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ABSTRACT

THE USE OF 360-DEGREE FEEDBACK® COMPARED TO TRADITIONAL EVALUATIVE FEEDBACK FOR THE PROFESSIONAL GROWTH OF TEACHERS

A review of the research and literature on the teacher evaluation process for more than three decades criticizes current teacher evaluation methods (Thomas, 1979; Scriven, 1981; McGreal, 1983; Prybolo, 1998; Peterson, 2000; Aseltin et. al. 2006; Toch & Rothman, 2008). It has been suggested that school systems need to evaluate their teacher evaluation process in order to bring it into alignment with their mission, vision, values and goals as well as provide a meaningful exercise for both the administrator and the teacher. Holland and Garman claim that there is little to no evidence supporting the claims that evaluative supervisory visits to classrooms support instructional improvement.

This study investigated the use of the 360-degree feedback process as an option to the single source
traditional evaluative feedback for the professional growth of teachers. Empirical research on the use of 360-degree feedback in elementary and secondary educational settings is quite limited. This study sought to understand teachers' perceptions of the quality of feedback they received from the traditional evaluative feedback to feedback they received from a multi-source feedback process. Results from a 360-degree feedback pilot study were analyzed to determine the effectiveness of this process in a K-12 educational setting.

This descriptive study utilized the 360-degree feedback model for K-12 education from Iowa State University. The Research Institute for Studies in Education at ISU provided the surveys used to compare teachers' experiences with the traditional single-source feedback performance evaluation to the feedback they received from the 360-degree feedback process. 27 K-12 teachers from a large suburban school district in the Hudson Valley of New York State participated in the project.

Results from the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed Ranks Test indicated that the participants in this project found
the multi-source feedback process to be significantly more helpful than the traditional method in a number of areas, among them is developing professional growth goals, identifying professional development needs and focusing on student achievement.
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Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Teachers do make a difference; there has been an ongoing debate about how much teachers make a difference in student achievement relative to a number of other factors that might affect student achievement (Wang, Haertel, & Walberg, 1993 as cited in Wright, Horn, & Sanders, 1997). A meta-analysis was conducted from more than 5,000 studies to examine the effects of leadership practices on student achievement by the Mid-Continent Regional Educational Lab (Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003). The findings demonstrate that there is a "substantial relationship between leadership and student achievement" (p.3). Their balanced leadership framework, grounded in substantial evidence identifies 11 school and teacher practices and student factors influencing student achievement:

1. Guaranteed and viable curriculum
2. Challenging curriculum
3. Parent and community involvement
4. Safe and orderly environment
5. Collegiality and professionalism
6. Instructional strategies
7. Classroom management
8. Classroom design
9. Home environment
10. Learned intelligence/background knowledge
Marzano (2003) also emphasizes the effect of individual teachers on student achievement. He noted that all researchers agree that the impact of decisions made by individual teachers is far greater than the impact of decisions made at the school level. He cites studies by Sanders and Horn (1995); Wright, Horn and Sanders (1997); and Haycock (1998) that illustrate the profound impact an individual teacher can have on student achievement.

According to Sanders and Rivers (1996) effective teachers appear to be effective with students of all achievement levels, regardless of the level of heterogeneity in their classrooms. They claim that more can be done to improve education by improving the effectiveness of teachers than by any other single factor. Therefore, the teacher appraisal process should help generate evidence about a teacher's knowledge and teaching capabilities.

According to Mason (1996, as cited in Akpotu & Oghuvbu, 2004) the absence of a teacher assessment paradigm grounded in evidence, discussions about teaching will remain largely removed from the realities of classroom practice and will thus have little impact on student learning. Milanowski (2004) presents a framework (see Figure 1) for the use of
empirical evidence of a relationship between teacher evaluation scores and measurements of student achievement to support the use of the scores for administrative purposes and for research on teacher effects on student learning:

**Fig. 1.** Conceptual framework of the relationship between teacher evaluation scores and measurements of student achievement. (p.38)

The author contends that the reputation of teacher evaluation is not particularly good in that these practices neither improve teachers nor accurately represent what happens in the classroom. A look at the history of the teacher evaluation process provides insights to the reputation of this process.
History of the Teacher Evaluation Process

