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Abstract

Race to the Top is a $4.35 billion United States Department of Education program created to spur innovation and reforms in states and local districts of K-12 education. It is funded by the Education Recovery Act as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 and was announced by President Barack Obama and Secretary of Education Arne Duncan on July 24, 2009. States were awarded points for satisfying certain educational policies, such as performance-based standards (often referred to as an annual professional performance review), for teachers and principals, complying with nationwide standards, promoting charter schools and privatization of education, computerization of assessments, and changes in states’ teacher evaluation systems. In many states this has come to mean that teacher evaluation models had to have to be overhauled. Most importantly political and philanthropic entities have partner to promote shifts in the concept of teaching effectiveness. Both political parties have supported linking teacher evaluation to student test scores; and foundations such as the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, the Milken Family Foundations, and the Broad Foundation have invested significant dollars to support teacher evaluation reforms. In promoting Race to the Top, President Barack Obama’s 4 billion competitive grant program aimed at systemic education reform. President Obama (2009) stated, “Success should be measured by results. That’s why any state that makes it unlawful to link student progress to teacher evaluation will have to change its ways.” (Corcoran, 2010, p. 2).
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

To spur innovation and reform in states and local districts of K-12 education, the U.S. Department of Education created Race to the Top (RTTT), a grant program. This 4.35 billion dollar investment has propelled reform across the country. Corcoran (2010) says RTTT is about seismic shifts in our conception of teacher effectiveness aimed at systemic education reform (p. 2). It is funded by the Education Recovery Act as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 and was announced on July 24, 2009, by President Barack Obama and Secretary of Education Arne Duncan. States were awarded points for satisfying certain educational policies, such as performance-based standards for teachers and principals (often referred to as an annual professional performance review), compliance with nationwide standards, promoting charter schools and privatization of education, computerization of assessment, and changes in teacher evaluation systems (Blumenfield, 2012, p. 1).

In many states this is interpreted to mean revision of tenure laws, evaluation systems and procedures (Corcoran, 2010). Most importantly, political and philanthropic entities have partnered to promote shifts in the concept of teaching effectiveness. Both political parties support linking teacher evaluation to standardized test scores of students. Additionally, foundations such as the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, the Milken Family Foundations, and the Broad Foundation have invested significant financial support in these reforms. The prevailing consensus among policy makers, stakeholders, and federal and state education officials is that public schools in the United States need to improve quickly.

Accountability of teachers and principals is paramount for student achievement if American students are going to be college and career ready with appropriate 21st century skills
and equipped to compete successfully in global initiatives. In support of his new education challenges, President Obama (2009) stated, “Success should be measured by results. That’s why any state that makes it unlawful to link student progress to teacher evaluation will have to change its ways.” (Corcoran, 2010, p. 2).

For nearly 50 years the improvement of public education has been a priority for local, state, and federal policy makers. A Nation at Risk highlighted the perceived deficiencies of the United States educational system, and more and more questions were raised about the quality of public schools (Kersten, 2006, p. 234). Due to this perceived failure, along with the push for highly qualified teachers and increased accountability for student outcomes, states have begun to play a larger part in evaluation policies and procedures (Anderson, 2012; Hazi & Rucinski, 2009). Value-added measures of teacher effectiveness are the centerpieces of a national movement to evaluate, promote, compensate, and/or dismiss teachers based, in part, on student test results (Corcoran, 2010). Part of the RTTP promise is to help states and districts close achievement gaps and get more students into college by supporting reform strategies that include recruiting, evaluating, and retaining highly effective teachers and principals (Boser, 2012). As school organizations move to standards-based evaluation systems, they should also be interested in the reliability and validity of the evaluation scores produced, especially when these scores have consequences for teachers, such as termination, tenure, and pay for performance (Milanowski, Kimbo, & White, 2004). Bartoletti and Connelly (2014) posit that principals know—as does the rest of the educational community—that teacher quality is the single most important school-based factor in student achievement. Principals want their schools and students to achieve. Principals want the teacher evaluation process to be successful. A successful process is predicated on meaningful feedback, mentoring, and coaching, as well as appropriate support
for principals to execute evaluation models that accomplish the goal of evaluation to improve instruction and learning (Bartoletti & Connelly, 2014).

Baker, Oluwole, and Green (2013), explain that new evaluation models have been adopted by state legislatures and supported by school administrators, federal officials, and policy makers across the nation in an attempt to evaluate teacher effectiveness and promote and retain teachers that are successful (p. 2). Alicas (2005) contends that the value-added method of evaluation “appears flawed, essentially because it assumes that the gain score of students (value-added) is attributable only to the teacher(s)” (p. 1). Jacob and Lefgren (2008) studied principals in a portion of the Midwest and found that when principals use value-added measures of teacher evaluations, the principals are able to determine the “best and worst teachers” (p. 129).

In New Jersey, the Teacher Effectiveness and Accountability for the Children of New Jersey Act (TEACHNJ) was signed into law on August 6, 2012. Callahan, Golway, and Sadeghi (2012) posit that the legislative intent is to make it more difficult for teachers to earn tenure and easier for school districts to eliminate underperforming teachers. Under the old law, tenure was awarded after three years. Under the new law, teachers are required to work four years, with the guidance of a mentor, and show consistent achievement of good grades on annual performance evaluations in order to attain tenure (para. 3).

According to Callahan et al. (2012), TEACHNJ also targets teachers who have already earned tenure. Prior to the new legislation, school districts could dismiss tenured teachers for “inefficiency,” but the process for doing so took years and could often cost districts hundreds of thousands of dollars, leading many school districts to avoid the process altogether. Now, once a school district files tenure revocation papers with the state, teachers have 105 days to appeal the
decision. Under the new law, arbitration occurs outside of the courts, and costs are capped at $7,500, to be paid by the state (para. 4).

Beginning in September 2013, all of New Jersey’s teachers will be evaluated on an annual basis. The evaluations will be based on multiple observations of classroom performance, as well as student learning outcomes. Rather than relying on absolute standardized test scores, a statistical formula, called value-added measures, determines student growth from year to year and compares that growth to that of their peers. Every teacher receives a summative rating of “highly effective,” “effective,” “partially effective,” or “ineffective.” Untenured teachers are required to attain two positive evaluations within their first three years. Also, in a major change in educational policy, tenured teachers can lose their jobs after two consecutive years of ineffective evaluations (Callahan et al., 2012, para. 5).

The evaluation system has begun to use district and state approved evaluation instruments and professional standards that focus on teaching practices and student learning. The new evaluation systems measure three components: teaching practices through observation by qualified principals and administrators, student standardized test scores, NJ ASK Student Growth Percentiles (SGPs), and Student Growth Objectives (SGOs). A statewide database will be used to collect individual student assessment on standardized tests and link the results to individual teachers through class rosters. This provides an opportunity for the Department of Education to use value-added scores to track growth and determine if teachers are ineffective, partially effective, effective, or highly effective (Callahan et al., 2012, para. 6).

According to the New Jersey Education Association (NJEA), the state’s largest teachers union, each school has established a School Improvement Panel that consists of a principal (or designee), an assistant or vice principal, and a teacher. Selected teachers are those “persons with
a demonstrated record of success in the classroom,” chosen in consultation with the union (Callahan et al., 2012, para. 7).

The School Improvement Panel is responsible for overseeing the mentoring of new teachers and for implementing classroom evaluations of all teachers. NJEA will not allow teachers to take part in the classroom evaluations unless agreed to by the union. NJEA wanted this provision included in the legislation so teachers would not be placed in the difficult and awkward situation of evaluating other teachers (Callahan et al., 2012, para. 8).

The School Improvement Panels will use state approved teacher evaluation frameworks such as the Danielson model, the Marzano model, the McREL teacher evaluation system, or the Stronge teacher evaluation system. All of the models are currently being piloted across school districts in New Jersey. School districts may use one of these NJDOE approved teacher evaluation frameworks or they may develop their own, but all frameworks must be approved by the state (Callahan et al., 2012, para. 9).

The Obama administration’s RTTT competitive grant-award program initiated an unprecedented wave of state teacher-evaluation reform across the country (McGuinn, 2012, p. 1). To date, most of the scholarly analysis of this activity has focused on the design of the evaluation instruments and the implementation of the new evaluations by districts and schools (McGuinn, 2012, p. 1). Various approaches to new evaluation processes have been implemented within the past several years. McGuinn (2012) outlines a brief synopsis of procedures in five states where reform models of teacher evaluation are based on quantitative data.

Tennessee has a statewide teacher evaluation model that local districts are required by law to adopt. The system uses three components to arrive at a teacher’s level of effectiveness: observation data (50%); student growth (35%); and student-achievement data selected by the
educator and his/her supervisor from a list of state approved options (15%). Teachers with less than four years in the classroom are observed six times per year, while more experienced teachers are observed four times per year. The evaluation system was implemented statewide in the 2011-2012 school year (McGuinn, 2012, p. 11).

In Colorado, Senate Bill 10-191 directs school districts to adopt new teacher evaluation systems that are based 50% on student academic growth, and 50% on observations and/or other methods that measure professional practice. The system incorporates four performance-level ratings for educators. Local school districts can adopt the state model wholly or in part, but district evaluations must meet or exceed the state’s criteria and are subject to state review. The new evaluation system was scheduled to be implemented statewide in the 2013-2014 school year, following a two-year pilot (McGuinn, 2012, p. 17). Pennsylvania’s new teacher evaluation system is based on traditional teacher practices and classroom observations (50%) and multiple measures of student achievement and growth scores (50%). Statewide implementation of the new system began in the 2013-2014 school year, following three years of pilot testing in numerous school districts. Districts are allowed to use any state-approved model (McGuinn, 2012, p. 27).

Delaware has a single statewide evaluation model, but local districts have the option to use an alternative evaluation model in conjunction with the state model. The new statewide evaluation system establishes four levels of educator performance, uses multiple valid measures in establishing performance levels, requires no more than five components with one dedicated exclusively to student improvement (growth), and weighted at least as high as any other component. The new teacher evaluation system was piloted during the 2011-2012 school year with implementation in the 2012-2013 school year (McGuinn, 2012, p. 31).
Last, Rhode Island’s evaluation reform is written into the regulations of the State Board of Regents for Elementary and Secondary Education, which established a default state model that all districts are required to use unless they propose an alternative model approved by the state education agency. Educator evaluations must contain three components based on evidence of professional practice, professional responsibilities, and student learning. The state is silent on the percentage that each component contributes to the final rating. Statewide implementation of the full evaluation system is taking place during the 2012-2013 school year (McGuinn, 2012, p. 33).

**Problem Statement**

The importance of American teachers and their ability to deliver quality instruction with measurable outcomes has never been so focused on in public education as it has been in the present day. In the era of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and RTTT, teacher and principal accountability and effectiveness has forced states to impose new teacher and principal tenure and evaluation laws. For decades, teacher evaluations were little more than a bureaucratic exercise that failed to recognize either excellence or mediocrity in teaching. As such, the evaluation process represented a missed opportunity for giving teachers valuable feedback that could help them improve their practice (Hull, 2013, p. 1).

Policy makers and school administrators have embraced valued-added models (VAMs) of teacher effectiveness as tools for educational improvement (Haertel, 2013, p. 3). New Jersey, like most states, has implemented new tenure and evaluation laws that now make it easier to dismiss ineffective teachers and principals. This undoubtedly will have lasting implications for public education in general and the teacher and principal professions in particular. AchieveNJ consists
of three basic parts: a score based on teacher practice, a score based on Student Growth Objectives (SGOs), and, for teachers in tested grades and areas, a score based on Student Growth Percentiles (SGPs). These scores are weighted and combined to create a summative rating, which determines the final effectiveness rating of a teacher.

However, it is well established in the education research community that tying standardized test scores of students to teacher evaluations and tenure is not what value-added models should be used for. Baker, Barton, Darling-Hammond, Haertel, Ladd, Linn, Ravitch, Rothstein, Shavelson, and Shepard (2010) conclude that there is broad agreement among statisticians, psychometrics, and economists that student test scores alone are not sufficiently reliable and valid indicators of teacher effectiveness . . . even when the most sophisticated statistical applications such as VAMs are employed (p. 2).

Opponents contend that there is extreme rating volatility, positing that rating instability in value-added models is very high, resulting in extreme year-to-year and even multi-year volatility. VAM estimates have proven to be unstable across statistical models, years, and classes that teachers teach (Baker et al., 2010, p. 5). There is very little evidence that supports the validity or reliability of Student Growth Objectives (SGOs), particularly in the many untested subjects. There is little to no evidence of any predictive validity for SGOs that would lead to the conclusion that they are viable measures of student achievement and teacher effectiveness.

Bartoletti and Connelly (2014) posit that over the past several years policy makers have focused on the implementation of new teacher evaluation systems as a key reform initiative. As the most important figure with regard to instructional leadership, principals bear the primary responsibility of implementing teacher evaluation and believe evaluation should aim to build teachers’ instructional capacity (Bartoletti & Connelly, 2014). There are obvious challenges
with the current implementation of new teacher models. Issues regarding the impact on an administrator’s time is critical. Quality and/or job-embedded professional development to execute the model with fidelity, reliability, and validity may be critical challenges for school-based administrators. Finally, understanding the functionality of the data management instrument plays a critical role as a component for administrators to get past the challenges that are inherent in the new model.

Firestone et al. (2013) reported in their New Jersey Teacher Evaluation Assessment, that 90% of the administrators surveyed reported that they were spending more time conducting observations and entering observation data than they had previously. Administrators also described new time demands that are now being made of them, including doing more pre-observation conferences with teachers, doing longer post-observation conferences, and providing more detailed records of observations (Firestone et al., 2013). Few studies exist pertaining to the challenges associated with the implementation of teacher evaluation models in New Jersey. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine the challenges associated with building-based administrators in executing the new teacher evaluation model.

**Purpose**

Therefore, the purpose of this qualitative descriptive study was to examine the challenges associated with the implementation of the new evaluation process. Twelve administrators from the northern, central and the southern regions of the state, using different types of evaluation models, were selected to participate in the research.

**Research Questions**

The goal of this study was to answer the following overarching and broad research question: What are the challenges of New Jersey building administrators associated with the
implementation of New Jersey’s Teacher Evaluation Model? The following sub questions guided this research as well.

1. What are New Jersey administrator’s beliefs about the new evaluation process and/or procedures?

2. What factors are considered to be challenges and facilitators to program implementation?

**Theoretical Framework:**

*Everett Rogers’ Diffusion of Innovations*

The theoretical framework that guided this research is Rogers' (2003) Diffusion of Innovations. Rogers' work is instructive because it speaks to how individuals deal with and communicate change whenever a new ideal or innovation is introduced to change agents. Everett M. Rogers’ book, *Diffusion of Innovations* (2003), outlines several theoretical perspectives about the concept of the diffusion of change. Diffusion is the process by which the adoption of an innovation within an organization or community is communicated through certain channels over time among the members of a social system (Rogers, 2003). There are four main elements in the Diffusion of Innovations: (1) innovation itself, (2) communication through certain channels, (3) over time, and (4) among the members of a social system (Rogers, 2003). Rogers (2003) outlines four theories related to the diffusion of innovations: (1) innovation-decision process theory, (2) the individual innovativeness theory, (3) the rate of adoption theory, and (4) the theory of perceived attributes.

Rogers (2003) says the perceived attributes of innovation “should not be assumed, as they sometimes have been in the past, that all innovations are equivalent units of analysis” (p. 15). Rogers (2003) posits the characteristics of innovation, as perceived by individuals, help to explain their different processes of adoption: (1) Relative advantage is the degree to
which an innovation is perceived as better than the idea it supersedes. The degree of relative advantage may be measured in economic terms. (2) Compatibility is the degree to which an innovation is perceived as being consistent with the existing values, past and present experiences, and needs of potential adopters. (3) Complexity is the degree to which an innovation is perceived as difficult to understand and use. Some innovations are readily comprehended by most members of a social group; others are more complicated and are adopted more slowly. (4) Trialability is the degree an innovation may be experimented with on a limited basis. New ideas that can be tried on the installment plan will generally be adopted more quickly than innovations that are not divisible. (5) Observability is the degree to which the results of an innovation are visible to others. The easier it is for individuals to see the results of an innovation, the more likely they are to adopt.

The innovation-decision process theory describes five stages. The first stage is knowledge. Rogers’ theory states that future adopters must first learn about the innovation. Next, they must be persuaded about the qualities of the innovation. Third, they must make the decision to adopt the innovation. Fourth, once adopted, they must actually act to implement the innovation. Fifth and finally, the implementers must confirm they made the right decision. Upon achievement of these stages, diffusion results (Rogers, 1995).

The individual innovativeness theory addresses who adopts the innovation and at what time they adopt. This effect is usually plotted on a bell-shaped curve showing the categories of adopters of an innovation. The first category is the risk-taker innovators (2.5%), who are seen as the pioneers leading the way. The second category is the early adopters (13.5%), who spread the word to others. The third and fourth categories are the early majority (34%) and late majority (34%) of those adopting the innovation. The role of
the innovators and early adopters is to communicate positively to the early majority. The late majority, as the name implies, waits to be sure there is little risk in adopting. The final group, the laggards, represents the last 16%. The laggards are highly skeptical and resist the change to the extent that many never adopt the innovation (Rogers, 1995).

