (fair assessment of instruction, valid measurement of student learning). They do not feel as strongly about the benefit and impact of their local plans upon the teaching and learning in their district. And, they feel less strongly that their local plans drive professional development.

Incongruence between their beliefs and the implementation of their local plans could occur if the purpose for plan development and implementation are not clear or if they mean different things to different groups. Similarly, differences of opinion about what constitutes success in the development and implementation of teacher evaluation plans could also lead to conflicting positions regarding the successfulness of plan implementation.

This differential response pattern for local plan issues in superintendents' responses suggests a lack of certainty about their plans and their effectiveness that is similar to the response patterns of teachers' and principals' beliefs about the impact of their local evaluation plans documented in the previous brief in this series published in the fall of 2014 (Murphy, Cole, Pike, Ansaldo & Robinson, 2014). That brief reported that superintendents, principals and teachers all had generally less positive perceptions of their local plans than their beliefs about essential evaluation concepts.

Superintendent responses about the need for, the benefit of, and the capabilities of effective teacher evaluation to impact instruction and student learning and inform teacher professional development are essentially still high. But, there is a notable shift pattern to less certainty in their convictions. This shift is evident when comparing 2014 survey responses in the highest two categories of agreement with the less firmly held category of Somewhat Agree with those in the 2012 survey.

Local experiences with the state mandated tests and a relatively marginal improvement if any at all in student performance could be contributing factors to this shift towards less confidence in the implemented changes.

There is a minor shift between the two surveys to strongly agree and agree on questions related to accurately judging instruction. Contrary to the other shifts in perceptions being reported, this is a shift in the desired and positive direction. This may be related to the fact that Superintendents have more confidence in 2014 in their evaluators observing and rating instruction and in the rubrics used in the observation and evaluation process. Certainly, evaluators have had opportunities for training and more experience in understanding the rubric language used for observations. There may be a belief that this aspect of the evaluation may be working better than they thought it might two years ago when implementation of SEA 01 had just begun. However, it is interesting to note that even though the previous brief reported that principals had high levels of confidence in their ability to evaluate and to recognize good instruction, teachers expressed concerns.

Another pattern worth mentioning in a more affirmative direction is the lessening of concern and apprehension in the 2014 survey responses about sufficiency of resources and capability to develop and implement the new and more comprehensive requirements of the teacher evaluation law. It appears that superintendents have more confidence or are not as concerned about the resource capabilities for plan development or implementation as they were in 2012. The lack of monitoring plan development and implementation across the state at the time of the survey may have contributed to this response pattern. In other words, a lack of monitoring may have created a false sense of security in that there would be no consequences for failing to comply with the legislation.

However, since the surveys, the state has begun the implementation of a monitoring system to review local level compliance with plan development and implementation. Although there are no specific consequences for a lack of plan compliance, the fact that the plans will now be reviewed could have some impact in the future upon how superintendents feel about the resources necessary for compliance. A more positive interpretation of this response shift is that superintendents simply have experienced that meeting the plan requirements of the legislation is not as resource prohibitive as originally thought.

In the 2014 survey, superintendents did not indicate a clear relationship between teacher evaluation results and professional development in their local districts. This result suggests that there could be some lack of conviction about the purposes of the evaluation process. If supervision and evaluation are about improvement and not about dismissal, the use of professional development has to be an integral part of the process (Reeves, 2010; Hallinger, 2011; Wallace Foundation, 2011). The monitoring process mentioned in the previous paragraph could also have an impact in the future upon the relationship between the evaluation of teachers at the local level and the results of the evaluation process and the use of the results to guide professional development. The use of evaluation results for professional development is part of the state's new monitoring process. With the experience of a monitoring process that reviews the use of evaluation data for professional development, districts may incorporate data from evaluations in a more coordinated fashion into their district professional development plans and for the growth of individual teachers.

The question concerning the need for changes in the evaluation system prior to the new law is another one of a select few questions where the strength of agreement is actually more represented in the Strongly Agree response option for both surveys.

It increased in its strength of agreement over the two-year period between the two surveys. However, it does beg the question of what superintendents think that the changes should have been or should be since they obviously have concerns about the changes that happened. The fact that only 26.5% feel that the new law has improved the teacher evaluation process in their districts even though they felt then and now that changes were needed, underscores this point.