Twenty six years ago, the *Handbook of Teacher Evaluation* (Millman, 1981) was published to provide practitioners with a reference guide to the theory, methodology and practical application of teacher evaluation. At that time Scriven (1981) wrote that the current teacher evaluation system was a "disaster" and criticized practitioners for not utilizing current knowledge in the field to improve their teacher evaluation procedures. He called classroom observation visits a "disgrace", yet to this day many school districts still utilize this process as the primary evaluation method for the annual performance review of teachers. Classroom observations are generally followed by a summative checklist where teacher behaviors are listed and rated on a Likert-type scale. These scales rate teachers' performance using descriptors such as but not limited to: unsatisfactory, basic, proficient, and distinguished. McGreal (1983) found that summative methods comprise 65% of teacher evaluation systems throughout the nation. The summative evaluation checklist format might also include
the administrator's comments about the teacher's strengths and weaknesses, recommendations for further consideration, or goals for improvement. The feedback obtained from this process tends to be based on the classroom environment and teacher behaviors at the time of the visit.

In the fall of 2006, 23 years following the McGreal (1983) study, this researcher and the model schools staff specialist at the Dutchess County Board of Cooperative Educational Services surveyed 83 school principals in Dutchess County, New York. Dutchess County is located in the mid-Hudson Valley region of New York State and includes urban, suburban and rural school districts. Sixty-one percent of the respondents indicated the summative evaluation checklist model is the primary model utilized for the annual performance review of teachers. Thirty-nine percent reported the summative evaluation checklist model is not used at all in their districts. Other methods of teacher evaluation being used as indicated by this survey included: professional growth plans (5 districts), student achievement data (7 districts), teacher portfolios (3 districts), peer review (3 districts), and teacher goal setting (11 districts). Many of these methods are used in
combination or are offered to teachers as options for their annual performance review. The preponderance of evidence indicated by this limited survey support the theory that the summative evaluation check list continues to be widely used for the annual performance review of teachers.

According to Peterson (2000) the vast majority of teachers (94%) are competent in their instructional skills and the traditional observation checklists are less than professionally meaningful. The culture of teacher evaluation has been one which values a non-threatening, time efficient methodology. The observation checklist has met and continues to meet those needs. Despite using these traditional methods of teacher evaluation, they rarely help teachers make a direct link with their professional growth and student learning needs (Aseltine, Faryniarz, & Rigazio-Digilio, 2006). A process for providing teachers with actionable feedback toward professional growth, and ultimately student achievement, ought to be explored.

**Best Practices**

Several processes have emerged in the current teacher evaluation literature that focus on providing teachers with
such feedback: data collection and goal setting, professional growth plans, teacher portfolios, peer review, and multi-source feedback referred to as 360° Feedback®.

Student Achievement Data

Using student achievement data to inform instruction can assist teachers in identifying student academic deficits in need of improvement, as well as identifying student strengths for enrichment purposes. Once this data is obtained, the administrator and teacher can implement the goal setting process. Earlier research on teacher evaluation practices (Acheson & Gall 1987, Iwanicki 1981, McGreal 1983, Redfern 1980, as cited in Stanley and Popham, 1988) indicate that evaluation should involve individual goal-setting activities that occur between teachers and administrators and should form the major focus for what they do together.

Teacher Professional Growth

It was suggested by Clarke and Hollingsworth (2002)

1 360° Feedback is a registered trademark of Teams, Inc.
that we must understand the process by which teachers grow professionally and the conditions that support and promote that growth. Professional growth is a continuing process of reflective learning. The characteristics of a professional learning community have the professional growth of teachers as a key component. This concept is presented in a paper by Koops and Winsor (2006). "Designing a professional growth plan with individual faculty members gives supervisors opportunities to reinforce the strengths of teachers and recommend courses and conferences that can help teachers to develop new classroom strategies" (p.66).

In an environment where professional growth is used as an evaluative tool, continuous school improvement is the goal. These schools provide time for collaboration and time for addressing questions about instruction and curriculum.