The theory of rate of adoption illustrates adoption of innovations with an s-curve on a graph. The theory states that the adoption will grow slowly in the beginning, followed by an accelerated period of growth that tapers, becomes stable, and eventually declines (Rogers, 1995).

The theory of perceived attributes postulates that individuals become more likely to adopt an innovation when they perceive the following five ordered attributes:

1. The innovation demonstrates an advantage over the status quo or a competing innovation.
2. The innovation is perceived to be compatible with existing values and practices.
3. The innovation is not overly complex.
4. The innovation has trialability (meaning that it can be tested for a specified time before full adoption.)
5. The innovation must present concrete, observable results (Rogers, 1995).

**Significance of the Study**

This research is important because the new evaluation model will have serious implications for personnel, compensation, and tenure decisions for teachers and principals. It is also important because of the possible legal implications, particularly as it relates to due process. Finally, it is significant for the positive or negative potential impact it may have on student outcomes. This research has the potential to inform policy makers, stakeholders, politicians, and
educators of the challenges of building-based administrators in executing the new teacher evaluation model effectively.

While there continues to be a growing number of studies on teacher evaluations, as they relate to value-added models, there are limited studies that focus on the complexities of challenges of teacher evaluations that building administrators face. This study provides evidence needed for policy makers, stakeholders, and others to better determine how administrators can become more efficient in leading and delivering a quality evaluation model that has accuracy, validity, and fidelity. Since state and federal officials are requiring these mandates, this study may also provide state and federal officials an opportunity to ensure quality professional development for administrators. Determining what administrators find challenging in this new process will provide valuable evidence for policy makers, stakeholders, politicians, and educators to inform what works and what doesn’t with respect to the new teacher evaluation model.

**Procedure**

The purpose of this descriptive study was to examine the challenges of New Jersey administrators associated with the new teacher evaluation process from the perspective of building-based administrators (principals, assistant principals, and vice principals) in the state of New Jersey. Administrators from the northern, central, and southern regions of the state were selected to participate in the study.

In order to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the new evaluation process currently used in New Jersey, building-based administrators were interviewed on the challenges they faced in implementing the new model.
Limitations

Conducting the interviews of a small sample of New Jersey administrators is a limitation because only principals, vice principals, and assistant principals from elementary, middle, and high school were represented. This is a limitation because there are other administrators, such as directors, assistant directors, and supervisors who may be experiencing challenges that were not captured in this study. They may also have had experience with the observation tools and the data management systems that were not included in this study. Although there was 100% participation, caution must be utilized because only administrators that have implemented evaluation systems have been solicited for this training. Their responses may be biased given that they received training and professional development from several different districts utilizing different models.

Definition of Key Terms

Accountability: Accountability is defined as the delivering of results.

Teacher Evaluation: Teacher evaluation is one method used to determine the accountability of teachers.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP): Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) is an annual measurement of student participation and achievement in statewide assessments.

School Administrator: School administrator is the term that refers to the person responsible for the daily operations and leadership at a particular school site. Included in this term are principals and assistant principals.

Perception: Perception is a person’s “awareness, consciousness or view”

Due Process: Due process is the legal requirement that a state must respect all of the legal rights that are owed to a person.
Reliability: Reliability is the extent to which an experiment, test, or measuring procedures yields the same results on repeated trials.

Validity: Validity is the extent to which a test measures what it claims to measure.

Value-Added Models: Value-added models purport to be able to take student standardized test scores and measure the “value” a teacher adds to student learning through complicated formulas that can supposedly factor out all of the other influences and emerge with a valid assessment of how effective a particular teacher has been.

Student Growth Percentile: Student growth percentile is a measure for each student in a school in how he or she performs on state tests from one year to the next as compared to other students across the state with similar achievement levels.

Bias: Bias is prejudice in favor of or against one thing, person, or group compared with another, usually in a way considered to be unfair.

Chapter Summary

While the research on teacher evaluations is extensive, few studies have been conducted on the challenges associated with the implementation of building base administrators in New Jersey and their role in the evaluative process. The purpose of this study was to examine the challenges associated with the implementation of building-based administrators about TEACHNJ. This descriptive study surveyed certified, active administrators within three different regions of New Jersey (northern, central, and southern). An interview process of open-ended questions was determined to be most effective for this process. The results of the study will strengthen the existing body of literature and provide educators, policy makers, and other stakeholders in New Jersey with current research and information that can be useful in
strengthening the process for administrators as they become more experienced and more effective in the evaluative process.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to describe the challenges to building-based administrators associated with implementation of New Jersey’s new teacher evaluation model. The review of the literature focused on various challenges within the new teacher evaluation model with which building administrators have to contend.

Review of Literature Search Methods

To collect information for this dissertation, online databases and traditional library references were used. These included a number of resources found in the Seton Hall University Library database, peer review journals, texts, and websites. Computerized databases included Dissertation Abstracts, EBSCOhost research, SAGE, ERIC research databases, JSTOR, ProQuest, Google, and Google Scholar. Search terms included the following: principal evaluations, education reform, teacher evaluation, teacher reform, teacher evaluation, validity, and reliability, and principal challenges with new reform.

Chapter Organization

This literature review examines the multitude of challenges for principals and the complexities of reforms that impact teacher evaluations. The chapter begins with an historical overview of the history of teacher evaluation from the perspective of the work of Fredrick Taylor in the 1900s on efficiency, scientific management, rating scales, and the role of teacher evaluation, as well as Cubberley's (1916) work on public administration. Second, the chapter proceeds to an understanding of the purpose and development of evaluations. Haefele (1993), Danielson and McGreal (2000), Arredondo and Rucinski (2000), Costa, Garmston, and Lambert

**History of Teacher Evaluation**

Rating and evaluating teachers are not new phenomena and can be traced back to the early 1900s. Fredrick Taylor’s seminal work on efficiency and scientific management played a major role in teacher evaluation development. Taylor believed that measurement of specific behaviors of factory workers was perhaps the most powerful means to improve production. He argued that if there were 100 ways to perform a task, some methods would be more efficient than others (Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston, 2011. p. 1).

Within a short period of time, educational efficiency experts emerged with their own agenda for promoting better schools. Chief among the techniques were scientific rating scales (Glanz, 1991, p. 7). According to Taylor (1911), these principles could be applied to discrete
tasks such as shoveling coal and to more systemic tasks such as the selection of workers, development of training programs, and processes for dividing labor. Taylor's ideas resonated with engineers and business owners, and colleges of engineering and business were well positioned to infuse his principles into their courses. Also, Taylor's principles began to have an impact on K-12 education (Marzano et al., 2011, p. 1).

According to Marzano et al. (2011), educators like Edward Thorndike began to view measurement as the ultimate tool for a more scientific approach to schooling. Thorndike's theories were applied to administration by Ellwood Cubberley (p. 14). Originally published in 1916, Cubberley's book, Public School Administration (1929), described how Taylor's principles could be used to manage schools in the same way factories are managed.

Our schools are, in a sense, factories in which the raw products (children) are to be shaped and fashioned into products to meet the various demands of life. The specifications for manufacturing come from the demands of twentieth century civilization, and it is the business of the school to build its pupils according to the specifications laid down (Cubberly, p. 338).

Based on the factory metaphor, as cited in Marzano et al., Cubberley devised a set of principles for school administrators that emphasized measurement and analysis of data to ensure productivity of teachers and schools. In the third edition of his book, Public School Administration (1929), Cubberley provided specific examples of how a scientific approach could be applied during classroom observation. He described specific feedback that a supervisor might provide to a teacher. For example, on a scale of A to F, a sixth grade teacher was given a D for her arithmetic lesson. Cubberley's supervisory form stated the following:

Weak Points: Entirely wrong procedure for type of problems used. No attempt at problem-solving instruction. . . Suggestions Made: Explained to her that being a new
teacher to our schools, she evidently did not know how we teach arithmetic. Explained faults of the lesson, but commended her managerial ability. Told her how she should handle such work, and gave her Newcomb's *Modern Methods of Teaching Arithmetic* to take home to read designated chapters. (Cubberley, 1929, p. 327).

**Purpose of Teacher Evaluations**

Teacher evaluation systems should provide meaningful opportunities for teachers to improve instruction with a clear focus on student achievement. Donald Haefele (1993) states a clear sense of purpose should govern the design of a teacher evaluation system. Haefele (1993), identifies the following purposes that must be served, arguing that a system should do the following:

- Screen out unqualified candidates
- Provide constructive feedback
- Recognize and help to reinforce effective practices
- Provide direction for staff development
- Unify teachers and administrators around improved student learning

Danielson and McGreal (2000) state that quality evaluations should have sources of information that “document all evaluative criteria; that evaluators follow procedures, including due process; that procedures are equitable, meaning evaluators make consistent judgments based on evidence; and that there is inter-rater agreement” (p. 30).

According to Harris (1998), evaluation is a set of predetermined criteria by which all teachers are judged; there are no individualized considerations or cooperation by groups of teachers to evaluate (p. 13). Nolan and Hoover (2008) define evaluation as “an organized
function designed to make comprehensive judgments concerning performance and competence for the purpose of personnel decisions such as tenure and continued employment” (p. 6).

Further, Costa, Garmston, and Lambert (1988) posit that teacher evaluations are important for making personnel decisions about employment by using a rating scale that makes judgments about teachers’ performances. According to Iwanicki (1998), three approaches of teacher evaluations still guide the fundamental teacher evaluation process: Past evaluation focused on rating teachers on the basis of style or trait criteria. Present evaluation focuses on analyzing teaching on the basis of accepted practices. Future evaluation will focus on analyzing teaching on the basis of what students and teachers learn (p. 155).

Similarly, Arredondo and Rucinski (2000) posit that scholars, educators, and policy makers understand the importance of developing teacher evaluation systems that are designed to improve teacher practice and improve student outcomes. Ovando and Ramirez, Jr. (2007) suggest that there is a gap in teacher performance literature, therefore eliminating teachers from the discourse on evaluations (p.86). Also absent from the discourse are principals (Torff, 2005). Hence, it is important to focus on the perceptions of teachers and principals in the overall development of teacher evaluations (Ovando & Ramirez, Jr., 2007, p. 88).

The focus on teacher evaluation is not a new phenomenon; its growth and development began in the mid-1800s. Teacher evaluation practices have an extensive history of development within the American public school system (Ovando & Ramirez, Jr., 2007, p. 88). According to Harris (1998), “In U.S. public schools, supervisory practice was differentiated from classroom teaching by the mid-nineteenth century as both rural county and urban city school systems emerged” (p. 1). Subsequently, the 1850s mark the period when the first public school
educational supervisors assumed the role and were recognized as the first school personnel responsible for several non-teaching duties (Hardy, 1997, as cited in Ovando & Ramirez, p. 88).

Moreover, Ovando and Ramirez, Jr. (2007) suggest that teacher evaluation has evolved and research surmises that new performance and evaluation processes are shaped by certain conditions (p. 88). Danielson and McGreal (2000) state that conditions may include the following: “reform and restructuring initiatives, increased understanding of teaching, of how adults grow and learn, increased awareness of the importance and complexity of teaching, increased focus on the development of teacher expertise, new understanding about staff development, and the reappraisal of traditional supervision” (pp. 15-16).

Coppola, Scricca, and Connors (2004) developed the Supportive Schools Model, which incorporates an evaluation piece, includes an introduction, factual data, instructional strengths, and recommendations for professional growth and extracurricular activities. The End-of-the-Year Evaluation is part of a larger supervision plan (Coppola et al., pp. 18-19). Hunter (1988) developed a diagnostic guide to assist supervisors in evaluating teacher performance. Hunter asserts that the summative evaluation should have criteria, use a known instrument, be based on data, and include goals for next year (1988, p. 60). McGreal (1988) purports that teacher evaluation is successful when it has four components: a clear criterion, opportunities for teacher involvement in the system, multiple sources of data, and feedback activities that are incorporated into the evaluation systems (McGreal, as cited in Minnear-Peplinski, p. 61).

According to Marzano (2012), evaluation instruments for teacher learning and teacher competencies need different evaluation systems. States, districts, and schools across the United States are actively developing or implementing teacher evaluation systems (Marzano, p. 15).
One can trace this flurry of activity to a variety of reports and initiatives that highlight two failings of past efforts: (1) Teacher evaluation systems have not accurately measured teacher quality because they have failed to do a good job of discriminating between effective and ineffective teachers, and (2) teacher evaluation systems have not aided in developing a highly skilled teacher workforce (Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, 2011; Toch & Rothman, 2008; U.S. Department of Education, 2009; Weisberg, Sexton, Mulhern, & Keeling, 2009, as cited in Marzano, 2012, p. 1).

Attaching test scores to teacher effectiveness has become a major policy initiative throughout the country. These learning gains are measured by pretests and posttests to see what kinds of gains are made year-to-year by students. Schochet & Chiang (2010) posited that this would be an equitable way to evaluate teacher effectiveness, simply because of the ability to monitor the progress students make from year to year (p. 1).

Student learning gains, as measured by students’ scores on pretests and posttests, increasingly are being used to evaluate an educator’s performance. Known as “value-added” measures of performance (VAMs), the average gains of students taught by a given teacher, instructional team, or school are often the most important outcomes for performance measurement systems that aim to identify instructional staff for special treatment, such as rewards and sanctions (Schochet & Chiang, 2010, p. 2).

The incorporation of VAMs in teachers’ evaluations, according to Darling-Hammond, Amrein-Beardsley, and Rothstein (2012), is based on the notion that teacher effectiveness is correlated to individual student achievement (p. 2). Darling-Hammond et al. (2012) contend that assessments assume that the test students take actually assess what students have learned, that teachers alone influence student achievement, and that other classroom influences play no role in
teacher effectiveness. Most importantly, research reveals that gains in student achievement are influenced by much more than any individual teacher (Darling-Hammond, et al., 2012). Other factors include the following:

- School factors such as class size, curriculum materials, instructional time, availability of specialists and tutors, and resources for learning (books, computers, science labs, and more)
- Home and community support or challenges
- Individual student needs and abilities, health, and attendance
- Peer culture and achievement
- Prior teachers and schooling, as well as other current teachers
- Differential summer learning loss, which especially affects low-income children
- The specific tests used, which emphasize some kinds of learning and not others and which rarely measure achievement that is well above or below grade level (Darling-Hammond et al., 2012, p. 1).

Value-Added Models

Amrein-Beardsley (2014) posit that bias is a huge threat to validity, as biasing factors (e.g., student risk factors) both distort the measurement of a variable and distort their interpretations, either increasing or decreasing, in this case, VAM-based estimates. “This occurs even though the biasing factors are unrelated to what the test-based indicators (VAMs) are meant to represent (teacher effectiveness). Accordingly, if VAM estimates are highly correlated to biasing factors, then it becomes impossible to make valid interpretations about the causes of student achievement gains or losses as intended. Bias is most difficult to statistically “control for” because students are rarely, if ever, randomly assigned to classrooms, and teachers are rarely randomly assigned to classrooms as well” (p. 1).
There have been great concerns regarding reliability and VAM/SGP models, particularly as they relate to reliability. For example, a teacher classified as effective using these models has a 25% to 50% chance of being classified as ineffective the following year, and vice versa (Haertel, 2011, p. 13). Under some conditions, VAM scores and rankings can change substantially when a different model or test is used; a thorough analysis should be undertaken to evaluate the sensitivity of estimates to different models (Amrein-Beardsley, 2012, p. 8).

In addition to reliability being a concern of VAM, Braun (2005) states validity is just as important with respect to tests and what they are intended to measure. Typically, state content standards are broad, ambitious, and often ambiguous (p. 5). The author concludes that the degree of transition and continuity of tests and standards varies among states and subject areas Braun (2005). Reviews of state testing often reveal that they do not measure some of the content standards at all, and some only superficially, focusing instead on aspects of the standards that can be probed with multiple choice questions (American Federation of Teachers, 2001, p. 2).

Growth and Value-added Models that are based on student achievement data are increasingly positioned as more objective measures of teacher effectiveness (Collins & Amrein-Beardsley, 2014, p. 3). Growth models measure student progress toward proficiency from one point to the next in relation to academically similar students; also, they help to measure student progress toward proficiency standards (Colorado Department of Education, 2012, p. 1). Growth models are used for more descriptive purposes (Betebenner, 2011; Betebenner & Linn, 2010; Briggs & Betebenner, 2009; Linn, 2008, as cited in Collins & Amrein-Beardsley, 2014, p. 4).
VAMs better estimate a teacher’s impact on student growth over time, and as such are being used by states for more consequential purposes (Collins & Amrein-Beardsley, 2012, p. 4). The authors add that this is due to VAMs’ advanced methodologies and often the statistical controls that are used to block, or control for, the student’s background, risk, and other extraneous variables (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender, poverty, attendance, English proficiency, and involvement in special education, gifted or other programs) that otherwise make it impossible to determine actual teacher impact on student growth over time (p. 2).