Even though superintendents generally do not have the same level of apprehension about their ability to "comply" with the requirements of the law, they continue to have a concern that there are few dollars for compensation. This could have an impact on district climate and diminish the buy in and support for new teacher evaluation policy. The lack of funds could fuel a feeling that there is a lack of support and resentment from staff for changes in their evaluation experiences. This concern for lack of funds may be a bedrock concept from which many of the response patterns may be attributed. Higher expectations in the accountability model without sufficient resources could lead to a lack of trust and low morale.

Related to this apprehension is the manner in which compensation is impacted by the law and its stipulation concerning ratings and compensation. According to SEA 01, only teachers rated as "effective" or "highly effective" are to be eligible for pay increases. How this impacts the reception of the new systems and their fidelity of implementation could be what is reflected in the response patterns to this question. Knowing that their teachers are apprehensive about meeting the higher expectations of new teacher evaluation requirements without meaningful compensation could create apprehension in superintendents about the overall impact upon their staff relations. It appears from the stability of the strength of agreement with this concern that it rises above beliefs and perceptions of other plan components.

The recurring concerns expressed across the two survey administrations may also be related to the context concerning teacher evaluation ratings, student performance, school grades and the policy and legislation that define the state's accountability system. The letter of the law requires, at least for teachers in "tested areas," that the rating be based on the academic growth of a teacher's students. However, recent information provided by the state Department of Education (Pies, 2014, & IC 20-28-11.5) illustrates somewhat of a methodological conflict in the measurement philosophy for recognizing school performance with the expectations for student growth used to evaluate its teachers. Legislated financial incentives in the form of "School Performance Awards" are contingent upon a school's school year over school year percentage growth rate of students receiving passing scores on achievement tests. This conflation of growth with achievement creates murkiness in the accountability system that does nothing to boost confidence in its fairness. In effect, while teachers' individual ratings are based to some extent on their contributions to student growth, state-funded incentives depend on school-wide achievement data heavily impacted by the level of achievement students start the year with rather than how much learning has occurred. The former is directly related to demographic issues that place teachers in schools with high levels of poverty at a disadvantage.

The lack of superintendent agreement about the fairness of their local plans represents an even more disturbing response. The discussion above has been a discussion on the capability of district plans to address legislated requirements for plan development and implementation in a number of methodological areas, (e.g., the capability of measuring student learning with validity and reliability, resources to address evaluation requirements, etc).

Responses concerning plan fairness, however, get to the heart of district and school culture, and reflect the fundamental issue that impacts the development of trust with teachers and those responsible for providing support through supervision. It is of particular concern because the concept of fairness is essential in the establishment of a healthy school culture and climate. The supervision and evaluation process, if nothing else, must be fair. For superintendents to feel otherwise could influence how they may communicate the necessity and advisability of the new systems to their principals and teachers. If this lack of conviction is translated into conversations and local level relationships even though the official communications are different, the reception of the changes by principals and teachers may be something less than enthusiastic.

Much has been written about district and school change and the roles of schools boards, principals and teachers in the change process (Reeves, 2009; Fullan, 2001; Senge, 1990;). Educators along the responsibility and accountability continuum experience the change process in similar and different ways. One may conceptualize a process from governance and policy, through teaching practices in classrooms, inclusive of supervision by principals and leadership by superintendents as generating different sets of responsibilities and experiences. However, the responsibilities of the superintendent in the leadership and accountability paradigm create a unique relationship and experience with the challenges and opportunities of developing and implementing effective teacher evaluation systems. These experiences of superintendents are reflected in their responses across these two surveys and provide an insight into how the implementation of the new requirements impact and are related to their beliefs.

Another way of expressing the implications of the results is whether anything less than Strongly Agree from those with leadership responsibility or change will result in the confidence and conviction essential for buy in and implementation with fidelity. A lack of certainty among superintendents could result in communication that is not expressed with conviction and lead to less buy in and fidelity in plan development and implementation. These responses interpreted in the context of concern at the public, legislative and policy level could indicate that a trickle-down effect of something less than perceived commitment from others along the continuum of responsibility for development and implementation may result in an erosion of support and commitment to the changes required by the legislation.

Any changes in superintendent perceptions and attitudes concerning teacher evaluation related to implementation are worth inquiring about. They could represent differences attributable to implementation experiences. They could represent changes in the political, policy, and guidance context of the implementation experiences as well as plan components. Further, these comparisons of superintendents' responses across surveys administered over the span of time since the law's implementation offer insights into the relationships between leadership at the highest administrative levels and implementation experiences upon their beliefs, expectations and leadership practices.

The long and the short of this interpretation of the similarities and differences between the responses of the previous survey and the current one may simply be that what we are seeing is a more realistic assessment of plan capabilities and implementation experiences.