Learning Portfolios

Learning portfolios are another option available to schools for use in the annual performance review of teachers. In the past decade, the use of learning portfolios has seen an increase in K-12 education (Danielson & Abrutyn, 1997; Wortham, Barbour, & Desjean-
Perrotta, 1998) as well as promoting the development of
teaching skills and reflective practice for pre-service
teachers (Beck & Weiland, 2001; Klenowski, 2000). The
National Board of Professional Teaching Standards continues
to use portfolio assessment as part of their current
certification process. Even though the process of
developing a professional portfolio may be time consuming,
Denzine (2001) concluded that the process is low-cost and
can be an effective strategy for encouraging professional
growth among staff.

Peer Review

In 1972, Hare and Frankena (as cited in Fiege &
Dollase, 2002) defined peer-group supervision as a process
by which professionals meet to review cases and treatment
approaches without a leader present to share expertise and
take responsibility for their own and each others’
professional development. Peer review programs can be
quite costly to implement. Districts must plan and develop
training and education programs so teachers can become
knowledgeable about the peer review process and its
evaluation methods (Kumrow & Dahlen, 2002). The cost of
potential teacher stipends and substitute teachers to allow for teachers to observe others must also be considered.

360-degree Feedback

A contemporary feedback strategy that builds professional growth is known as the 360-degree feedback process. The 360-degree feedback procedure relies upon feedback from peers, subordinates, supervisors, and others within the evaluatee's circle of involvement. The intent is to link feedback received to the organization's goals and initiatives and to the employee's professional career development.

As far back as 20 years ago, research has shown that 360-degree feedback can enhance communications and performance (Bernadin & Beatty, 1987) when the employee is held accountable to develop a professional growth plan in line with the organization's mission, vision, values, and goals. Schools might also experience similar results if the 360-degree feedback process is offered as an option for the annual performance review of teachers.

There are a number of alternatives to the summative evaluation check list for the annual performance review of
teachers: professional growth plans, teacher portfolios, data collection and goal setting, and 360-degree feedback.

Considering the benefits of the 360-degree process in other organizations, this study explores the possibility that K-12 teachers can also benefit from receiving feedback from more than one source, which has traditionally been the administrator. This might include feedback from multiple sources such as students, parents, and colleagues as well as the administrator (see Figure 2).

Statement of the Problem

Many teacher evaluation procedures employed in public schools continue to rely upon one or two classroom observations per year which are documented on a summative evaluation checklist by a building administrator. A review of the literature indicates that this top-down method of teacher evaluation is neither objective nor reliable and fails to promote the professional growth of teachers (Koçak, 2006; Wilkerson, Manatt, Rogers, & Maughan, 2000).
Figure 2. 360° Feedback for teachers.
While many large corporations have incorporated the 360-degree feedback method to promote the professional growth of their employees, it’s use in education to provide teachers with actionable feedback toward professional growth is meager in the field of educational research (Koçak, 2006; Manatt & Benway, 1998; Manatt & Kemis, 1997; Smith, 2000). This study attempted to determine if the feedback from the 360-degree process provides more actionable feedback to teachers in pursuit of professional growth than the feedback obtained from the traditional teacher evaluation process currently in use. Prior to implementing the 360-degree process, teachers participating in a pilot project completed a survey to express their views of the quality of feedback they obtain during the traditional single source evaluation process. At the conclusion of the process, participating teachers completed an electronic survey to express their views of the 360-degree process. The problems with the traditional teacher summative evaluation process in use are that: it is top down, it often does not account for differences between experienced and beginning teachers, it provides limited feedback based upon student academic achievement, and it
provides little to no feedback on the professional growth needs of teachers (Danielson & McGreal, 2000).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to gain knowledge of the use of the 360-degree feedback method in K-12 education and to determine if this method of feedback is effective in assisting teachers' develop professional growth goals and identifying professional development needs. This information will help school leaders make informed decisions about the annual performance review of teachers. Providing teachers with several options to grow professionally to improve student achievement is an essential element of school leadership.

During the annual review process, teachers generally receive feedback from a single source which most likely is their building administrator. The 360-degree feedback process enables parents, students, and colleagues to provide teachers with performance feedback as well.

This study compared the 360-degree multi-source feedback method to the traditional single-source feedback method of evaluation in one suburban school district in the
state of New York. The effectiveness of each process in assisting teachers in identifying professional growth goals and identifying professional development needs was examined.