**Proponents and Opponents of Value-Added Models**

Although VAMs have had bipartisan support from policy makers, governors, and legislators nationally, there are plenty of opponents who believe that VAMs are inappropriate to evaluate teachers and influence high-stakes personnel decisions. Amrein-Beardsley and Collins (2012) conducted a mixed-methods study of the Houston Independent School District (HISD), which examined the intended and unintended consequences of using VAMs.

There was a response rate of 32%. “Almost 46% of a sample of HISD teachers who moved to different grade levels reported switching value-added ranks after the move, from ineffective to effective or vice versa and across grade levels that were adjacent” (p. 5). “Furthermore, over half (55%) of a sample of HISD teachers noted that their VAM reports did not match their supervisor’s observation scores” (p. 5). Ten percent of the same teachers expressed substantial concerns about being evaluated for content they were not teaching or being held accountable while teaching alongside others teachers responsible for teaching the same students the same subjects at the same time (Amrein-Beardsley & Collins, 2012, p. 6).

Since the implementation of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) in 2002, researchers, econometricians, and statisticians have explored various analytical methods to document student
academic progress over time, specifically to replace Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) measures (Amrein-Beardsley & Collins, 2012, p. 3). In the context of overhauling teacher evaluations, there are both proponents and opponents of using student test scores as a significant factor in the evaluation process. Haertel (2013) concluded emphatically that teacher VAM scores should not be included as a substantial factor with a fixed weight in consequential teacher personnel decisions. Much more serious is the fact that the scores may be systematically biased favorably for some teachers and against others; major potential sources of bias stem from the way our school systems are organized (p. 4).

Proponents such as President Obama in his 2012 State of the Union address cited Chetty, Friedman, and Rockoff’s (2011) study. The study found an effective teacher could raise the lifetime earnings of a student by more than $250,000 (The White House, 2012, p. 33). Other proponents have posited that VAM measures of teacher quality are essential to American economic growth. Researchers have argued that firing the bottom 5% to 8% of teachers and replacing them with average teachers could result in an economic growth of trillions of dollars to the U.S. gross domestic product (Hanushek, 2011, p. 7).

Similarly, Jacob and Lefgren (2008) studied elementary school principals in the western United States and found that when principals use VAMs in teacher evaluation, the principals are able to determine the “best and worse teachers” (p. 129). However, the authors also found that principals can generally identify teachers who produce the largest and smallest standardized achievement gains, but have far less ability to distinguish between teachers in the middle of this distribution (p. 103).

By measuring student progress from year to year, value-added measures are good predictors of how a student will perform in the future. Suggesting that policymakers should be
cautious when using VAMs to determine teacher effectiveness, Schochet and Chiang (2010) stated that while value-added measures are “fairly strong predictors of subsequent year academic outcomes” (p. 36), conversely they can incorrectly identify teachers needing assistance. Schochet and Chiang (2010) suggested that VAMs are more reliable predictors of teacher effectiveness when paired with evaluations by principals (p. 8).

Within the context of school reform over the past several years, teacher tenure has become a highly charged issue. With the implementation of the RTTT initiative, local, state, and federal government agencies have begun wide-ranging, far-reaching tenure policy changes. There are disadvantages to tenure, which have led politicians, policymakers, and school administrators to begin to question its usefulness. Opponents maintain that state and federal laws, as well as collective bargaining, now protect teachers from unwarranted dismissal and that the procedure for dismissal is so cumbersome and expensive that few superintendents and school boards pursue it, except in the most serious instances. For this reason, few other professions offer tenure because employees are adequately protected with existing laws (McLeod, 2010, p. 4).

Opponents of tenure say it removes incentives for teachers to extend more than minimal effort and to focus on improving their teaching (Thibodeaux, 2010, para. 4). One of the controversial issues that arises from the tenure debate is that tenure creates complacency. Furthermore, opponents say tenure makes it difficult to remove underperforming teachers because the process is long and expensive. A June 1, 2009 study by the New Teacher Project found that 81% of school administrators knew a poorly performing tenured teacher in their schools; however, 86% of administrators said they do not always pursue dismissal of teachers because of the costly and time-consuming process (McGuinn, 2010, p. 2.).
Tenure makes it costly for schools to remove a teacher with poor performance or who is guilty of wrongdoing and incompetence. It costs an average of $250,000 to fire a teacher in New York City (Rhee, 2008, para. 5). New York spent an estimated $30 million a year paying tenured teachers accused of incompetence and wrongdoing to report to reassignment centers (sometimes called "rubber rooms") where they were paid to sit idly. Those rooms were shut down on June 28, 2010 (Brill, 2009). Teacher tenure requires schools to make long-term financial commitments that they cannot afford, particularly in a struggling economy, and it prevents flexibility within the districts. Teacher employment contracts generally lack provisions for declining enrollment and economic turmoil (Roza, 2006, p. 11). Additionally, opponents of tenure believe that it promotes mediocrity and leads to the retention of complacent teachers while younger, more creative ones are bypassed and innovation is stymied (Thibodeaux, 2010).

Eliminating a teacher for poor performance is an involved, complicated, time-consuming process, particularly if the effectiveness of a tenured teacher is in question. Because of this, the profession has been criticized for using tenure as a means of protecting poor teachers (Lavigne & Good, 2013, p. 16). Within the context of school reform, teacher tenure has become a controversial issue. With the implementation of the RTTT initiative, local, state, and federal government agencies have begun wide-ranging, far-reaching tenure policy changes, which, of course, is the impetus for teacher evaluation reform (p. 17).

Proponents of tenure say it protects teachers from being fired for personal, political, or other non-work related reasons (Horn, 2003). Also, tenure prohibits school districts from firing experienced teachers to hire less experienced and less expensive teachers (Thibodeaux, 2010).
Also, proponents posit that tenure protects teachers from being fired for teaching unpopular, controversial, or otherwise challenging curricula, such as evolutionary biology and controversial literature (Stephey, 2008).

Proponents contend that it protects teachers from being prematurely or unfairly fired after a student makes a false accusation or a parent threatens expensive legal action against the district. After an accusation, districts might find it expedient to quickly remove a teacher instead of investigating the matter and incurring potentially expensive legal costs. The thorough removal process mandated by tenure rules ensures that teachers are not removed without a fair hearing (Wolpert-Gawron, 2009). In addition, proponents also say that tenure provides the job security needed for academic freedom, protects teachers from being dismissed at the whim of school-board members or politicians, insures that older, higher-paid teachers with long experience will not be replaced by younger, less-experienced teachers, gives teachers the necessary security to allow them to be innovative and creative, and provides a mechanism under which tenured teachers can be dismissed solely for just cause, after due process (Stephey, 2008).

**Emerging Studies**

Collins and Amrein-Beardsley (2014) developed a one-stop database on growth or value-added models, in place or in development in each state. This resource is used as a component of state-based teacher evaluation systems research.

Despite widespread use, however, not one state has articulated a plan for formative data use by teachers. Federal and state leaders seem to assume that implementing growth and value-added models leads to simultaneous data use by teachers. In addition, state representatives expressed concern that the current emphasis on growth and value-added models could be applied to only Math and English/Language Arts teachers with state standardized assessments (approximately
30% of all teachers). While some believe implementation of the Common Core State Standards and associated tests will help to alleviate such issues with fairness, more research is needed concerning the lack of fairness associated with growth and value-added models (Collins & Amrein-Beardsley, 2014, p. 1)

In addition, Polikoff and Porter (2014) conducted a subset of the Measure of Effective Teaching Project (METP). In their study which analyzed 327 fourth and eighth grade teachers, no association was found between valued-added measures and other accepted measures of teaching quality, such as the degree to which instruction is aligned with state standards or content assessments. There were weak associations of content alignment with student achievement gains, and no association with the composite measure of effective teaching (Polikoff & Porter, 2014, p. 16).

In a study published by the American Educational Research Journal, Harris, Ingle, and Rutledge (2014) found that evaluations of teachers by principals may capture results above and beyond those that are assessed by value-added measures. Harris et al. (2014) asked 30 principals to rate teachers and then compared those ratings with value-added scores. In short, while the correlation between the simple numeric principal ratings and teacher value-added measures is modest, principals do seem to know who their high flyers are, even if they do not always identify them in the ratings (Harris et al., 2014, p. 20).

The findings published in the American Educational Research Journal by Paulfler and Amrein-Beardsley (2013) show that students are not randomly distributed into classrooms. This finding is important because random distribution or random assignment of students is a technical assumption of some value-added models.
The authors state, in this case, random assignment would involve using probabilistic methods to assign students to different treatment groups (e.g., classrooms or schools). This would help to ensure that the student characteristics that might bias treatment effects (e.g., different teacher- or school-level effects) are equally probable across comparison groups (e.g., students within classrooms with different teachers or students within different schools). This would help to make causal statements about treatment effects (e.g., teacher or school effects) using output indicators (e.g., growth in student achievement) more validly interpretable using standard statistical reasoning approaches (p. 3).

**The Houston Independent School District (HISD)**

Amrein-Beardsley and Collins (2012) examined the data of the Houston Independent School District, the largest school district in Texas and the seventh largest in the country. The focus of the examination was the intended and unintended consequences of using VAMs for high-stakes decision making. This district is using value-added data more than any other in the country for high-stakes purposes, expressly for merit awards and to make teacher termination decisions (Corcoran, 2010, p. 2.).

Amrein-Beardsley and Collins (2012) examined other intended consequences (e.g., value-added use and data-informed change) and unintended consequences (e.g., perverse side effects as well) (p. 2). Teachers who do not receive merit monies attribute the lack of rewards to the types of students they teach and how these students bias their scores. (Rothstien, 2009, p. 7). Teachers who loop or teach back-to-back grade levels report bonuses for the first year but nothing for the next as they max out. Teachers of ELL students who mainstream do not see
value-added scores increase, and the same holds true for special needs teachers with inordinate numbers of special needs students (p. 8).

**Perceptions of the Evaluation Rubric**

The NJ Teacher Evaluation RU-GSE External Assessment Year 1 report conducted by Firestone, Blitz, Gitomer, Kirova, Scherbakov, and Nordon (2013) provided information on three aspects of districts’ perceptions of the teacher evaluation rubric. The goal was to find rubrics that were accurate, fair, and provided useful feedback to help teachers improve their practices, and that could be used for personnel decisions. (Firestone et al., 2013, p. 25).

Generally, administrators had a more positive view of these evaluation rubrics than teachers. For instance, 74% of administrators agreed that the evaluation rubrics assessed teachers accurately, as did 32% of teachers. Similarly, 75% of administrators agreed that the rubrics generated information that provided useful individual feedback or guidance for professional development. Subsequently, districts differ on how their programs are perceived. For instance, the percentage of administrators who think the teacher evaluation rubrics are accurate ranges from 38% to 100%, and the percentage of teachers who agree on this point ranges from 20% to 52%, indicating that districts have quite different views of their teacher evaluation rubric (Firestone et al., 2013, p. 4).

Firestone et al. (2013) found that administrators are more positive about the use of teacher-evaluation rubrics than were teachers. More administrators than teachers agree that the use of teacher-evaluation rubrics generated accurate assessments, did so fairly, provided teachers with useful feedback for improving their practices and separated more and less accomplished teachers (Firestone et al., 2013, p. 50). Also, more administrators than teachers agreed observers
had the knowledge required to appraise teachers, and actually gave accurate feedback (Firestone et al., 2013, p. 51).

Firestone et al. (2013) examined four possible factors that have an impact on the teacher evaluation rubric: time, training, the data management tool, and resistance. Ninety percent of the administrators surveyed reported that they were spending more time conducting observations and entering observation data than they had previously (p. 5). Additionally, the authors contend that training was another beneficial factor that helped administrators understand the evaluation rubric. Further, “Administrators received substantially more training on the new rubrics than teachers; four times as many teachers as administrators reported receiving less than eight hours of training on the rubric” (p. 5).

The third factor, the data management tool, presented interesting findings. Firestone et al. (2013) reports that these tools often include a tablet-based element for recording observation data in the classroom, a means to record data, generate observation reports, and share them with teachers, store the data in a central location, and run analyses to identify patterns. The tools created their own learning issues that initially slowed recording and led to lost reports (p. 6). Last, in light of the different perceptions between teachers and administrators of the evaluation rubric, the issue of resistance from teachers arose. It was reported that “teachers were more guarded in their discussions with administrators than in the past” (p. 6). Three distinct themes emerged, including that some teachers felt the rubric was subjective, had major discrepancies, and that they were given inappropriate observations (p. 7).

**Principals’ Challenges of Teacher Evaluations**

The administrator’s role in evaluations is a critical major part of a teacher’s success or failure; through years of research it is commonly recognized that principals are an important
conduit for successful teacher evaluations. Studies over the last 25 years highlight the principal as the central person responsible for school evaluations (Colby, Bradshaw, & Joyner, 2002, p. 7). In addition, researchers Hallinger and Heck (1996) posit that the “evaluation instrument should be used as a tool for change and can be helped along by the principal’s influence” (p. 2).

Lefgren and Jacob (2007) conducted a study in a mid-sized school district in the western United States to determine how well principals can distinguish between more and less effective teachers. The study examined, over time, elementary school principals with common demographic variables as well as standardized test scores. The finding of their study revealed that principals are successful in identifying the best and the worst teachers but are not as successful in identifying teachers in the middle of the distribution (Lefgren & Jacob, 2008, p. 33).

Doherty (2009) surveyed 14 administrators in a suburban Massachusetts school district, using the Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP) as well as interviews from small groups. The findings show that administrators from this district conjecture that augmentation of the current teacher evaluation process could enhance the effectiveness of principal observations and evaluations of teachers while “differentiating the teacher evaluation systems, reducing the amount of paperwork in the process, increasing the number of informative observations and walkthroughs, developing differentiated rubrics for different teacher positions, and using multiple sources of data” (p. 4). Moreover, these administrators did not believe that the evaluation system improved teaching and learning (Doherty, 2009).

Amendt (2004) surveyed principals and superintendents in Iowa school districts. A total of 333 surveys were mailed electronically to selected participants; 228 surveys were completed. The study sought to determine if administrators perceived a difference in the effectiveness of
evaluations that had been used in the past compared to the current system of evaluation, the Iowa Teacher Quality Evaluation Standards and Criteria (ITS). The findings showed that the administrators found several components of the ITS evaluation process to be more effective, with 68% of the respondents indicating the new system of evaluation had improved. In addition, data showed that despite the many positive components in the evaluation method, 66% still found it to be too time consuming and believed as well that teachers needed more training on the new evaluation process (as cited in Sheppard, 2007).

In a qualitative research study in a small rural school district in the mid-Atlantic region, Sutton (2008) surveyed a sample population that included five teachers and five principals. The participants were interviewed individually, using open-ended questions pertaining to the district’s current teacher evaluation system. According to Sutton, administrators believed that implementing the following changes in teacher evaluations would further enhance the process: assisting master teachers to grow professionally and become staff developers working with less experienced or skillful teachers; using professional development plans as a part of evaluation for tenured people who are not master teachers to help them stretch and grow; using portfolios with informal walkthroughs to provide checks and balances as an alternative system for evaluation of master teachers; offering the option of action research for master teachers (as cited in Sheppard, 2013, p. 109).

Xu and Sinclair (2002) surveyed teachers and principals to determine what, if any, changes should be made in the evaluation methods currently used in elementary schools in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. The objectives of this study were as follows:

- To determine similarities and differences in perceptions regarding the major purposes of evaluating instruction.
• To elicit suggestions for changes from teachers and principals to make evaluation of instruction more meaningful in their local schools

• To analyze the degree to which evaluation of instruction is intended to provide information that teachers may use to increase student learning (p. 3).

The general schools were selected at random from all elementary schools in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and the target schools, also elementary, were chosen from the Massachusetts Coalition for the Advancement of Learning. The study consisted of surveying teachers and principals as well as looking at teacher contracts and evaluation instruments. The sample included 39 principals and 42 teachers. In addition to the survey instruments, the researchers conducted approximately 30 hours of interviews with principals and teachers.

Xu and Sinclair (2002) used what teachers perceived and what principals perceived as the major purposes of teacher evaluation: to improve instruction and determine the effectiveness of the current evaluation process. Findings indicated that only 20.59% of principals surveyed believed that the purpose of teacher evaluation was to improve student achievement (as cited in Sheppard, 2013, p. 25).

Barton (2010), investigated principals’ perceptions of teacher evaluations. This study was conducted in an urban California school district where 52 principals completed and returned the survey. Barton found that principals believed that using both formative and summative evaluations of teachers was more effective for those teachers without tenure than for those who were tenured. On the other hand, the researcher found that principals believed formative evaluations were more effective for those teachers with tenure. As with other research, Barton found that the principals believed the evaluation process is too time consuming and very rarely has a clear purpose (as cited in Sheppard, 2013, p. 26).
Firestone et al. (2013) investigated the barriers and facilitators of New Jersey’s new evaluation model. The two-year study focused on three questions: What were administrators’ and teachers’ perceptions of the implementation of the new teacher practices? What were their beliefs about new teacher evaluation procedures? What factors are perceived to be barriers and facilitators to program implementation? The report found that training was a major challenge, along with time management of other administrative duties and responsibilities as well as the data management tools that support teacher practice (Firestone et al., 2013).