A sobering interpretation would be that the superintendents are less optimistic as a result of the concerns about plan implementation; the link with compensation, the debates about the weight of student growth, and the constant scrutiny over the distribution of highly effective and effective ratings. A more hopeful interpretation is that even in the face of uncertainty, those at the highest leadership levels in districts across the state maintain their belief in the necessity and effectiveness of effective supervision and evaluation in ensuring that teachers are supported and students receive the high quality instruction essential for their success. It is possible that a perplexing relationship between beliefs and perceptions, plan development and achieving the intents of implementation is occurring.

These survey responses concerning the development and implementation of teacher evaluation plans to comply with the law suggest that the implementation process to date, leaves much to be desired. How the process continues to unfold could likely have an impact upon school quality and student learning and the hiring and retention of teachers, principals and superintendents.

## FUTURE RESEARCH

There are a number of questions about the impact of Senate Bill 1 upon teacher evaluation in Indiana that remain to be answered. Have the perceptions and beliefs of superintendents responsible for the leadership role in plan development and implementation changed with the implementation experiences that accompany compliance? If they have or have not changed – why? Are there specific characteristics of the legislation that have an impact upon all other experiences? Are there particular aspects of the law that impact development and implementation at the local level more than other aspects of the law? Are there some aspects of the political and policy environment that shape the experiences of plan development and implementation at the local level more than other factors?

Do others more directly responsible for implementation of the plans associated with the law have the same perceptions? If they have the same perception, why do they? And, if they do not have the same perceptions, why do they not? Have superintendent priorities changed? Have they been able to implement their priorities?

Additional research to probe deeper into the outcomes of teacher evaluation will be important. For instance, if we assume that effective supervision and evaluation can improve the design and delivery of instruction, a clarifying question would be to see if student growth and achievement have improved over a period of time. Similarly, if there is a relationship between effective implementation and an improvement in instruction, one could compare the overall ratings for teachers over the time period to determine if there is a relationship between student growth and achievement results and teacher evaluation ratings.

The two surveys have presented an opportunity to compare the reality of implementation and the professed priorities of superintendents determined from the original survey within the context of three important dynamics in the state's educational environment: student outcomes, teacher evaluation outcomes, and school outcomes. Much is made about the profile of teacher evaluation system ratings and whether or not the ratings reflect the actual quality of teacher performance in schools and classrooms. In general the underlying theme is whether or not there is a misalignment between teacher performance ratings, school grades and student learning outcomes. The question begged is whether teacher ratings are a product of plan design or more a product of plan implementation. Again, the data from these two surveys will not allow direct answers for this question to be drawn. However, insights may appear with a future comparison of respondent feelings about plan components, development processes, and implementation experiences.

The differences in superintendent responses to questions concerning their local plans and those questions inquiring into superintendent general beliefs about teacher evaluation is somewhat perplexing. A lack of congruence between what is intended versus what is experienced could happen. The degree to which this is happening is worth investigating in future research. Questions identifying whether philosophical differences in the evaluation process and the requirements of the legislation, the impact upon the requirements of legislation in the development of local plans, or the resistance to plan development and implementation are significant in the evaluation experience are worth exploring.

The dynamic nature of a teacher evaluation process characterized by new methods, procedures and expectations for teacher evaluation in Indiana and across the country poses challenges and opportunities for all involved. Teachers, principals and superintendents experience these changes in both similar and different ways. Differences in leadership style, expectations, implementation strategies, resistance, communication, acceptance, understanding, beliefs, attitudes, and perceptions are all concepts along the hierarchy of role, responsibility and accountability that are impacted by and impact the experiences and effectiveness of implementation. Continued analyses may provide insight into these and other underlying factors impacting plan development and implementation experiences that have an influence upon participant responses, even though the more probing questions that attribute causality to the responses were beyond the scope of this study.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of this study and developments at the national, state and local levels suggest that a shift to a more balanced approach in teacher evaluation that includes both accountability and support for teacher development is important.

In a system focused upon supporting teachers and developing their capabilities for success, there would be requirements to show how the results of the evaluation system are translated into professional development and coaching for teachers to address areas of improvement. In a system focused upon teacher development, needs improvement ratings would also be eligible for compensation increases. In a system focused upon teacher improvement and the development of effective supervision and evaluation relationships, the demonstration of evaluator and teacher training to ensure the fluency of expectations, the experience of effective and constructive feedback, and the encouragement of motivating observations and judgments of teacher effectiveness would serve as the framework of the teacher evaluation experience. This shift is consistent with the best practices in the literature of change and allows superintendents to lead in a role of support that inspires collegial interactions that affirm those most important in the teaching and learning process.