Design and Methods of the Study

This study was a non-experimental, quantitative, and qualitative study. The qualitative data was obtained through this researcher's description of her experience implementing the pilot project and the teacher participants' responses to the open-ended questions on the pre and post surveys. The quantitative data was obtained from pre and post survey responses from the 27 participants in the pilot project.

Prior to implementing the 360-degree process, teachers participating in a pilot project completed an electronic survey to express their views of the quality of feedback they obtain during the traditional single source evaluation process. At the conclusion of the process, participating teachers completed an electronic survey to express their views of the 360-degree process.
Significance of the Study

Pressured by the demands of the No Child Left Behind Act, the public is seeking accountability in schools, the most important factor in that is teaching performance. As school leaders look for ways to improve student learning, there is a need to connect student achievement with the teacher evaluation process. Data from more than one source, such as the building administrator, may prove to provide more meaningful feedback for the annual performance review of teachers. This project studied the impact of 360-degree feedback on teachers' ability to identify professional growth needs, professional development needs, and develop plans for improvement. This study also attempted to determine whether or not the 360-degree feedback process is useful for this district and other school districts as a tool for the annual professional growth of teachers.

Research Questions

The following research questions were designed to provide insights toward the use of the 360-degree feedback
process in K-12 education as compared to the traditional summative evaluation checklist model:

How was the 360-degree feedback program implemented in a suburban school district?

To what extent does the traditional single-source feedback method of evaluation provide useful feedback to teachers?

To what extent does the 360-degree feedback model provide useful feedback to teachers?

To what extent does the 360-degree feedback model compare to the traditional single-source feedback model toward assisting teachers in developing professional growth goals?

To what extent does the 360-degree feedback model compare to the traditional single-source feedback model toward assisting teachers in developing professional development needs?

Procedures

The data obtained for this study was provided by the Research Institute for Studies in Education (RISE) at Iowa State University. Twenty-seven teachers from one suburban New York district voluntarily participated in this
district’s pilot project using the 360-degree feedback model for professional growth as opposed to the traditional teacher evaluation model.

The participating teachers completed an electronic pre-study survey based on their experiences with the traditional teacher evaluation process.

The participating teachers completed a post-study electronic survey based on their experiences with the 360-degree feedback process.

The RISE survey data was analyzed for this study.

Limitations

While the studies on teacher evaluation offer insights into teacher improvement toward student achievement and teacher professional growth, care must be taken on making generalizations. Each of the described practices may be suggested for use in K-12 schools, however one cannot assume that these practices will ultimately result in increased student achievement.

This study is limited to one suburban school district in the state of New York.
Findings from this study may not be generalized to any group other than the teachers participating in this pilot project.

The data obtained from this study may be affected by the Hawthorne Effect as teachers perceive they are part of a new professional growth process.

Teacher survey responses were representative of their individual experiences with traditional evaluative feedback compared to the 360-degree feedback process.

Teachers may have felt threatened by this process and respond negatively for fear of 360-degree feedback becoming an evaluation requirement.

The completion of feedback surveys provided to teachers relied upon the honesty of each individual to complete their survey as truthfully as possible toward providing actionable feedback to each teacher participating.

The number of surveys returned may limit the amount of feedback obtained for use.

The teacher participants may generally seek and are receptive to feedback despite the 360-degree process.
Teachers may perceive feedback from students, parents, and peers as threatening and become defensive after receiving feedback results.

Delimitations

The 360-degree Feedback model is new to the field of K-12 educational research and there are limited studies comparing this model to traditional teacher evaluation feedback models.

This study will be limited to one school district from which 360-degree feedback data will be analyzed.

This study is limited to the data obtained from teachers voluntarily participating in the pilot project.

Definitions

Annual Performance Review - An annual or multi-year plan for evaluating the performance of teachers who provide instructional services or pupil personnel services as stipulated by the New York State Commissioner of Education Regulations 100.2 (o)(2)(iii)(a)(1).

Useful Feedback - produces learning and tangible, appropriate results, such as increasing effectiveness and improving performance skills (Cannon & Witherspoon, 2005).
**Professional Growth Plan** - An alternate approach to the clinical observation for the purpose of a teachers' annual performance review. The focus of the professional growth plan is directed toward instructional improvement allowing teachers to explore a wide range of professional growth options by submitting a plan jointly agreed upon between the teacher and administrator.