Sartain et al. (2011), in a study titled *Rethinking Teacher Evaluation in Chicago*, found that many of the challenges principals faced in the implementation of the new evaluation were directly related to time and the amount needed to dedicate to the process such as prioritizing other duties and responsibilities. While most principals describe their main role as instructional leader, they are pulled in other directions and do not spend as much time in classrooms as they would like. Finding the time to engage in the conference process—preparing, scheduling, and holding the conferences themselves—was difficult for most principals (Sartain et al., 2011). Both teachers and principals had difficulties scheduling observations. Principals reported that observations were frequently canceled due to emergencies in the school or principals being summoned to attend last minute meetings at the central office (Sartain et al., 2011). One administrator is quoted as saying, “The logistics around scheduling all the pieces of the observation is a daunting task, even if the payoff is worth it” (p. 35).

Another barrier that Sartain et al. (2011) found to be problematic for principals was the data-management instrument used. Program administrators in Chicago integrated a ratings database into a website called DS2, similar to Teachscape, iObservation, or Stronge data
management systems. From the beginning of the pilot, principals reported that the data entry piece of the evaluation system was overwhelming and time consuming. Most cited it as the biggest challenge of the evaluation pilot. One principal reported, “I was trained to do my observations on paper. I have all the documentation and forms in my accountability binder, but I haven’t gotten to DS2. I understand its importance in tracking things and making things easier in the long run, but getting to it initially has been a challenge (p. 36).

The administrator’s role in evaluations is critical to, and a major part of, a teacher’s success or failure, and it is commonly recognized through years of research that principals are an important conduit for teacher evaluations. Studies of the last 25 years highlight the principal as the central person responsible for school evaluations (Colby, Bradshaw, & Joyner, 2002, p. 7). In addition, researchers Hallinger and Heck (1996) posit that the evaluation instrument should be used as a tool for change, and can be helped along by the principal’s influence (p. 2).

**Chapter Summary**

The research indicates that there are many challenges to principals in the implementation process as they begin to roll out the new evaluation model. Some of the more obvious ones identified in the research are issues of technology as they relates to professional development, data instrument, time, validity, reliability, and the capacity to build trust among staff. In order for this transition to be of real value for student outcomes and valuable for principals in particular, flexibility is necessary; and adjustments must be made on the part of policy makers, stakeholders, and state and federal decision makers. The research indicates that training for the effective usage of technologies and data management systems and the implementation of these technologies is paramount. The principal’s time and prioritizing what is important in a school building become paramount to the role of the principal in the evaluation process. As we move
forward with these new models of evaluation, will decision makers make the commitment to offer more support, both financially and logistically, with respect to hiring more assistant principals, vice principals, and other observers to assist with this time-consuming endeavor? Since this is a paradigm shift, it is evident that principals will need high quality training, credentialing, and ongoing job-embedded professional development, particularly as a way to build capacity and trust among teaching staff. Also, this would include meeting the challenge of ensuring reliability and validity of evaluation instruments as it relates to using clear rubrics and giving quality feedback while trying to ensure adequate attention to complete the time consuming process.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHODS

The purpose of this qualitative case study is to explore the challenges to school-based administrators associated with the implementation of New Jersey’s new evaluation model, AchieveNJ. Firestone et al. (2013) conducted research on the perceptions and challenges of administrators; some of those interview questions were used with participants in this research. District administrators participated in face-to-face interviews for approximately 45 minutes. The administrators represented districts of various sizes, locations, and socioeconomic statuses. A 100% response rate was achieved. The interviews posed various questions about the implementation of new teacher evaluation systems and the data management system used. Demographic questions about each participant’s professional background and professional work experience sought to produce specific data about the participant and school. In all forms of qualitative research, some and occasionally all of the data are collected through interviews. DeMarrais (2004) defines an interview as “a process in which a researcher and participant engage in conversation focused on questions related to a research study” (p. 55). Jackson (2009) posits that participants answer the questions, and researchers describe the responses given.

This study created research-based evidence that will assist policy makers with policy creation and support professional development as well as other support systems and mechanisms that pertain to school administrators. In order for the interviews to be both reliable and valid, it is important that the questions are constructed properly (Jackson, 2009, p. 10). Questions were written for clarity and ease of comprehension. For confirmation, this researcher conducted practice interviews with an expert panel of building and central office administrators, formed expressly to determine if any questions needed follow-up probes and/or clarifications.
According to Glesne (2006), there are three dominant data-gathering techniques in qualitative inquiry: participant observation, interviewing, and document collection. For this study, the interview process was selected because, according to Merriam (2009), interviewing is necessary when behavior, feelings, or how people interpret the world, cannot be observed. Dexter (1970) summarizes when to use interviewing: “Interviewing is the preferred tactic of data collection when . . . it will get better data or more data or data at less cost than other tactics!” (p. 11). Merriam (2009) posits that interviewing is the best technique to use when conducting intensive case studies of a few selected individuals. “The primary mode of data collection should be based on the kind of information because it is likely to elicit data and information needed to gain understanding of the phenomenon in question, contribute different perspectives on the issue, and make effective use of time available for data collection” (Glesne, 2006, p. 36).

This chapter includes the procedures that are used to gather data, and methods used to analyze the data collected. The chapter describes the following: the research questions, the research design used in the study, selection of the sample for the study, the instrument used in the study, and procedures for data collection and data analysis.

**Research Questions**

The goal of this study was to answer the following overarching and broad research question: What are the challenges to school-based administrators associated with the implementation of New Jersey’s new evaluation model, AchieveNJ? The following subordinate questions guided the research as well.

1. What are New Jersey administrators’ beliefs about the new evaluation process and/or procedures?
2. What factors are considered to be challenges and facilitators to program implementation?

**Research Design**

The purpose of this qualitative study was to conduct a systematic formal inquiry into the factors associated with the challenges to building-based administrators when implementing AchieveNJ. The study focused on three regions of New Jersey (north, south, and central). In order to determine the current challenges to administrators, a series of questions related to each individual’s professional background; and a series of more detailed questions aimed at focusing on the challenges of implementation were developed for an in-depth interview.

**Population and Sample**

This research study focused on three regions of New Jersey (north, south, and central). The districts vary in enrollment and geographic distribution. There was a total of 12 districts—five high schools, three middle schools, and four elementary schools. There are six districts from the northern region, three from the central region, and three from the southern region. In addition, a mixture of low and high socioeconomic school districts were represented in the sample as indicated by the distribution from A to J (DFG) factor grouping (See Table A-1, Appendix C).

There was a total of 12 administrators who supervise approximately 441 teachers and have made approximately 882 observations/evaluations in the 2013-2014 school years. A nonprobability convenience sampling procedure was used to recruit participants. Convenience sampling is just what is implied by the term—sample selection is based on time, money, location, availability of sites or respondents, and so on (Merriam, 2009). This sampling strategy involved locating a few key participants who easily met the researcher’s established criteria for
participation in the study. Because of this, convenience sampling allowed the researcher to sample several administrators (Merriam, 2009). In order to ensure accuracy of the data—confirmability, dependability, transferability and credibility—the researcher and participants identified and agreed upon a site for interviewing participants (Merriam, 2009).

Also, this researcher asked colleagues from the Seton Hall Executive Ed.D. program for referrals to their colleagues in various regions of New Jersey to participate. Principals and assistant principals of these regions were contacted to request their participation. Table A-1, Appendix C, represents the districts of the participants. Table A-2, Appendix C, represents the observation tool and data management systems used by the participants.

**Instrumentation**

This researcher used two sets of questions: (1) to ascertain the professional background and experience of the participants, and (2) to ascertain the various challenges in implementation of the new teacher model. The interview questions were developed partly by querying a group of experienced administrators and colleagues. Also, permission was gained to use the Rutgers 2-year External Assessment of teacher evaluations (Firestone et al., 2014, See Appendix I). The instrument contained both short and in-depth questions. Completion of responses took approximately 25 to 45 minutes. The first set of questions focused on the demographic and professional background of the participants. The second set of interview questions focused on the challenges of implementation associated with the new evaluation model, and a subset of questions explored administrators’ beliefs about process and procedures, challenges, and facilitators. To ensure and protect confidentiality, after completion of the interview, each participant was issued an identification code that corresponded to the participant’s responses. Interview questions queried administrators on the challenges associated with the implementation
of the new model, the successes and failures they have had, the training and professional development they received and needed in order to evaluate staff effectively, and how central office administrators supported their work in this new paradigm shift.

**Data Collection**

Prior to beginning the research, the Institutional Review board (IRB) of Seton Hall University granted permission to proceed with acquisition of data. An introductory letter was mailed to school administrators, informing them of the study. Two weeks later, all administrators who had not responded were contacted by email. Once respondents consented to participate, a schedule for interviews was designed and interview questions were formulated. Hard copies of the interview questions were brought to the meeting sites, along with an informational consent letter explaining the purpose of the study and detailed instructions on how the interview process would work. The consent letter ensured participants of anonymity and confidentiality.

**Data Analysis**

Interview questions were analyzed to gather data. The administrators were pre-coded Administrator #A1, Administrator #A2, Administrator #A3, and so on, to protect names and identities. Before the interview questions were administered, a standardized script was used to add the elements of confidentiality, reliability, and validity of the data. No administrator was identifiable or recognizable in the research. The administrators read and signed the consent letter and completed the interview. The last page of the interview questions asked administrators to consent to participate in individual interviews.

The interviews were conducted at specific locations that provided convenience and privacy for the administrators. The interviews took place in the following locations: Seton Hall
University’s study room, a public library, this researcher’s office and/or conference room, and at
the homes of several administrators. Use of an interview guide ensured consistency in data
collection. Interviews lasted approximately 20 to 45 minutes; all interviews were audio-recorded
and transcribed by this researcher. The information was used to make and develop follow-up
questions and probes, if necessary.

Glesne (2006) noted the fact that a researcher is likely to gather more data than originally
thought; therefore, by the end of data collection, a researcher should expect to feel overwhelmed
by the quantity of information amassed. To avoid this dilemma during this study, data gathering
was approached with methodical organization (Glesne, 2006). Prior to both the pilot study and
the actual research project, memos were written, analytical files made, and preliminary coding
schemes developed (Glesne, 2006). This process made the volume of information and data
collected less intimidating and easier to manage (Glesne, 2006).

After gathering and sorting the data from the actual study into analytical files, a coding
scheme to manage the data was developed (Glesne, 2006). These schemes were logged into a
code book as a means of methodological organization (Glesne, 2006). Ultimately, these coding
schemes became themes (Glesne, 2006; Bogdan & Biklen, 2007).

Open coding, also known as substantive coding, is conceptualizing on the first level of
abstraction (Glaser, 1978). Written data from field notes or transcripts are conceptualized line by
line. In the first stages of data analysis, everything is coded in order to identify the problem and
develop resolution techniques. Often coding is done in the margins of transcripts and field notes
(Glaser, 1978). Thus, the first step of the coding process consisted of open coding. Upon
transcription of interviews, typing of notes, and sorting and arranging the data, careful reading of
this information led to concentrated reflection on its overall meaning (Glaser, 1978).
Additionally, the interview responses and transcripts were read and reread, making notes and highlighting key words as appropriate. Then, an initial set of codes and categories were developed based on the data. Selective coding was done after having developed the initial set of codes or categories and described the behavior of the participants in resolving any concerns they may have had.

**Assumptions**

In this study, there are several assumptions that the researcher took for granted. These assumptions assumed that the administrators took the interview seriously, purposefully, and accurately answered the questions, expressing true feelings about the challenges of implementing the new teacher evaluation model. This was assumed because they are professional educators. Also, it was assumed that administrators would take this study seriously in the hope that it would give voice to their concerns. It was expected that administrators facilitating the new model would not be fearful of responding to the interview questions, and would be forthright, welcoming the opportunity to add their voices, expertise, and experience to this research. This was an assumption, because not all administrators may have wanted to participate in the study but did so for various other reasons, unbeknownst to the researcher.

**Limitations**

There were certain limitations or potential weaknesses inherent to this study. The limitations were that interviews were completely voluntary; administrators could decide to opt out at any time for one reason or another, leading to a decreased number of responses. Administrator reluctance to participate could have stemmed from apprehension to call attention to teacher evaluation, a highly controversial and political issue. They may have feared potential
lawsuits and subsequent loss of school funding. Furthermore, validity of the collected data hinged on the administrators’ truthful responses when answering questions.

**Delimitations**

Delimitations specify the selected boundaries of the study. This study could still be considered limited by nature, particularly because of the small sample size. The reality is that the sample may not be an accurate representation of the population. Responses to the interview questions may or may not reflect the true challenges of the population since the sample size was limited to administrators who agreed to participate and administrators who were building-based. The study was limited to administrators who worked in eight counties and twelve school districts. There are 21 counties and approximately 604 school districts in the state of New Jersey.

**Ethical Assurances**

IRB approval was obtained along with approval from the administrators. Possible participants were invited to participate in the study through an informed consent letter explaining the study in detail and indicating that they would be giving their consent to participate in the study. Participants’ names and personal information were not gathered. Instead, administrators were assigned participant numbers to protect identities. They could have chosen to withdraw from the study at any time with no penalty. Transcripts of completed interviews will be kept electronically in a password-protected file on the researcher’s personal computer for a period of five years.

**Chapter Summary**

Teacher evaluation can be a vital process in the improvement of instruction and student achievement. Collecting and interpreting the challenges of implementation by administrators, the researcher was able to determine which elements of the current methods of teacher evaluation
were deemed effective. The interview data collection method allowed administrators and the researcher to reflect upon the current process of teacher evaluation systems. This process is intended to help state and local officials examine their current practices and procedures in order to improve the evaluations systems.
CHAPTER IV
RESEARCH FINDINGS

Twelve school-based administrator participants were asked to respond to a set of 13 demographic questions that included race, gender, education attainment, current position, years employed in current position, years taught before becoming an administrator, time employed in the current district, grades taught, subjects taught, number of teachers evaluated, and the student and teacher population of their individual schools. A second set of questions queried the challenges associated with the implementation of AchieveNJ, the new teacher evaluation model. Two sub-questions about administrators, their beliefs, and the process and procedures of the new evaluation model and which factors were considered challenges and which considered facilitators to program implementation were also asked. The responses were recorded and transcribed for accuracy.

Bartoletti and Connelly (2014) posit that over the past several years policy makers have focused on the implementation of new teacher evaluation systems as a key reform initiative (p. 3). As the most important figure with regard to instructional leadership, principals bear the primary responsibility of implementing teacher evaluation and believe evaluation should aim to build teachers’ instructional capacity (Bartoletti & Connelly, 2014).

Research reveals that there are obvious challenges with the current implementation of new teacher models. Issues regarding the impact on an administrator’s time are critical. Quality and/or job-embedded professional development to execute the model with reliability and validity are also critical challenges for school-based administrators. Finally, understanding the functionality of the data management instrument plays a critical role as a component for administrators to get past the challenges that are inherent in the new model.
The overarching purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore the challenges associated with the implementation of New Jersey’s new evaluation model, AchieveNJ. In particular, this study investigated the hurdles that school-based administrators face in their attempt to comply with the new policy. The research was guided by two sub-questions as well:

1. What are New Jersey administrators’ beliefs about the new evaluation process and or procedures?

2. What factors are considered to be challenges and facilitators to successful implementation of the new evaluation policy?

Principals want the teacher evaluation process to be successful. A successful process is predicated on meaningful feedback, mentoring, and coaching, as well as appropriate support for principals to execute evaluation models that accomplish the goal of evaluation to improve instruction and learning (Bartoletti & Connelly, 2014). The Obama administration’s Race to the Top competitive grant program initiated an unprecedented wave of state teacher-evaluation reform across the country (McGuinn, 2012, p. 1). To date, most of the scholarly analysis of this activity has focused on the design of the evaluation instruments or the implementation of the new evaluations by districts and schools (McGuinn, 2012, p. 1). Various approaches to new evaluation processes have been implemented within the past several years.

**Participants’ Demographics**

**Participants’ Demographics: Race, Gender, Educational Attainment, Position**

Table 1 below identifies a diverse group of administrators by race, gender, educational attainment, and position. Of all the administrators, six of the building-based administrators were Black and four were White. One was Hispanic and one of Asian descent. Eight of the
administrators were male and four were female. Eight had attained a master’s degree and four had earned a doctorate degree; nine were principals and three were assistant principals.