The finality of the analysis of these results is the possibility that the entire process of change in the development and implementation of teacher evaluation plans has to be re-framed to ensure that those responsible for the process feel that it is about support and improvement rather than dismissal. In order for this to happen, issues concerning compensation and sufficiently funding education so that those responsible for teaching students in districts, schools and classrooms everyday feel that they are valued and that their efforts are supported and appreciated must be addressed. The analysis and interpretations of the 2012 and 2014 superintendent responses suggests that something less than confidence in the necessity for the changes and the support for their implementation is having an impact upon the development and implementation of teacher evaluation plans in the state of Indiana.

It also suggests that consulting superintendents, principals, and teachers as the state moves forward with its response to the requirements and intent of SEA 01 is advisable.

Finally, it is also important to support Superintendents by providing training experiences, so that Superintendents can effectively develop and implement policies addressing the requirements for teacher evaluations and SEA 01. Additionally, as Superintendent's have indicated, it is important that the state provide consistent, clear and accurate communications regarding the law's implementation, provide clear guidelines for plan development and implementation, and support professional development for evaluator training.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank the following individuals and organizations:

The INTASS Advisory Board (members include: Indiana School Board Association, Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents, Indiana Association of School Principals, Indiana State Teachers Association, AFT Indiana, IUPUI, Indiana Department of Education, Center for Education and Career Innovation, INTASS Consortium, and Charter Schools) and the INTASS Consortium for their feedback on survey questions, review of study findings and supporting the administration of the survey.

**Joel Fosha**, Communications Manager, Indiana Institute, Indiana University for the layout, design, and printing of the brief.

**J.T. Coopman**, Executive Director, Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents for dissemination of the survey and his review of the brief.

**Trish Campbell**, Administrative Assistant, Center on Education and Lifelong Learning for developing the tables.

## AUTHORS

**Dr. Hardy Murphy** is Co-project Director for the Indiana Teacher Appraisal and Support System (INTASS) and serves as the Executive Director of the Indiana Urban Schools Association. He is also a member of the Educational Leadership faculty at IUPUI.

**Dr. Cassandra (Sandi) Cole** is Co-project Director for the Indiana Teacher Appraisal and Support System (INTASS) and is the Director of the Center on Education and Lifelong Learning at Indiana University.

**Dr. Jim Ansaldo** is a Research Scholar at the Center on Education and Lifelong Learning at Indiana University and a key contributor to the INTASS project.

**James Robinson** is a Research Associate at the Center on Education and Lifelong Learning and a key contributor to the INTASS project.

## REFERENCES

- Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2004). *Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement*. New York: Sage Foundation.
- Coggshall, J. G. (2007). *Communication framework for measuring teacher quality and effective-ness: Bringing coherence to the conversation*. Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.
- Curtis, R., & Wiener, R. (2012). *Means to an end: A guide to developing teacher evaluation systems that support growth and development*. Washington, DC: The Aspen Institute.
- Daley, G., & Kim, L. (2010). *A teacher evaluation system that works*. [Working Paper]. Santa Monica, CA: National Institute for Excellence in Teaching.

ECRA Group. (2010). *Effective Superintendents: ECRA Literature Review*. Retrieved from [http://www.ecragroup.com/sites/default/files/images/HYA\\_Superintendent.pdf](http://www.ecragroup.com/sites/default/files/images/HYA_Superintendent.pdf)

Forsyth, P. B., Adams, C. M., & Hoy, W. K. (2011). *Collective Trust: Why Schools Can't Improve Without It*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Goe, L., Holdheide, L., & Miller, T. (2011). *A practical guide to designing comprehensive teacher evaluation systems*. Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.

Murphy, H., Cole, C., Pike, G., Ansaldo, J., & Robinson, J. (2014). *Indiana teacher evaluation: At the crossroads of implementation*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, Indiana Institute on Disability and Community.

Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline*. New York: Doubleday.

The New Teacher Project-TNTP. (2015). *Recommendations for strengthening Indiana's Teacher Evaluation System*. Report presented to the Indiana State Board of Education.

Reeves, D. (2009). *Leading change in your school: How to conquer myths, build commitment and get results*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Reeves, D. (2010). *Transforming professional development into student results*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Waters, T., & Marzano, R. (2006). *The effect of superintendent leadership on student achievement* [Working Paper]. McREL International. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED494270.pdf>