**360-degree Feedback** - Feedback obtained from multiple sources. In this study the sources included students, parents, and colleagues.

**Summary**

During the teacher annual review process, teachers generally receive feedback from a single source which is typically their building administrator. Research on the teacher evaluation process over several decades criticizes the teacher evaluation process using the checklist model as being ineffective in improving instruction toward student academic achievement and guiding the professional growth of teachers. This stems from a culture of teacher evaluation that values a non-threatening, time efficient methodology. Several teacher evaluation processes have emerged that
focus on providing teachers with useful feedback toward the improvement of instruction and ultimately student achievement. There are a number of alternatives to the summative evaluation check list for the annual performance review of teachers. Among these best practices are the use of student achievement data to guide instruction, teacher professional growth plans, learning portfolios, peer review and the 360-degree feedback process. This study compared teacher’s perceptions of the quality of feedback they have received from the traditional evaluation process with the feedback they received from the 360-degree feedback process.

Organization of Remaining Chapters

Chapter II presents a review of the current literature and research on the teacher evaluation process. The chapter discusses teacher performance and student achievement, current “best practices” in teacher evaluation such as data collection and goal setting, professional growth planning, teacher portfolios, peer review, 360-degree feedback, and current teacher evaluation practices.
Chapter III describes the research methodology, the setting, the strategies implemented to answer the research questions, the instrumentation, the data collection, and the data analysis.

Chapter IV summarizes the implementation of the 360-degree feedback pilot project in a suburban K-12 school district and a detailed analysis of the quantitative data including an interpretation of the qualitative data as they pertain to the research questions.

The research findings and the implications for future research, practice and policy in teacher evaluation are discussed in Chapter V.
Chapter II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview

The review of the literature builds a conceptual framework for understanding teacher evaluation practices with particular attention paid to the practice of 360-degree feedback. This study examines the issues related to teacher evaluation from various perspectives. The topics discussed in this literature review include: a synopsis of teacher evaluation practices, teacher performance and student achievement, data collection and goal setting, professional growth plans, teacher portfolios, peer review, and 360-degree feedback.

Synopsis of Teacher Evaluation Practices

Over two decades ago the trend toward improving the teacher evaluation process came to the forefront of educational research. Thomas (1979) suggested if school districts wish to improve teacher performance, administrators should be able to detect their strengths and weaknesses. He criticized the use of instruments constructed solely to determine if specific behaviors are
observed or not observed on a specific visit. McGreal (1983) pointed out that the concept behind teacher evaluation or the general purposes of evaluation are not the problem but the way the process is carried out, he states that it is the system that is the problem. "Too many schools are so paralyzed by what teacher evaluation used to be that they resist promising new alternatives" (Iwanicki, 2001, p.59). Peterson (2000) found that 94% of teachers evaluated on a summative checklist are competent in their instructional skills and these traditional observation checklists are less than professionally meaningful. In a recent report, Toch and Rothman (2008) criticized teacher evaluation systems in public education as being "superficial, capricious, and often don't even directly address the quality of instruction, much less measure students' learning" (p. 1). They found that 93% of the 25,000 teachers in the Chicago school system received top ratings of "excellent" or "superior" on the teacher rating scales between 2003 and 2006.

School systems need to evaluate their teacher evaluation process in order to bring it into alignment with their mission, vision, values and goals. A question for
reflection on this process was presented by Prybylo (1998): is teacher evaluation a meaningful exercise for both the principals and the teacher, or is it a burden to be endured for the sake of bureaucracy? In a Nevada school district of 53,000 K-12 students, teachers complained that evaluation was something that was done to them rather than with their collaboration and gave them very little new, enlightening, or challenging information (Sawyer, 2001). Administrators in this district stated that they were “able to give some useful feedback to teachers but were frustrated by the system’s lack of specificity” (p. 45). They developed an evaluation policy that utilized formal classroom observations, differentiation between teachers of varying levels of experience, self evaluation, peer observation, professional growth plans and expectations for graduate course work. They found this process resulted in an increase of discussions about teaching and learning and the discussions resulted in collaboration that focused on improving the quality of instruction.