Table 1

Participants’ Demographics: Race, Gender, Educational Attainment, and Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race or Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Attainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Years of Employment, Teaching and Administrative Experience, and Current District

Administrators’ years of employment, years of teaching experience, years of administrative experience, and years employed in the current district are listed in Table 2 below. Four of the administrators have 1-3 years of employment experience, three have 4-7 years of experience, two have 8-11 years of experience, and three have 12 plus years of employment experience. One administrator has 1-3 years of teaching experience, four have 4-7 years of teaching experience, five have 8-11 years of teaching experience, and two have 12 plus years of teaching experience. Three administrators have 1-3 years of administrative experience, one administrator has 4-7 years of administrative experience, two participants have 8-11 years of
administrative experience, and six administrators have 12-plus years of administrative experience. Three of the administrators have worked in their current districts 1-3 years, one administrator has worked 4-7 years in the current district, two administrators have 8-11 years in their current district, and six administrators have 12 plus years in their current district.

Table 2

*Years of Employment, Teaching and Administrative Experience, and Current District*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience (yrs.)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12- plus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12- plus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-plus</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-plus</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Professional Characteristics**

Table 3 describes the professional characteristics of administrators by prior grades taught, prior subjects taught, and the number of teachers evaluated by the administrator. Prior to becoming administrators, two of the practitioners taught in Grades PK-3. Three taught in Grades 4-5, two taught in Grades 6-8, and five taught in Grades 9-12. Two administrators taught math,
one taught English, one taught social studies, two taught science, four taught all subjects, and two taught in other areas.

One administrator was responsible for evaluating 1-15 teachers, five administrators for evaluating 16-31 teachers, three for evaluating 32-47 teachers, and three for evaluating 44 or more teachers.

Table 3

*Professional Characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades Taught</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PK-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Taught</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Subjects</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers Evaluated</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-47</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student and Teacher Population**

Table 4 reflects findings that characterize student and teacher populations. Seven administrators had a student population of 1-500 students. One had a population of 501-1,000. One administrator had a student population of 1,001-1,500, and three participants had a student population of 1,501 plus students.
Six administrators had a teacher population of 1-50 teachers, two had a teacher population of 51-100, one had a teacher population of 101-150, and three had a teacher population of 151 plus teachers.

Table 4

**Student and Teacher Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Population</th>
<th># of Students</th>
<th># of Teachers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-500</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-1000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001-1500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501- plus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Population</th>
<th># of Students</th>
<th># of Teachers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-150</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 plus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results Regarding Interview Questions**

The goal of this study was to answer the following research questions: What are the challenges associated with the implementation of New Jersey’s new evaluation model, AchieveNJ by school-based administrators? The following sub questions guided the research as well: What are New Jersey administrators’ beliefs about the new evaluation process and procedures? What factors are considered to be challenges and facilitators to program implementation?

**Challenges Associated with Implementation**

The administrators’ responses for the theme “Major Challenges” advanced four categories that administrators felt were a challenge to implementing the new evaluation model. Five of the administrators consider professional development to be a challenge for implementation of the evaluation model. Three administrators suggested that technical issues
with the data management instrument were a challenge to implementation. Three of the administrators explained that scheduling presented challenges, and one administrator said that time management had become a challenge in the implementation process.

Table 5

*What Are the Challenges Associated with Implementation?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme Title</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Major Challenges of New Program</td>
<td>Professional Development; Technical Issues; Scheduling; Time Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Experience with the Data Management Tools</td>
<td>Not user friendly; Difficult; Unreliable; Easy; No opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Effect on Other Administrator Duties</td>
<td>Student/Parent Contact; Management Responsibilities; Climate and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Resources Developed</td>
<td>None; Links and Webinars; Extra PD; PD was sufficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Challenges**

In the category “Professional Development,” administrators felt that the lack of professional development was a challenge towards implementation. There were concerns with how it was delivered to teachers. It appeared that some teachers and administrators did not understand the model, while others felt they did not receive adequate training. The findings also suggest that the data observation tool was not aligned to the data management tool.

As concluded by one administrator, “Implementation or the lack of professional development of the model was a major issue for us.” Another expressed the lack of professional development for both teachers and administrators, stating, “There was a lack of professional development for teachers, and they did not really understand the model.” Some administrators had issues with the functionality and usefulness of the components and domains, as noted by the
following responses: “There are still components of the system that we are not sure of the functionality or what the intent was. It makes it challenging and because of the way the day is structured, you don’t really have much time to sit in on webinars; they may be offered in the middle of the day.” Another stated, “The professional development we received did not assist us well with understanding the domains; I don’t feel it taught us what the domains were really about.”

Finally, another administrator described how inconsistent the professional development was and how it made implementation of the model an arduous endeavor. “We received very shoddy professional development in our first year of implementation; that in itself was very challenging.”

Administrators also cited “Technical Issues with the Data Management System” as a challenge to the implementation process. Uploading information, losing data, having to re-enter data, and not getting technical issues resolved in a timely efficient manner presented challenges to the implementation process for administrators as noted by the following responses: “There were a multitude of technical issues; teachers and administrators had a very difficult time uploading information into the data management system.” Furthermore, some administrators experienced difficulties in navigating the system. “Just trying to navigate the system was a chore, oftentimes data were lost and we had to re-enter information.” Teachscape appeared to have an increased level of technical issues; their trouble-shooting department did not respond in a timely, efficient manner, as one administrator expressed so perceptively and noted in the following response: “Teachscape had an abundant amount of technical issues that could not get resolved in a timely manner.”
Administrators had a difficult time maintaining schedules in terms of their evaluations, pre-and post-conferences, and other meetings related to their professional responsibilities. One administrator observed and lamented, “The unsuspecting events of the day had an impact on implementing the model and made it challenging with respect to implementation.” According to another principal, “Adhering to schedules is very difficult, especially when crises arise. When you’re dealing with the day-to-day operations of the school, it is very difficult to stick to a schedule and timelines.” Moreover, just aligning the conferences to the school schedule was challenging for some administrators as evident in the following quote: “Trying to keep the pre- and post-conferences aligned to the schedule you had was challenging. You might have something scheduled and then, lo and behold, something in the building happens that demands your immediate attention.” Administrators had to re-think time management and new ways of planning for meetings. This was necessary because the time allotted for meetings, observing, and writing evaluations had increased exponentially.

Administrators felt that this too was an issue, as noted by some of their responses. “Time management was an issue. It required a new way of planning out your time. Conducting the actual observation and writing it up was challenging. Others stated, “Time management is an issue. The amount of time that it now takes to observe a teacher and write an observation has increased tenfold.”

Another challenge associated with the implementation of the new evaluation model by the administrators was their “experience with the data management systems.” Data management systems are the systems used to store data from the observations. The systems also correlate data and give scores and ratings of teachers along with producing data to help administrators help
teachers improve instruction. The data management systems that are referenced in this study are Marshall, Teachscape, McRel, iObservation, On Course, and Marzano.

The interview responses for the theme “Experience with the Data Management System” advanced four categories that administrators felt were a challenge to implementing the new evaluation model. Five of the administrators stated that their data management system was not user friendly. Three of the administrators said their systems were unreliable, and two of the administrators said that their management systems were easy to use or navigate. Only one administrator had no opinion of the data management system.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Challenges</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Issues</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experience with Data Management Systems

Administrators’ use of their data management systems produced various challenges and negative experiences with their chosen instrument. Some felt their systems were cumbersome, while some others felt that their systems were not user friendly. Still others felt it did not align well with the observation tool, and others struggled with learning the system altogether.

According to administrators, the data management systems were also laborious, lacked the necessary components they needed, and took too long to revise and rework. Some administrators noted the following responses: “Teachscape was difficult to use and we did not have all the features. It took so long to update.” Moreover, another administrator suggested that
the data management system was difficult to master, and they had to invest time to understand
the system. This was noted in the following response, “It wasn’t easy to navigate, and you had to
spend an inordinate amount of time learning the system.” Another administrator stated, “It is
extremely inefficient. It doesn’t necessarily align directly with the Danielson Framework system.
We used Teachscape. Teachscape needs to be user friendly.” Interestingly, those administrators
who had experience with technology and the use of software did not have major issues with the
data system. An administrator stated, “My background is in technology, so for me it wasn’t that
bad. However, for my colleagues, Teachscape wasn’t user friendly. They really struggled with
learning the system.” Further, another expressed that “McRel was very cumbersome. I had a
difficult time. Sometimes I could figure out how I got somewhere in the system; other times, I
was completely lost. It just wasn’t user friendly.”

Furthermore, the data suggest that the data management systems used by administrators
presented various issues of unreliability for the administrator. These systems seem to have had
issues regarding lost data and entering and retrieving accurate data. Administrators did not have
access to all the features. Notably, one administrators stated, “Teachscape became an issue of
reliability. You would lose a lot of data. Inputted data would disappear and no one could find it.
When you called for support they had no idea about how to fix it. They would give you the run
around.” Similarly, as stated by two administrators, “Just trying to navigate the system was a
chore; oftentimes data were lost and we had to re-enter information.” Another practitioner
commented, “The Marshall system didn’t give us complete accurate information. Staff were left
out of the system, and it often didn’t add people. It didn’t compute our data well, which was
important to my team.”
In contrast to the challenging experiences noted, some administrators boasted a positive experience in regard to their data management system. One administrator claimed their use of their data management system presented no issues. Further, administrators with a solid understanding of technology did not report any negative issues or challenges within their systems. They felt that the training they received was sufficient as noted in the following response: “Marzano was an easy system to learn; it was very easy. All of us had iPads. You can just touch and type, and everything is right there. It was extremely easy.” Conversely, another administrator responded, “For me personally, it was easy, particularly because of my background in technology. My colleagues and members of my team struggled with it.” Similarly, one administrator responded by saying, “After training, it was, you know, not a negative or positive experience, just something I had to learn to implement.”

The interview responses for the theme “Effect on Administrators’ Other Responsibilities” advanced three significant categories that participants felt were a challenge to implementing the new evaluation model. Five of the administrators stated, that student parent contact was impacted negatively, five said, management responsibilities became a challenge. Two of the administrators said, that the climate and culture in their buildings had become a challenge and affected the implementation of the model.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience with Data Management Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasn’t user friendly/difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Effect on Administrators’ Other Responsibilities

Administrators reported that the new evaluation systems had impacted their student and parent contact time in a negative way. The data suggest that working with students and solving parent issues had become a secondary priority for administrators. As an example, one administrator stated, “The evaluation systems have taken away from administrators being able to truly solve and give the attention to student issues in ways and manners we were able to do so before. It has taken away from student contact. Discipline problems have increased as a result.”

Less student and parent contact time was evident for administrators, as illustrated in the following administrator responses: “I can’t get to the needs of my students.” Another stated, “Student and parent issues have taken a back burner; I see students less and less.” Moreover, another administrator, stated, “It really disrupts how I operate; I think the big thing is not being able to go where the kids are, like events and making other important connections.” Finally, another stated, “It has taken a toll with contact time with students and parents. Since I have dedicated more time to observing teachers, of course that is less time that I’m spending interacting with students and meeting with parents.”

In a like manner, non-instructional or managerial duties have been impacted greatly because of the new evaluation system. Subsequently, administrators reported having a difficult time managing their other responsibilities due to the amount of time that they have dedicated to the evaluation process. This is noted in the following administrator’s responses. One, administrator stated, “The time that it takes to complete these evaluations sometimes leaves me with no time for my other responsibilities.” By the same token, another administrator stated, “It’s taxing, I have discipline responsibilities and operational responsibilities. It takes a lot more time to complete evaluations, and other duties are impacted because of it. I’m finding myself
delegating some responsibilities to other staff members—not necessarily a good thing.”

Furthermore, another replied. “It has impacted everything; I’m finding myself playing catch up and not being able to leave until 6 p.m. or 7 p.m. in the evening.” Similarly, another stated, “It has taken a toll on my other responsibilities. Meetings are always pushed back, documents are late, and it’s really difficult to manage.” Finally, another stated, “It has greatly impacted everything. It’s very difficult. There is a management portion to the job that we are responsible for. I have done all the other stuff after school, like reports, reading emails, and returning phone calls. I get home on average by 6 p.m. daily.”

In a similar way, administrators have also reported that the school’s climate and culture and student and staff morale have suffered under the new evaluations process, as illustrated by the following administrator responses. “We’ve seen discipline problems increase just because we weren’t around students; I’m not as visible as I used to be and it has had an impact.” Moreover, an administrator stated, “Before the new system I was better able to get a pulse on the climate and culture of the school. Now I’m a lot less visible in classrooms and hallways, and I’m interacting less with teachers and other staff members.” In a similar fashion, an administrator stated, “It’s put a strain on everything, particularly the climate of the building.” Furthermore, another administrator commented, “My other responsibilities have suffered. I never felt like I’ve lost control of my building until last year. Building morale and culture and climate have suffered. I have no time to check on the people who matter the most.”

The interview responses for the theme “Resources Developed” advanced four categories that administrators felt were a challenge to implementing the new evaluation model. Five of the administrators said they had no other resources at their disposal. Three of the administrators stated that were exposed to other links and webinars. Two said that they had to pay for extra
resources if they wanted them, and two said that the monetary resources they received were insufficient.

Table 8

Effect on Administrators’ Other Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student/Parent Contact</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Responsibilities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate and Culture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Resources Developed

Most administrators made it clear that their district and state officials did not offer any other resources to assist with the implementation of the teacher evaluation process. As a result, this was a challenge to the implementation process. Similarly, an administrator stated, “We did not receive any other resources from the district. There is a process that if you get stuck on something, you are supposed to notify the assistant superintendent . . . but I’m not sure of any other resources to help you with this process.” Moreover, another stated, “We did not develop anything that the district didn’t develop. I think what we typically do is go to the state website and we get our information from there.” In addition, another replied, “We have an incomplete handbook.”

Surprisingly, administrators did report that the webinars and videos, as well as central office personnel, were helpful in providing assistance with regard to the training of the evaluation process. These sources actually facilitated the implementation process. For example, according to one administrator, “We have webinars and videos on how to use the tools and training videos. All the training was recorded, so you could refer to it again.” Another administrator stated, “There are various links you can go to for assistance in terms of resources; training is available from central office staff if you need it.”
In addition, another administrator reported that anything above and beyond what they initially received with regard to training and professional development was very costly and prohibited administrators from adding other resources for professional development (PD). This also was a challenge to the implementation process. Similarly, an administrator stated, “We had to subscribe to McRel if we wanted any extra resources for teachers and administrators. Now the SCIP teams have to be paid if they want PD. It’s very expensive.” Moreover, an administrator stated, “Danielson provided nothing extra in terms of resources, and neither did the district. In fact, the last professional development workshop cost us in excess of $6,000.00 and that was for one day. It’s extremely expensive.”

Additionally, some administrators felt that the resources they received were at best inadequate and in some instances caused fear and anxiety for both participants and staff. Others felt that resources weren’t being provided at the most optimal times as well, further challenging the implementation process. Reluctantly, an administrator replied, “I know this, we had professional development. It was wheeled out very chaotically and was very weak. I think that heightened and inflamed the fears of teachers and administrators. It produced fear and anxiety for supervisors, administrators, and teachers. It was a very stressful year. Another administrator concluded, “Everything is through email. There are webinars, but they aren’t being provided at a time when we can afford to take the time to sit and actually delve into them.”

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links/Webinars</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay for Extra PD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD/inadequate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Administrators’ Beliefs about the Process and Procedures of the Evaluation Model

Administrator’s responses for the theme “Adequate Support from Vendors” advanced three categories that analyzed administrator’s beliefs about the process and procedures of the new evaluation model. Seven of the administrators believed they received adequate support from the vendor. Three of the administrators suggested that the support they received from the vendors was inadequate, and two of the administrators said that they were unsure if the support was adequate or inadequate.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Categories/Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Adequate Support from the Vendors</td>
<td>Adequate support; Inadequate support; Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Benefits of the Pre- and Post-Conference</td>
<td>Richer dialogue with teachers; Collaboration on expectations; Clarification of expectations; More thought dialogue; Clarification of expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fair Assessment of Teachers</td>
<td>Objective; Evidence-based; Collaboration; Lack of evidence; Not convinced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>New versus Old System</td>
<td>Better systems; Old systems more efficient; No different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Adequate support from NJDOE</td>
<td>Inadequate training; Insufficient funding; Wasn’t sure of support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Streamlining Process</td>
<td>Increase Resources; Eliminate # of Tenure Observations; No need for streamlining</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adequate Support from the Vendors

A majority of the administrators believed that they had received adequate support from the various vendors when an issue arose. According to one administrator’s experience, a significant time was spent with them, one vendor even calibrating observations. Reflecting
further, the administrator stated, “Ken Marshall from the Marshall Group came and spent the day with us. We did observations together and we sat down and debriefed and made attempts at calibration.”

As a further illustration of administrators receiving adequate support from a vendor, one stated, “We called Teachscape three or four times. The question we were seeking help with we couldn’t find answers to in the manual or help section. The people who answered our inquiry were helpful. They usually got back to us within 24 hours and gave us the answers we were looking for.” In addition, another replied, “They have been helpful. They have a help desk that is ready to assist. There have been times when you have to wait a while, but they do get back to you. I would say the vendor is proactive in making sure your concerns are addressed.”