Accountability has been lacking in most teacher evaluation procedures. Koops and Winsor (2006) attempted to use teacher observation, supervision, and evaluation to
improve upon the quality of the educational process. They state that "effective evaluation should hold teachers accountable while encouraging them to remain current in their fields and challenging them to develop and use a repertoire of effective methods" (p. 61).

In their research of current evaluation practices Kersten and Israel (2005) found that the evaluation tools available have changed significantly from the past. They mention the work of DeMoulin (1988) and Edmonds (1981) who found that the process of conducting one or two classroom visits a year followed by a summative evaluation checklist to be unacceptable practice. Danielson and McGreal (2000) identified six main deficiencies in current teacher evaluation systems: (a) they utilize outdated, limited, evaluative criteria; (b) they indicate few shared values and assumptions about good teaching; (c) they lack precision in evaluating performance; (d) they are hierarchical one-way communication; (e) there is no difference between novice and experienced practitioners; and (f) they are conducted with limited administrator expertise. As school districts develop committees to
improve their teacher evaluation systems, Danielson and McGreal recommend they focus their discussions on:

1. Those practices that are realistic for the district in terms of teacher and administrator time demands.
2. The availability of resources to support the training necessary to make new systems function effectively.
3. The level of commitment that the administration, the board of education, and the teachers union have to break away from more traditional views of evaluation. (p. 17)

The Washoe County school district in Nevada desired a teacher evaluation system based on a progressive set of teaching expectations to monitor and guide teachers' performance (Kimball, White, Milanowski, & Borman, 2004). They drew from the Danielson and McGreal (2000) framework-based evaluation to test the hypothesis that if such systems represent quality teaching, then the assessment of teaching behaviors using such standards will reflect measures of student achievement. This process utilizes various sources of evidence from the teacher in the
evaluation process: teacher self-assessment, pre-observation data sheets, classroom and non-classroom observations and conferences, instructional artifacts, reflection forms, three week unit plan, logs of professional activities, and parent contacts.

The study attempted to explore the relationship between evaluation scores and student achievement based on results from district, state, and national norm-referenced reading and math tests from third, fourth and fifth grade students. The results were mixed in that the relationship of teacher evaluation scores to student achievement was positive for each grade and subject but the coefficients were not statistically significant in all the cases. The potential lack of alignment between what is taught and what students are tested on was considered a confounding factor in this study as was the fact that only 7 of the 23 evaluation components from the teacher evaluation system were included. This lack of a more comprehensive performance measure resulted in the absence of additional important information about teacher performance.

Looking to improve the teacher evaluation system in the country of Cyprus, Kyriakides, Demetris, and Charalambous
(2006) described the deficiencies in the current evaluation system which included:

1. A lack of common framework and training for those conducting the evaluations;
2. Four 40-minute observations during the school year is considered inadequate;
3. Reports do not discriminate between teachers;
4. The majority of teachers earn a score of 32 points or better out of a possible 40 points;
5. Student outcomes are not taken into consideration;
6. No account is taken of parents' or other stakeholders satisfaction;
7. There is not a serious commitment to use the current system for professional development and improvement;
8. The focus on the teacher de-contextualizes the process from the school effect. (p. 4)

In their study, the authors looked to the existing literature on school and teacher effectiveness research in an attempt to build a valid teacher evaluation system. Their survey asked teachers to evaluate the appropriateness of 42 teacher evaluation criteria. The results from 237
Cypriot primary teachers, indicated that teachers consider most of the criteria from teacher effectiveness research to be important for summative and formative evaluations. It was also noted that even though the teachers disapprove of the current system and that teacher involvement in the development of the process is important, they seemed less eager to welcome changes in the current system especially in the areas of teacher accountability and school constituency satisfaction. They conclude by acknowledging that most teacher effectiveness studies have elaborated on classroom activities, failing to consider other school factors; change in schools must occur at both the school and class levels simultaneously.