At the same time, several administrators believed that they did not receive adequate support from the vendors because most of their concerns were handled through a third party or central office. They felt that they did not spend quality time with trainers representing vendors, particularly at the building level.

Specifically, one administrator declared, “I don’t think the support was adequate. Other than a lady coming in one time. I wouldn’t know who to reach out to for assistance.” In addition, another replied, “I would probably say ‘no’ to that. That’s probably more of a central office question; but, as far as support from Teachscape on a building level, we didn’t receive any support from them.” Finally, another administrator declared, “No, we were directed to send all questions and concerns to the assistant superintendent, who was the liaison. Responses were then forwarded to us. In my opinion, that didn’t help me at the building level.”

Administrators also reported that they were unsure if the support they received was a function of central office or the vendors because they had no communications at the building
level with the vendor. For instance, two administrators were unsure if they received adequate support from the vendor. One administrator stated, “I didn’t deal directly with the vendor. I received good support from central office, but I’m not sure if that was a function of the vendor or personnel in central office.” Equally important was the fact that administrators were unsure of the support they received, as noted in the responses by administrators. “I’m not sure if the training was a function of the company we used or the staff in central office. There wasn’t a lot of communication between the building and the vendor and the building and central office, I’m just not sure.”

The pre-and post-conference is another mandate of AchieveNJ that most administrators believed was beneficial. The administrator responses for the theme “Benefits of Pre- and Post-Conference” advanced several important categories, such as richer dialogue with teachers, more collaboration, and clarification of expectations and goals. Nine of the administrators believed that the pre- and- post conference was beneficial for both parties. Two of the administrators had a negative opinion. One administrator thought they were a benefit because of the conversations that ensued but didn’t see the value in announced observations.

Table 11

Adequate Support from the Vendors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Support</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate support</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benefits of the Pre- and- Post Conference

The majority of the administrators thought the pre- and post-conferences were beneficial because they clarified issues, they gave the teacher an opportunity to flush out ideas, and they
developed a richer dialogue about teacher practices. One administrator stated, “I believe they were beneficial. They basically give you an opportunity to see where your teacher is coming from in the post-conference. You have a chance to clarify any misconceptions.” Another replied, “I believe the pre- and post-conferences were beneficial for me. They gave me advance information on what I was going to observe. If something went wrong, the teacher had an opportunity to explain it in the post-conference.” Another stated, “When we did a post-conference, in many cases they could clarify something that wasn’t seen in the observation.” Additionally, an administrator replied, “In my opinion it was a benefit. Teachers have a chance to get to know us. We have richer dialogue about goals and expectations for students, and it is a continuous collaboration process.” Furthermore, another stated, “It took the guesswork out of exactly what it is the teacher is doing in the classroom and what I’m looking for. It puts everyone on an equal playing field.” Finally, another administrator disclosed, “I thought the pre- and post-conferences were extremely important. They forced me to meet with teachers, but more importantly, they helped me to understand why a teacher did what he or she did in a lesson.”

On the other hand, other administrators did not believe that the pre-and post-conferences were beneficial and did not serve a legitimate purpose. They had a very negative attitude towards the process. This was evident in the responses of the administrators, “Since I don’t have anything good to say about the process in terms of the pre- post-conferences, I won’t say anything.” Another stated, “The pre- and post-conferences didn’t do anything for me. We get a ‘dog and pony show’ from teachers.” Similarly, one administrator really didn’t have any faith in the pre-and post-conference process due to the fact that they believed that announced visits resulted in a show. In addition, one administrator stated, “It was beneficial because I got to
converse with the teacher, but I don’t see the benefit in announced observations.” Another stated, “It was more of a benefit for the teacher than for me.”

Notably, the administrator responses for the theme “Fair Assessment of Teachers” advanced three categories that they believed were fair and unfair in the processes and procedures of the evaluation model. Five of the administrators believed that the new system offers a fair assessment of teachers. On the other hand, five administrators felt that it was difficult to call the systems a fair assessment of teachers. This was due to the lack of evidence the system produced and because the system is still a function of human input. As a result, administrators stated that they were not yet convinced that the system was any fairer then the prior system they had used.

Table 12

**Benefits of the Pre- and Post-Conference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarification</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration, Rich Dialogue, Negative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had Issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fair Assessment of Teachers**

Five of the administrators felt that the evaluation system was a fair assessment of teachers because it is objective. It allows for collaboration and it is neutral in providing evidence.

Similarly, an administrator stated, “The new system allows you to be objective as you implement the Danielson model.” In the same fashion another replied, “We are in constant collaboration with teachers.” Furthermore, another said, “I do believe it to be fair . . . what I found is that those teachers that weren’t doing that well in the old system are still not doing well in this system.” Another emphasized participants’ feelings by stating, “It’s asking you to be neutral in how you document evidence . . . you write down what you see and hear as opposed to interpreting the
lesson.” Yet another stated, “The observer is just supporting the evidence he or she sees with classroom interactions.”

Subsequently, an equal number of administrators also felt that the new system did not provide enough evidence to be considered a fair assessment of teachers. This was concluded because some practitioners believe that there are some things for which you cannot produce evidence. Some administrators believe that some things are not in the rubric, and some believe it is not the rubric. Others believe that human input is the impetus for an effective evaluation system and not the system itself. Reluctantly, two administrators stated, “In some ways ‘yes’ and in some ways ‘no.’ I use the evidence document; I think that helps me find the rating based on what I saw. Some things you can’t necessarily produce evidence for. For example, on the rubric for ethical behavior, what type of documentation can you show that you model ethical behavior?” Another stated, “I don’t know if the systems offer a fair assessment. I mean we are the ones doing the evaluations at the end of the day. It falls on us to make sure that the evidence we are collecting is sound and beneficial for the practitioner.” In addition, another stated, “Yes” and “no.” Any evaluation system is a snapshot; but because it’s evidence-based, what happens when I don’t see something?”

Notwithstanding, a few administrators were not convinced that this was a fair model. They did not believe that these models could capture all the variables needed to produce a solid evaluation system. Others still cut corners in terms of process and procedures, particularly when they are overburdened with managerial and other operational duties and responsibilities. As a result, one administrator stated, “I’m not convinced that this is a fair system. There are too many variables that go into producing a solid evaluation/observation for a teacher. I’m not sure if any of these models have the ability to capture everything they need to without taking into
consideration the expertise of the certified evaluation.” A second administrator replied, “Sometimes I think ‘yes’ and then other times I think ‘no.’ When I run into issues of time management and operational issues that I have to deal with, I find myself still cutting corners with this model and to me that’s not fair to teachers or to me.”

The administrative responses for the theme “Comparing the New Evaluation System with the Old Evaluation System” advanced three categories that administrators believed impacted the processes and procedures of the new evaluation system. Four of the administrators believed that the new system was better. Five of the administrators believed the old system was better and three of the administrators believed that there was no difference in the evaluation systems.

Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fair Assessment of Teachers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective, evidence based, and collaboration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Evidence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not convinced</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comparing New Evaluation System with Old Evaluation System**

A number of administrators believed the new system has great potential to improve teaching, some have observed tremendous growth in their staff, and some believe the new system reduces the amount of bias and subjectivity in the evaluation process. For instance, one administrator stated, “I think the new system is probably going to yield better results. I think it will help us improve teaching. The narrative didn’t provide enough feedback for teachers.” To put it another way, an administrator stated, “Before, all we had was a narrative system where you go in and write what you saw and give some commentary, commendations, and recommendations. With Marzano, it gives you specific indicators as well as rubrics to follow.” Another stated, “I think it is highly effective in terms of meeting the needs of the teachers.”
We’ve seen tremendous growth. I think the staff is much closer.” Finally, another stated, “I like the new system. It reduces the amount of bias; I think the new system is less subjective.”

A majority of the administrators reported that they believe the old system was better than and just as efficient as the new one. They contend that having the ability to include a narrative was a plus for the evaluation process. According to one principal, “The old system was very efficient; there are too many quirks in the new system. It’s hard to capture everything in a 20 minute observation.” Comparatively, another administrator replied, “I believe the old system was fine and we could use it accurately. Once teachers got a number, it became a competition.” Furthermore, another administrator stated, “I like the old system, as you had the ability to write more things down. I was way more comfortable with it; I was just able to capture more.” To conclude, another stated, “I feel the new framework was originally designed to prepare teachers to become effective teachers. I don’t feel it should be used on a day-to-day basis to observe and evaluate.”

On the contrary, several of the administrators felt that there was not any difference in either system or that both were equally effective. This was noted in the administrators’ responses. “I think the old system was equally effective with less time.” Another stated, “The only difference is a data management component.” Still another administrator said, “I don’t think the system is better or worse or less efficient.”

The administrator responses for the theme “Adequate Support from the New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE)” advanced three categories that administrators believed impacted processes and procedures. Those categories were adequate support, inadequate support and not sure. One administrator believed that they received adequate support from NJDOE, Additionally, seven of the administrators felt that they received inadequate support from the
NJDOE. Four stated that they were not sure of the role of the NJDOE. The administrators seemed to base their belief on whether or not they received support from NJDOE in terms of funding and other types of supports.

Table 14

Comparing New Evaluation System with Old Evaluation System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New System Better</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old System Better</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Different</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adequate Support from New Jersey Department of Education

Surprisingly, only one administrator felt that that the NJDOE provided adequate support in the implementation process of the teacher evaluation model. The administrator stated, “Whenever we called them (NJDOE), they did a training. We also contracted with ERIC; they’re affiliated with Rowan University. They do a lot of professional development with us. They offered a lot of training on McRel. We also worked with the RAC team, and they are always putting us in contact with people that we need to talk to, so I would say ‘yes.’”

Conversely, seven of the administrators thought that the support from the NJDOE was inadequate, either because they did not receive funding, they lacked professional development or hands on training experience. Evidence of this data is found in administrators’ responses, “I’m going to say no. Everything is left to the district to implement. But that is my opinion.” Other administrators stated the following: “Support would be in the form of funding. I don’t think so” “I’m pretty sure they didn’t base it on what we were told.” “I don’t think so because we only had approximately 16 hours of training; it would have been nice if they would have allowed us more hands-on experience and more modeling to implement the tool.” “From my position, I do not
believe we received adequate support, but I don’t how much the district reached out to NJDOE. From my standpoint, ‘no.’”

Yet, a significant number of administrators stated that they were unsure about the support given by the NJDOE and could not be exact in recalling whether or not the NJDOE supported their districts. Some administrators could not actually determine whether they received adequate support from NJDOE, stating, “I can’t really answer that. I know in the beginning of last year we did a huge professional development; however, I don’t recall anyone from the NJDOE facilitating any professional development, but I’m not sure.” Another administrator recalled, “Not sure whether we did or not. We decided on the tool. I haven’t seen state folks come in and walk us through the process.”

The administrators’ responses for the theme “Streamlining the Process” advanced four categories that administrators believed impacted processes and procedures of the evaluation model. Three of the administrators believed that increasing resources such as hiring more personnel to do observations was needed. Two administrators believed that eliminating one or two of the three observations for tenured teachers would be helpful. Three of the administrators believed that a decrease in overall paperwork would be helpful. Meanwhile, four administrators stated that the process should not be streamlined.

Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequate Support from New Jersey Department of Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Streamlining Process**

Some administrators felt that the evaluation process could be streamlined by adding more resources; this included hiring more personnel to assist with the observation process and to manage the day-to-day operations. For instance, an administrator stated, “You need to hire people dedicated to conducting formal observations. That would be their sole purpose in the districts.” In another example, one stated, “We have this new process, but we don’t have all the resources. I’m doing the work of two people because of the ratio of teachers to principals that the Marshall Evaluation systems has set.” Finally, another explained by stating, “The challenge is that if you are the only administrator in the building and you have 30 practitioners, you have to evaluate the support staff and everyone else. That becomes a serious challenge. I personally need help.”

Moreover some administrators believed that it was not necessary for all teachers to be subjected to the new amount of evaluations in the new evaluation systems. This included eliminating some of the evaluations for tenured teachers. One administrator stated, “We should have started using the process with non-tenure teachers. I don’t believe it was necessary to increase the number of observations for tenured teachers from one to three per year.” A second administrator emphasized this by stating, “Eliminating some of the mandatory observations for tenured staff would have been helpful.”

Consequently, administrators believed that the new evaluation systems had increased the amount of paperwork that must be completed but does not necessarily help in developing teachers in terms of their effectiveness. Evidence of this belief is found in the following administrative responses. “There is way too much time invested to complete a single observation.” Another administrator stated, “I think it should be streamlined. I think some of the
paperwork should be streamlined. We are completing a lot of paperwork, but we aren’t focusing on developing teachers.” Further, one administrator remarked, “A lot of paperwork goes into this process. As far as I’m concerned I believe much of it could have been eliminated.”

However, four administrators believed that the evaluation process did not need to be streamlined. They contended that it was good and should stay the way it is. One administrator stated, “The process is fine the way it is.” Another stated, “I think the process is a good one and therefore, I don’t think it should be streamlined.” Yet another stated, “I don’t think it should be changed at this point. We may need to tweak a few things, but overall I think it’s fine the way it is.” Finally, another concluded, “I think we have finally got to the point where teachers now understand the importance of the evaluation systems in terms of effectiveness and student achievement. I don’t see any reason to turn back now.”

Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Streamlining Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate # of Tenure Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease Paper Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Streamlining</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factors Considered To Be Challenges and Facilitators to Program Implementation

The administrators’ responses for the theme “Time Management” advanced three categories that administrators felt were a challenge to implementing the new evaluation model. Three administrators said their time management was impacted in how they responded to other tasks and duties. Four administrators reported that time management was impacted by an increase in workload, while five of the administrators recognized that time management was...
impacted by how they planned and organized their schedules and other daily, weekly, and monthly activities.

Table 17

*Factors Considered To Be Challenges and Facilitators to Program Implementation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>Impact on other tasks and duties; Increase in workload; Plan and organize efficiently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>SGO Training</td>
<td>Satisfied; Unsatisfied; No training at all; Direct from websites; Inadequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>SGO/Teacher Training</td>
<td>Yes; No; Yes, with explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Concerns Addressed in a Timely Manner</td>
<td>Quick response time; Poor response time; Non-issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Hours of Professional Development-Model</td>
<td>Adequate training; Inadequate training; Minimum training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Hours of Professional Development-Tool</td>
<td>Adequate training; Inadequate training; Minimum training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Time Management**

Administrators reported that their time management was impacted in a negative way and was a challenge to the implementation process. Administrators felt that they had no time for other duties and responsibilities and that the entire process was becoming taxing. Accordingly, one administrator stated, “With all the focus on this new model, my other responsibilities and duties are often incomplete or I’m always running to play catch up.” Another stated, “It takes away from other principal responsibilities and duties.” Another explained, “It’s taxing; I have to spend more time testing teachers as opposed to being an instructional leader. With the discipline and the operation side, this is making that component bigger and very taxing.”
Accordingly, a significant number of administrators felt that their workload had increased
tremendously. They explained that the time it takes to complete an evaluation has increased.
Administrators have reported that they now spend more time after school and on weekends
trying to complete the task, as noted in the following administrator responses. “This process has
caused me to spend an inordinate amount of time after school and on weekends trying to ensure
that I get other paperwork done.” Another stated, “During the observation cycle the workload is
tremendous. Three quarters of my day is spent just on observations, and of course I haven’t
mentioned the load in the evenings and on the weekends.” Still another states, “It takes up an
enormous amount of time to complete. I’m spending at least four hours on one observation. I
have 20 to evaluate.” Finally, “Because the work load has increased, I’m always finding myself
rushing to complete everything. I’m really not sure if I’m doing justice to the practitioner.”

Consequently, a significant number of administrators reported that planning and
organizing their schedules have changed drastically, particularly because the evaluation model
has become the priority over all other duties and responsibilities. For example, according to
several principals, “Something has got to give; it definitely makes things a challenge. I mean,
I’m fairly organized, but I had to get more organized, particularly when it comes to sticking to
the planned schedules.” Another stated, “It has forced me to plan out when I’m going to do a
couple of observations. If you have a couple planned for the day, it helps to be very organized.
Still another stated, “It’s very difficult with the Danielson model. You have to plan for a pre-
conference, then you have to do observations the following day. Next you have the post
conference. There is a great deal of time that goes into the planning and preparation for this
process.” One administrator explains, “You have to be more aware of your time management and
you have to methodically plan out your calendar.” Finally, one administrator concluded, “It has
taken over. It takes priority. In order to comply with AchieveNJ, the evaluation model takes priority over everything, particularly your schedule. Therefore you have to be an excellent planner and have good organizational skills.”

Considering that Student Growth Objectives (SGOs) were a major component of the new evaluation model in terms of implementation, it is interesting to note that administrators who said they had received training issued by the NJDOE or by their districts did not speak highly or favorably of the training.

Table 18

*Time Management*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Other Tasks, Duties</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Work Load</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning/Organizing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student Growth Objectives/SGOs Training**

The administrators’ responses for the theme “SGO Training” advanced three categories that administrators felt were a challenge. Four administrator stated that they were satisfied with the training they received from the New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE), four administrators said they were dissatisfied with their training from the NJDOE, and four administrators said they did not receive any training at all.