In order to update their evaluation procedures, school district personnel need to be informed of current practices shown to be effective by reviewing the research and literature. "Principals and supervisors who are in turn evaluating teachers need more information about best practices in this area" (King, 2003, p. 179). Breaking away from traditional views of teacher evaluation might involve providing teachers with more options within this process. These options might include data collection and goal setting, development of professional growth plans based on
measurable goals, peer review and coaching, professional portfolios, and the use of the 360-degree feedback process in the development professional growth goals.

Teacher Performance and Student Achievement

The results of a study by Wright, Horn, and Sanders (1997) document that the most important factor affecting student learning is the teacher: teachers do make a difference. The implications of their findings are that more can be done to improve education by improving the effectiveness of teachers than by any other single factor. “Effective teachers appear to be effective with students of all achievement levels, regardless of the level of heterogeneity in their classrooms” (p.57). This finding is supported by Sanders and Rivers (1996) who studied the cumulative effects of teachers on the academic progress of students. “The number one factor in achievement, the single greatest determinant of learning is not socioeconomic factors or funding levels. It is instruction” (Schmoker, 2006, p.7).

A review of state policy evidence on teacher quality and student achievement performed by Darling-Hammond (2000) indicated that the effects of well prepared teachers on
student achievement can be stronger than the influences of other factors such as poverty, language background and socio-economic status. Among the author's recommendations, she suggests that policies refining teacher professional development offerings are needed. Twenty years earlier, Hanushek (1971) attempted to identify the aspects of schools and teachers which are important in education. He found that the verbal facility and recentness of education has a significant effect on student achievement among second and third grade teachers, which provides the rationale for encouraging or requiring teachers to return to school periodically. Readers are advised to avoid the assumption that all certified teachers are well prepared, have strong verbal skills and have recently engaged in course work or professional development focused on student achievement.

According to recent evidence, certification of teachers bears little relationship to teacher effectiveness (measured by impacts on student achievement). There are effective certified teachers and there are ineffective certified teachers; similarly, there are effective uncertified teachers and ineffective uncertified teachers. The differences between the
stronger teachers and the weak teachers only become clear once teachers have been in the classroom for a couple of years. (Gordon, Kane, & Staiger, 2006, p. 5)

These authors suggest that if a system for evaluating teacher effectiveness is to work well, data systems are needed that can track the performance of individual students from year to year and link these results to their teachers.

In the search for adequate measures of teacher or classroom effects on student achievement, Kimball, White, Milanowski, and Borman (2004) contend that teacher performance assessment results could be considered as one possible alternative if the evaluation scores can be shown to be valid measures of teaching practice and to have a positive relationship to student achievement. New standards-based teacher evaluation practices have recently emerged to respond to the deficiencies in teacher evaluation practices of the past and improve instruction and accountability (Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Davis, Pool & Mits-Cash, 2000; Kimball, 2002; Milanowski & Heneman, 2001).
Drawing from the research of Darling-Hammond (1996); Iwanicki (1998); Peterson (2000), and Stiggins (1989), the Performance Based Supervision and Evaluation (PBSE) model as presented by Aseltine, Faryniarz, and Rigazio-Digilio (2006) is intended to bring about improved teaching practice as evidenced by improved student performance. The results of three case studies utilizing the PBSE model were consistent in that:

1. Student achievement consistently improved, as evidenced by performance on local assessments and state standardized tests.

2. Teacher capacity for making strategic instructional interventions based on student performance data increased.

3. Teacher professional development became far more connected to student learning needs.

4. Teachers and administrators become more focused and self directed, which changed both their supervisory conversations and the way in which they completed their professional responsibilities.
5. Student achievement, teacher development, and administrator development became closely linked to school improvement practices. (p.6)

Keeney (1998) also suggested schools that continually seek improvement employ effective accountability tools that allow them to examine their practices and utilize collected meaningful information to bring about the desired improvement in student performance. In order to achieve and sustain high student achievement, teachers must have a thorough and sophisticated understanding of standards and assessments, and the effective use of data to make effective decisions and align their professional development with student learning needs are essential skills of school leaders (Anthes, 2002).