Although some administrators stated they were satisfied with the training, an equal number of administrators were not satisfied. They reported that they were still struggling to train teachers without the assistance of trained experts. Administrators reported that they had to create their own training and protocols for SGOs.
For instance, one administrator stated, “We received training but not good training. Still today we are struggling to train our teachers because the forms changed. We weren’t notified until late.” A second administrator stated, “During training no one was really able to elaborate on questions we may have had. It was like this is the way it’s done and this is what you should have.” To put it differently, another administrator declared, “Basically, we received training from the State Department of Education. Basically, we read slides that were on the AchieveNJ website. I also did that on my own as well.”

Surprisingly, an equal number of administrators did not receive SGO training. Although they had training from the NJDOE, they did not consider the training to be quality training. They explained that the information they received was from slides from a website. Administrators explained their concerns by stating, “I created my own training for the teachers and support staff.” Another stated, “I don’t recall ever receiving training. A representative from the state came once and he spoke to us as a group, but there was no direct guidance on how to do it.” Still another administrator responded laughingly, “I hope that’s a rhetorical question. There was no real training on developing SGOs. A lot of the information came from a Power Point off a website.”

Although administrators had no obligation to train teachers in the SGO process, administrators still felt obligated to do so. Findings reveal that administrators overwhelmingly trained teachers in the SGO process.

Table 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Growth Objective/SGOs Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied with Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Training at All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Student Growth Objective/ SGOs /Teacher Training**

The administrators’ responses for the theme “SGO Teacher/Training” advanced three categories that administrators felt were facilitators to the implementation process of the evaluation model. Four administrators stated that they trained their staff in the SGO process. One administrator stated that they did not train any teachers. Furthermore, seven administrators stated they did train teachers, with an explanation as to why.

In spite of the fact that they had no obligation, the administrators still felt compelled to train staff in the SGO process. Administrators explained that helping their staff would be a benefit to the teachers and the SGO process. They also explained that assisting teachers would be in the best interest of everyone involved. For example according to one principal, “I created my own training. We did ‘SGOs for dummies.’ We did not receive any support or training or guidance for the rationale for the unscientific SGOs. We spent an enormous amount of time trying to rationalize something that was irrational. We did the training because our administrative team felt it was the right thing to do.” Another administrator stated, “We had to run workshops for our staff.” Similarly, another administrator stated, “We did it as a team. We sat with teachers and took them through the process. Since our talent officer would not do it, we felt we had to. The process was intuitive for some, but others struggled with it. We felt it was in everyone’s best interest to help them through the process.”

Whenever new programs are introduced to schools, a key component of a program’s effectiveness is the ability to answer concerns and address issues when the need arises. It is extremely important when this happens that stakeholders are given an opportunity to address concerns in a quick and efficient manner. The interview responses for the theme “Administrators’ Feelings Regarding Whether or not Their Concerns with the Model and Tool
Were Addressed in a Timely Manner” advanced categories such as a quick response time, poor response time, and a non-issue regarding timely responses. Three of the administrators believed that concerns that arose in the implementation process were quickly responded to. Five of the administrators believed that the response to their concerns was not responded to in a timely manner, whereas two had no issues with response times.

Table 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes with Explanation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administrators’ Concerns Addressed in a Timely Manner

Some administrators felt that their concerns were dealt with in a timely and efficient manner even to the point that some administrators were instrumental in getting their district to terminate one data management system and institute another in its place. This meant that the administrators thought that this helped to facilitate the evaluation process. A case in point, one administrator declared, “I feel like the opportunity to share concerns were addressed in a timely and an efficient manner.” Another stated, “That’s why we went from Teachscape to On Course rather quickly,” and a third administrator replied, “Yes, concerns were addressed in a timely manner. The district had a direct line to Marzano.”

On the other hand, the majority of the administrators felt that their concerns weren’t addressed efficiently and weren’t satisfied with the response time of the vendors or district personnel. For example, the following administrative responses support this data: “Our concerns were not addressed in a timely manner.” “No, I’m not totally satisfied with the response time of
the answers I received from our district and what the state was saying about some of the these models. “Yes and no, I would say concerns were answered, but it sure wasn’t in a timely manner.” “I’m still waiting for answers.” “I had several issues with Teachscape. I’ve made certain that I go through the assistant superintendent. They will create a case number and I will say they get back to you in 24 hours, but these questions should be answered in a few minutes.” Nevertheless, two administrators had no issues with their concerns being addressed in an efficient and timely manner. Moreover, other administrators stated, “I didn’t have any concerns with our model, other than the fact that it is time consuming.” Another stated, “I really didn’t have any issues. Marzano’s representatives were very efficient in responding in a timely manner.”

Table 21

*Administrators’ Concerns Addressed in a Timely Manner*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quick Response Time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Response Time</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-issue</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Professional Development Hours**

**Adequate Professional Development Hours**

A significant number of administrators felt they had adequate training to facilitate the implementation process if they had 18 or more hours. One administrator stated, “I went to two full days of training—that’s 12 hours. Then we had some training for another full day. So, I would say we had about 18 hours.” Another administrator stated, “We had a lot of days of training, somewhere in the area of 20 hours.” Another administrator replied, “We had a whole
week of training, about six-hour days.” Finally, another administrator stated, “We had upward of 40 hours.”

**Inadequate Professional Development Hours**

At the same time, a majority of administrators who had 12-17 hours or less of training considered it to be inadequate training and considered this to be a challenge to implementation. For instance, one administrator stated, “We had about 10-15 hours. We didn’t have nearly enough.” Another declared, “We had maybe two to three meetings, somewhere in the area of about 12 hours.” Yet another emphasized, “We had about 16 hours, but this wasn’t enough.” And at least two administrators had less than 10 hours of training, stating, “We had less than ten hours of professional development—not enough. We had less than eight hours, and this was definitely problematic in terms of understanding all of the domains and components and expectations.”

**Professional Development for the Observation Tool**

Professional development for the observation tool was an important component for the implementation of the model. The administrator responses for the theme “Professional Development for the Data Management Tool” advanced several categories, such as adequate professional development (PD), inadequate professional (PD) hours, and minimum hours of professional development (PD). Four of the administrators believed that they had adequate training on the observation tool. Six of the administrators believed they did not have adequate training on the observation tool, and two believed that they had minimum training or the training was fairly non-existent.
Table 22

Professional Development for the Observation Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate PD hours</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate PD hours</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum PD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional Development for the Data Management Tool

Professional development for the data management tool is an important component for the implementation of the model. The administrator responses for the theme “Professional Development for the Data Management Tool” advanced several categories such as adequate professional development (PD), inadequate professional (PD) hours and minimum hours (PD). Four of the administrators believed that they received adequate professional development PD/training on the data management tool. Five of the administrators however, believed that they had received inadequate professional development on the data management system, and three of the administrators said they had received very minimum training.

A significant number of administrators felt they had adequate training if they had 18 or more hours. Administrators who contracted with Marzano and Marshall appear to have more professional development and a better experience with the data management tool. This was seen as a facilitator to implementation. One administrator stated, “Our data management training was embedded into our observation tool training. This made things like understanding and alignment very easy.” A second administrator stated, “We had a lot of days of training, somewhere in the area of 20 hours. I thought the representatives from Marshall did an excellent job in the area of professional development.” A third administrator replied, “We had a whole week of training,
about six-hour days.” A fourth administrator stated, “We had upwards of 30 hours of training plus online modules if we felt we needed extra.”

Different from adequate professional development, a significant number of administrators did not believe their training for the data management tool was adequate and therefore a challenge to implementation. For example, one administrator stated, “We had less than 15 hours of total training.” Another said, “We had about 13 hours of training, but it wasn’t engaging.” Similarly, another administrator said, “but most of that time is spent showing you what the system looks like versus actually having you walk through the process. The system is pretty much by exploration, I really taught myself.” At least two participants had minimum training on their data management tool. According to one administrator, “Although they provided me with hours, I have to go at my own pace. No one came here to train me. I received less than eight hours of training, and it was spread out over a few months.”

Table 23

Professional Development for the Data Management Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate PD hours</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate PD hours</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chapter Summary

Presented in this chapter were findings of the study obtained through opinions, views, beliefs, and observations of administrators participating in semi-structured interviews of the challenges associated with the implementation of the new teacher evaluation model, AchieveNJ, by building-based administrators.
Accordingly, 15 themes and a significant number of categories were advanced from the interview process. In Table 5, the challenges associated with implementation, four themes were identified: major challenges of program implementation, experience with data management tools, effect on other administrator duties, and resources developed.

In conclusion, the majority of administrators had concerns mostly with professional development. Technical issues with the data management system and scheduling of evaluations and other important meetings were a very important concern to administrators as well. Similarly, the vast majority of administrators found the data management systems difficult to use and unreliable. On the other hand, three administrators found the systems either easy to use or had no opinion of them. Nevertheless, an equal number of administrators said their student/parent contact time and management responsibilities were diminished and impacted significantly in a negative way.

Conversely, a small number of administrators said their school’s climate and culture was impacted negatively. Furthermore, the vast majority of administrators stated that no resources other than what the district purchased initially were developed for them and teachers alike. Hence, a solid number of administrators stated that the professional development or training was inadequate and they had to pay significantly for more professional development.

In Table 10, administrative beliefs about processes and procedures, six themes were advanced: adequate support from vendors, benefits of pre- pos-conferences, fair assessment of teachers, new versus old system, adequate support from NJDOE, and streamlining process, categories that administrators reported played a significant role in the implementation of the evaluation program. A solid number of administrators stated they received adequate support from vendors.
However, a significant number of administrators said the support was inadequate or that they were not sure if they had received adequate support. Conversely, the vast majority of administrators thought the pre- and post-conferences were a benefit. Surprisingly, only one said that the vendors were helpful. An equal number of administrators said that the new evaluation system was a fair assessment of teachers. However, more administrators thought the old system was better, and three administrators said they thought that it did not matter which system was in place; both had legitimate value.

Similarly, the vast majority of administrators believed they did not receive the necessary support from the NJDOE. Finally, the vast majority of administrators thought the process should be streamlined by decreasing the amount of observations and paperwork. However, a solid number thought the process was fine the way it is.

In Table 17, factors considered to be challenges and facilitators to program implementation included the following: time management, SGO training, SGO training for staff, concerns addressed in a timely manner, and training for the observation and data management tool. These play a significant role in the challenges and facilitators associated in the implementation process.

In sum, administrators felt their time management was affected in the areas of planning and organizing, including an increased workload and an increase in other duties and responsibilities. In equal numbers, administrators felt they did not receive adequate training in the SGO process, they did receive adequate training, and they did not receive any training in the process of SGO training at all; and this was a challenge to implementation.

The vast majority of administrators trained their staff on the SGO process even though they were not obligated to do so, and only one did not train his/her staff. The majority of
administrators did not believe vendors responded in a timely manner to their concerns, and a significant number felt that response time was a non-issue. Administrators felt their professional development for the observation tool was inadequate, and the majority of administrators felt their professional development for the data management tool was inadequate as well
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Chapter V presents a summary of the findings as well as the implications, recommendations, and conclusions for future research. The purpose of this qualitative study was to examine the challenges associated with the implementation of the AchieveNJ, teacher evaluation model. Although research in the past has focused on the evaluation models, hardly any research exists that examines the challenges associated with the implementation of these models, particularly from the principal’s perspective.

For the most part, the overall findings from the administrators in this research revealed the following: lack of quality professional development for both the observations and the data management software. Challenges in balancing other important administrative and managerial/operational responsibilities and time management with the demands of conducting the required evaluations were challenges for the participants in implementing the evaluation model.

These findings are congruent with the results from previous studies on teacher evaluation. For instance Doherty (2009) surveyed 14 administrators in a suburban Massachusetts school district using the Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP). The findings suggest that administrators from this district thought that augmentation to the current teacher evaluation could be made to enhance the effectiveness of principals observing and evaluating teachers. However, “Differentiating the teacher evaluation systems, reducing the amount of paperwork in the process, increasing the number of informative observations and walkthroughs, developing
differentiated rubrics for different teacher positions and using multiple sources of data of the evaluation model was found to be extremely important to administrators” (p. 4).

Amendt (2004) surveyed principals and superintendents in Iowa school districts. The study sought to determine if administrators perceived a difference in the effectiveness of evaluations that had been used in the past compared to the current system of evaluation. A total of 333 surveys were mailed electronically to selected administrators with 228 responding. The findings showed that the administrators found several components of the Iowa Teacher Quality Evaluations Standards and Criteria (ITQESC) evaluation process to be more effective. Sixty-eight percent of the respondents indicated the new system of evaluation was an improvement over the old system. In addition, data showed that although 66% of the many positive components in the evaluation model were evident, administrators still found it to be too time consuming and believed as well that teachers need more training on the new evaluation process (as cited in Sheppard, 2007).

Firestone et al. (2013) investigated the barriers and facilitators of New Jersey’s new evaluation model. The report found that training was a major challenge, along with time management of other administrative duties and responsibilities, as well as the data management tools that support teacher practice (Firestone et al., 2013). Again with respect to the first theme, “Major Challenges,” the data from the current study suggest a significant number of administrators consider professional development to be a major challenge during implementation. Moreover, technical issues with the observation management tool became a major implementation obstacle. Sartain et al. (2011), posits in a study, Rethinking Teacher Evaluation in Chicago, that many of the challenges that principals faced in the implementation of the new evaluation model were directly related to the amount of time needed to dedicate to the
process of prioritizing other duties and responsibilities. While most principals describe their main role as instructional leader, they get pulled in other directions and do not spend as much time in classrooms as they would like. Finding the time to engage in the conference process—preparing, scheduling, and holding the conferences themselves—was difficult for most principals (Sartain et al., 2011). Both teachers and principals had difficulties scheduling observations. Principals reported that observations were frequently canceled due to emergencies in the school or principals being summoned to central office to deal with other issues (Sartain et al., 2011).

Another barrier that Sartain et al. (2011) found to be problematic for principals was the data management instrument used. Program administrators in Chicago integrated a ratings database into a website called DS2, similar to Teachscape, iObservation, or Stronge data management systems. From the beginning of the pilot, the principals reported that the data entry piece of the evaluation system was overwhelming and time consuming. Most cited the Danielson Framework as the biggest challenge of the evaluation pilot.

Based on the findings in the current research, three critical areas emerge that provide insight into how these findings could aid building-based administrators in executing teacher evaluation systems effectively. First, the Diffusion Theory of Innovation is particularly useful for this research because the theory provides a clear pathway and/or foundation for administrators to follow when engaging as change agents. For instance, trialability, an important component to relative change gives the participants an opportunity to try an innovation before they actually fully commit to a particular idea or innovation (Rogers, 2003). At least two of the participants in this research had a trial-and-error period before they actually committed to implementing the program. This trial-and-error period concluded with their administrative team terminating a system that they felt did not meet the needs of their administrative teams; therefore,
they were able to terminate the usage and replace it with something that administrators felt was more effective and beneficial to their needs. This is critical because the rate of adoption may have been much smoother because of the input administrators were allowed to have.

Subsequently, Rogers (2003) posits that for an innovation to take hold, people need to try an innovation before they commit to it. This includes giving guided practice and plenty of one-on-one assistance where needed. Unfortunately, in this study, the majority of participants were not afforded the opportunity of trialability and did not receive a chance to test the innovation. This garnered more uncertainty as administrators continued to implement the innovations, which resulted in a slow rate of adoption in districts.

Second, although evaluation reforms and new policies are generally mandated by federal and state authorities, the research suggests that local districts have an important role to play with respect to implementing quality professional development and other important key resources that would assist in aiding administrator’s successful implementation of the teacher evaluations models. Many of the participants found that professional development for the observation tool was inadequate; the same held true for the management tool, for response time, and addressing concerns in a timely manner.

Third, the evaluation model was in its infancy stages of development when this research was conducted; therefore, many of the reported findings could be attributed to the overall newness of the program.

**Recommendations**

The following recommendations are suggested. Since the research included only 12 administrators from 12 districts for analysis, further research should be conducted with a larger, more diverse sample size to improve the generalizability of the results. Rogers Diffusion of
Innovation should be used as a framework to assist “change agents” in implementing mandates and policy changes more effectively. A quantitative study could be conducted across districts to analyze what makes evaluation models successful or unsuccessful. Finally, this study should be replicated after the new evaluation system AchieveNJ has been implemented in New Jersey over the next two to three years.

**Conclusion**

Teacher evaluation reform is an important process that can lead to better outcomes for students and schools alike. Principals and assistant principals are the most important individuals in this process, particularly because they are entrusted with the responsibility of implementing state and federal government reform models and mandates with fidelity and integrity. Professional administrators need quality support to enable them to develop the necessary tools to implement the type of change stakeholders and policy makers are looking for. Subsequently, administrators have to be actively involved in the process and need to be provided with an opportunity to offer input in a collegial, professional, and trusting manner that honors and respects their expertise and professionalism. When professional administrators have concerns and issues about implementation gaps, they need to be heard, trusted, and given the latitude, capacity, and opportunity to help close those gaps.

The results of the administrator interviews indicate that administrators believe in and support high quality evaluation models that help teachers become better practitioners. The data and findings suggest administrators believe in and support high quality professional development. The data also suggest that administrators believe that other duties and responsibilities are important and need to be balanced alongside the teacher evaluation process. Data also suggest that the lack of support from the New Jersey Department of Education on
major initiatives and mandates like SGOs is a challenge in the implementation process of the model. However, the administrators in this study believe that although the new evaluation system may have flaws, it still has the potential to offer an effective fair assessment of teachers.

Additionally, several of the administrators interviewed believed that the pre- and post-conference mandate was useful for administrators and teachers. Similarly, a significant number of administrators felt that they did receive adequate support from the vendors of the observation tool and the data management instrument.
REFERENCES


Boser, U. (2012). *Race to the Top: What have we learned from the states so far?*


Appendix A

Interview Questions

Professional Characteristics

1. What is the highest degree you have?

2. What is your current position?

3. How many years have you worked in your current position?

4. How many years did you teach before becoming an administrator?

5. What grades did you teach?

6. What subjects did you teach?

7. How long have you been an administrator?

8. How long have you worked in the current district?

9. How many teachers do you evaluate?

10. How many teachers are in your school?
Appendix B

Interview Questions
Challenges, Beliefs and Facilitators

1. During the past school year, how many formal observations did you complete using the new system?

2. How much time is being dedicated to formal observations as opposed to informal observations?

3. How many walk-through observations did you complete during the past school year?

4. How much time can actually be dedicated to getting into every classroom?

5. Do you think the process should be streamlined?

6. On average, how many hours would you say were required to complete a single formal teacher observation, including pre- and post-observation meetings, the time to write the observation, and any other tasks associated with it?

7. How many hours of professional development did you receive to implement the new system?

8. How many professional development hours did you receive for the data management system?
9. How has the new evaluation system affected your other administrative responsibilities?

10. What impact does the new system have on your time management and other responsibilities?

11. Were your concerns with any issues with the data management system addressed in a timely fashion?

12. Did your district receive adequate support from the Department of Education?

13. Were your concerns with any issues related to the type of model you used addressed in a timely manner?

14. What, in your opinion, were some of the major challenges with the new systems?

15. How would you compare the effectiveness of the new system with the effectiveness of the old system?

16. Do you believe the new system offers fair assessment of teachers?

17. How would you compare the new evaluation system with the old evaluation?

18. What was your experience with the data management tool?
19. Did you receive professional development for the data management system?

20. Did you receive training for developing SGOs?

21. Did you help your staff develop SGOs?

22. Were the pre- and post-conferences beneficial for you and the teacher in your opinion?

23. Did you receive adequate support from the vendor?

24. What resources have been developed for the model and the tool?
### Appendix C

#### List of Tables

**Table A-1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participating School Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>District</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montclair (High School)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn’s Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freehold</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>District</strong></th>
<th><strong>County</strong></th>
<th><strong>Location</strong></th>
<th><strong>2000DF</strong></th>
<th><strong>Enrollment</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edison (Middle School)</td>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>GH</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsey</td>
<td>Bergen</td>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>3022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plainfield</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>8105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeton</td>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>6500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>District</strong></th>
<th><strong>County</strong></th>
<th><strong>Location</strong></th>
<th><strong>2000DF</strong></th>
<th><strong>Enrollment</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rutherford (Elementary)</td>
<td>Bergen</td>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>GH</td>
<td>2522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Lakes</td>
<td>Morris</td>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillside</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic City</td>
<td>Atlantic</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>6500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table A-2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participating School Districts, Observation Tool and Management System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>District</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freehold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Lakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montclair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penns Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plainfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutherford</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Participants Demographics/Descriptive Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race or Ethnicity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Years of Employment, Teaching and Administrative Experience, and Current District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience (yrs.)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12- plus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12- plus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-plus</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience (yrs.)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-plus</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Professional Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades Taught</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PK-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Taught</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Subjects</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers Evaluated</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-47</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44- plus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Student and Teacher Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Population</th>
<th># of Students</th>
<th># Of teachers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-500</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>501-1000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1001-1500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1501- plus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Population</th>
<th># of Students</th>
<th># Of teachers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51-100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101-150</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>151 plus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: What Are the Challenges Associated with Implementation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme Title</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Major Challenges of New Program</td>
<td>Professional Development; Technical Issues; Scheduling and Time Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Experience with the Data Management Tools</td>
<td>Wasn’t user friendly or difficult; Unreliable; Easy and No opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Affect on Other Administrator Duties</td>
<td>Student/Parent Contact; Management Responsibilities; Climate and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Resources Developed</td>
<td>None; Links and Webinars; extra PD; PD was sufficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Major Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Issues</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Experience with Data Management Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wasn’t user friendly/difficult</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreliable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Effect on Administrators’ Other Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student/Parent Contact</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Responsibilities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate and Culture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9: Other Resources Developed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links/Webinars</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay for Extra PD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD/inadequate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Administrators’ Beliefs about Process and Procedures of the Evaluation Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Adequate Support from the Vendors</td>
<td>Adequate support; Inadequate support; Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Benefits of the Pre and Post Conference</td>
<td>Richer dialogue with teachers; Collaboration on expectations; Clarification of expectations; More thought dialogue; Clarification of expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fair Assessment of Teachers</td>
<td>Objective; Evidence based; Collaboration; Lack of evidence; Not convinced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>New vs. Old System</td>
<td>Better systems; old systems more efficient; No different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Adequate support from NJDOE</td>
<td>Inadequate training; Insufficient funding; Wasn’t sure of support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Streamlining Process</td>
<td>Increase Resources; Eliminate # of Tenure Observations; No need for streamlining</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 11: Adequate Support from the Vendors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Support</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate support</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 12: Benefits of the Pre- and Post-Conference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarify</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration, rich dialogue, Negative Had issues</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 13: Fair Assessment of Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective, evidence based, and collaboration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Evidence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not convinced</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 14: Comparing New Evaluation System with Old Evaluation System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New system better</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old system better</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No different</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 15: Adequate Support from New Jersey Department of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16: Streamlining Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase Resources</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate # of Tenure Observation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease Paper Work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Streamlining</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17. Factors Considered Challenges and Facilitators to Program Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>Impact on other tasks and duties; Increase in workload; Plan and Organize efficiently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>SGO Training</td>
<td>Satisfied; Unsatisfied; No training at all; Direct from websites; Inadequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>SGO Teacher/Training</td>
<td>Yes; No; Yes, with explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Concerns address in a timely manner</td>
<td>Quick response time; poor response time; non-issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Hours of professional development- model</td>
<td>Adequate training; inadequate training; minimum training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Hour of professional development- tool</td>
<td>Adequate training; inadequate training; minimum training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18: Time Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on other tasks and duties</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase work load</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning/Organizing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19: Student Growth Objective/SGOs Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with training</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied with training</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No training at all</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20: Student Growth Objective/SGOs Teacher/Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes with explanation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21: Administrators’ Concerns Addressed in a Timely Manner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quick response time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor response time</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-issue</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22: Professional Development for the Observation Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate PD hours</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate PD hours</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum PD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23: Professional Development for the Data Management Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate PD hours</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate PD hours</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Informed Consent Form

1. **Researcher's Affiliation:**
   Vincent L. Stallings is a doctoral student at Seton Hall University, enrolled in the Ed.D., Executive Educational Leadership Cohort 16 Program.

2. **Purpose of Study:**
   The purpose of this qualitative case study is to explore the challenges associated with the implementation of New Jersey's new evaluation model, Achieve NJ. These implementation challenges will be investigated by interviewing practicing tenured building based administrators.

3. **Procedures:**
   The researcher will conduct twelve separate interviews with building principals and vice principals. The face-to-face interviews will last approximately 45 minutes each. Participants will receive interview questions before scheduled appointments.

4. **Study Instrument:**
   Data will be collected during the interview process from questions posed about the implementation of the observation tool and the data management system, along with demographic and professional experience of the participants. A sample of demographic based and interview questions are listed below:

   **Professional Experience:**
   - What School district do you represent?
   - What is the highest degree you have earned? BA, MA, Specialist, Ph.D. et cetera
   - What school did you attend for BA, MA, or Doctoral degree?
   - What is your current position within the school? Principal, Assistant Principal
   - How many years have you worked in your current position within the school system? 1-3 yrs, 4-6 yrs, 7-10 yrs, more than 10.

   **Interview Questions:**
   - How many formal observations during the past school year did you complete using the new system?
   - How much time is being dedicated to formal observations as opposed to informal observations?
   - On average, how many hours, would you say were required to complete a single formal teacher observation including pre-and post-observation meetings, the time to write up an observation and any other tasks associated with it?
   - How has the new evaluation system affected your other administrator responsibilities?
   - What impact does the new system have on your time management and other responsibilities?

5. **Voluntary Nature of the Project:**
   Participation in this study is voluntary. You may opt to refuse participation at any time, without penalty.

Department of Educational Leadership, Management and Policy
Jubilee Hall • 400 South Orange Avenue • South Orange, NJ 07079 • Tel: 973.768.3397 • Fax: 973.762.8047 • www.shu.edu

A HOME FOR THE MIND, THE HEART AND THE SPIRIT
Anonymity:
6. The identity of the participants will not be compromised or revealed. No names will be used during the transcribing process. Participants will be identified in the study using Administrator 1, Administrator 2, Administrator 3 and so on.

Confidentiality:
7. All data collected by the researcher will be kept confidential by the researcher.

Security of Stored Data:
8. Data will not be stored electronically on hard drive drives or laptops computers. If stored electronically it will only be stored on a USB key or CD. Data will be secured in a locked file cabinet for three years and then destroyed.

Risk:
9. There are no risks associated with this study.

Benefits:
10. The study will add potentially to the limited knowledge base of teacher evaluations from the perspective of building based administrators. Participation in the study has the potential to inform policy makers and other stakeholders about the current challenges associated with the implementation of Achieve NJ.

Remuneration:
11. There are no monetary benefits of any kind for participating in this study.

Contact Information:
12. Vincent L. Stalling (c/o Dr. Elaine Walker) Seton Hall University, 400 South Orange Avenue, South Orange, NJ 07079; email v232us@yahoo.com

Faculty Advisor: Dr. Elaine Walker, Seton Hall University, 400 South Orange Avenue, South Orange, NJ 07079; Email: Elaine.Walker@shu.edu

Institutional Review Board (IRB): Dr. Mary F. Ruzicka, Seton Hall University, 400 South Orange Avenue, South Orange, NJ 07079 (973) 313-4314 or irb@shu.edu

Permission to use audio and 1-phone recorders:
13. An audio recorder and 1-phone will be used to record the 45 minute interviews. Participants have the right to review any portion of the audio recordings and request that it be destroyed. The participants' names will not be used anywhere during the interview. The audio tape recordings and written transcripts will be stored on a portable hard drive (USB drive) in a secured space. The data will be included in the dissertation without personal or school district reference. All data will be destroyed after three years.

Acknowledgement of Informed Consent Form:
14. I have carefully read all of the Informed Consent Form and agree to participate in the research study. I acknowledge that I have received a copy of the Informed Consent Agreement.

Print Name

Signature

Date

Seton Hall University
Institutional Review Board

DEC 04 2015

Approval Date
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REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF RESEARCH, DEMONSTRATION OR RELATED ACTIVITIES INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS

All material must be typed.


CERTIFICATION STATEMENT:

In making this application, I (we) certify that I (we) have read and understand the University's policies and procedures governing research, development, and related activities involving human subjects. I (we) shall comply with the letter and spirit of those policies. I (we) further acknowledge my (our) obligation to (1) obtain written approval of significant deviations from the originally-approved protocol BEFORE making those deviations, and (2) report immediately all adverse effects of the study on the subjects to the Director of the Institutional Review Board, Seton Hall University, South Orange, NJ 07079.

VINCENT STALLINGS
RESEARCHER(S) OR PROJECT DIRECTOR(S)

DATE

**Please print or type out names of all researchers below signature.
Use separate sheet of paper, if necessary.**

My signature indicates that I have reviewed the attached materials and consider them to meet IRB standards.

ELAINE M. WALSH
RESEARCHER'S ADVISOR OR DEPARTMENTAL SUPERVISOR

DATE

**Please print or type out name below signature**

The request for approval submitted by the above researcher(s) was considered by the IRB for Research Involving Human Subjects Research at the meeting.

The application was approved ___ not approved ___ by the Committee. Special conditions were ___ were not ___ set by the IRB. (Any special conditions are described on the reverse side.)

DIRECTOR,
SETON HALL UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD FOR HUMAN SUBJECTS RESEARCH

Seton Hall University
3/2005
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OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
SETON HALL UNIVERSITY

December 4, 2014

Vincent L. Stallings
245 Fletcher Street
Edison, NJ 08820

Dear Mr. Stallings,

The Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board has reviewed the information you have submitted addressing the concerns for your proposal entitled “The Challenges Associated with Implementation of New Jersey’s New Evaluation Model, AchieveNJ, by School Based Administrators.” Your research protocol is hereby approved as revised through expedited review. The IRB reserves the right to recall the proposal at any time for full review.

Enclosed for your records are the signed Request for Approval form and the stamped original Consent Form. Make copies only of this stamped form.

The Institutional Review Board approval of your research is valid for a one-year period from the date of this letter. During this time, any changes to the research protocol must be reviewed and approved by the IRB prior to their implementation.

According to federal regulations, continuing review of already approved research is mandated to take place at least 12 months after this initial approval. You will receive communication from the IRB Office for this several months before the anniversary date of your initial approval.

Thank you for your cooperation.

In harmony with federal regulations, none of the investigators or research staff involved in the study took part in the final decision.

Sincerely,

Mary F. Rozicka, Ph.D.
Professor
Director, Institutional Review Board

cc: Dr. Elaine Walker
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Letter of Solicitation

Dear Administrators,

My name is Vincent Stallings and I am a student enrolled in Seton Hall University’s Executive Educational Administration Doctoral Program. You are invited to participate in a research study. The title of my research is "The Challenges Associated with the implementation of New Jersey’s New Evaluation Model Achieve NJ, by Building Base Administrators." This study will analyze the challenges associated with the implementation of Achieve NJ. By participating in this research you will be assisting in the completion of my dissertation requirement.

You were selected as a possible participant in this study because of your critical role in the implementation process. The purpose of this study is to understand the challenges related to the implementation, beliefs about the process and procedures and what factors facilitate success. All participants must be current practicing tenure building based administrators. Participants will represent various social, economic and geographic locations.

The process will be limited to your anonymous completion of a 45 minute interview and is entirely voluntary. Participation is voluntary, refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which the subject is otherwise entitled, and the subject may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits, to which the individual is otherwise entitled. Participant letter and number only-A1, A2, A3 and so on, will identify you. Data will not be stored electronically on hard drives of laptops or desktop computers. If stored electronically it will only be stored on a USB key or CD. Data will be secured in a locked file cabinet for five years and then destroyed.
Please contact me at v232us@yahoo.com and or my advisor Dr. Elaine Walker at Elaine.Walker@shu.edu, if you have any questions regarding the research. If you have questions about your rights as a participant in a research project, please email Institutional Review Board (IRB): Dr. Mary F. Ruzicka, Seton Hall University, 400 South Orange, Ave., NJ. 07079 IRB@shu.edu or call (973) 313-6314.

Sincerely,

Vincent L. Stallings
Re: Pilot study teacher evaluation 2nd year
William Firestone [william.firestone@gse.rutgers.edu]
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2014 3:54 PM
To: Vincent Stallings

Mr. Stallings, you have permission to use the instruments from our research on the condition that our research is cited in your final report. In addition, I'd appreciate being kept on the lists for any reports on the research that you do.

Good luck.

William A. Firestone, Distinguished Professor
Rutgers Graduate School of Education
10 Seminary Place
New Brunswick, NJ 08901
The best way to get me is by email at william.firestone@gse.rutgers.edu

On Sun, Mar 23, 2014 at 10:36 AM, Vincent Stallings <v.stallings@eastorange.k12.nj.us> wrote:

Good Morning Dr. Firestone,

I would like to have permission to use your teacher and administrator survey questions and focus group questions in your external assessment report 1 and 2 for my research on administrators perception and challenges of new evaluation.

Thanks,

Vincent Stallings
Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 9, 2014, at 6:00 PM, "William Firestone" <william.firestone@gse.rutgers.edu> wrote:

Mr. Stallings,

This is a little indirect, but here is a link to a story with a link to the web site for the report: http://gse.rutgers.edu/content/final-report-released-nj-teacher-evaluation-pilot-program

William A. Firestone, Distinguished Professor
Rutgers Graduate School of Education
10 Seminary Place
New Brunswick, NJ 08901
The best way to get me is by email at william.firestone@gse.rutgers.edu