A different perspective on teacher evaluation to improve student achievement suggests that students are a valued source of information regarding the quality of teaching. According to Akpotu and Oghuvbu (2004), students are the prime beneficiaries who bear the primary consequences of the schools' ineffectiveness and inefficiency. They contend that students can play a major role in assisting school management in addressing these
problems. Such student reports should form part of the annual evaluation of the teachers. The survey information that students provide is valuable because "students are uniquely able to evaluate many important aspects of the educational experience" (Kreiter & Lakshman, 2005, p.171). Douglas and Douglas (2006) suggest a triangulation of information must be sought to monitor and manage the quality of education: "Given that the direct receivers of the delivery of the teaching service are students, their experience and its improvement should be at the forefront of any monitoring of higher education quality" (p.6). They propose three ways to monitor service quality: feedback surveys, peer observation and students feedback surveys. Bingham and Ottewill (2001) also claim "better teaching did not necessarily come from appraisal, a triangulation of methods may be the best way forward if robust information on teaching and learning is to be gathered" (p.12). A number of alternatives are available for the evaluation of teachers. Specific leadership tasks that promote student achievement include knowledge and active involvement in instruction and assessment, as well as focused monitoring and evaluation (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005). The use of several alternatives as part of an evaluation package
can provide school leaders with several forms of data to evaluate the quality of teaching as it relates to student achievement.

**Data Collection and Goal Setting**

Data collection and goal setting is a process that attempts to utilize student quantitative data in the development of teacher goals aimed at improving teaching and increasing student learning. Using statistical procedures in the teacher evaluation process is commonly referred to as "value-added models" (VAM) developed by William Sanders (as cited in Braun, 2005) and currently used in districts in several states including Tennessee, Ohio and Pennsylvania. He suggests that value-added models may offer a more defensible foundation for teacher evaluation than absolute levels of student attainment or the proportion of students meeting a fixed standard of performance. The VAM draws on evidence of students' academic growth for evaluating teacher quality. Teachers use this evidence to develop teaching goals toward the improvement of instruction that meets the needs of their students. Many teacher evaluation procedures are subjective and are rarely linked to student achievement.
The VAM attempt to objectively link teacher effectiveness to student learning. Braun cautions districts who are considering the VAM "to specify the populations under study, describe the nature of the measures employed and define effectiveness in precise, quantitative terms" (p. 7). VAM can identify teachers who require professional development and additional supports. This report concludes with cautions for use of the VAM:

1. It should not serve as the sole basis for making decisions about teachers;

2. identifying which teachers are in need of professional support and those deserving of commendation can be tricky;

3. The use of VAM should not block the examination of the appropriateness of including other measures. School leaders should become more skilled in recognizing the kinds of assistance needed by individual teachers. (p. 15)

The values-added concept of teaching performance is based not on the absolute level of performance of students, but on the amount they learn as the result of the teacher's
efforts. (Danielson & McGreal, 2000). The system should take into account the baseline levels of student achievement. Caution must be taken to insure teachers are not penalized for taking on goals with difficult instructional challenges.

Stiggins (1986) indicated that an instrument used for growth should help good teachers become better teachers by identifying weak areas to be improved. Once weak areas are identified, administrator and teacher can implement the goal setting process. A plethora of previous research on teacher evaluation practices indicate they should involve individual goal-setting activities that occur between teachers and administrators and should form the major focus for what they do together (Acheson & Gall 1987, Iwanicki 1981, McGreal 1983, Redfern 1980, all cited in Stanley & Popham, 1988). Manning (1988) describes goal setting conferences with performance targets toward improvement should contain: a precise description of the performance desired; a description of the teacher and the observer roles in providing perquisites and assistance prior to the expected accomplishment of the target; a plan for demonstration of the target, details of how it is to be
observed, standards for satisfactory performance, and projected time lines (p. 95).

Tucker and Stronge (2005) also described assessing teacher quality through goal setting using SMART goals (specific, measurable, actionable, realistic, and timely). They suggest that the goal setting process fosters teacher reflection and collegiality as well as having the potential to transform how teachers plan and deliver instruction. "We believe that teacher participation in goal setting helps teachers become self-reflective practitioners who can adjust their practices when necessary" (Sawyer, 2001, p.45). The results of the Nevada study reported by Sawyer indicated that respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that:

Annual goal-setting sessions helped focus teachers’ efforts and helped them make progress.

The system increased meaningful dialogue between teacher and evaluator. (p.46)

According to the National Association of Elementary School Principals (1990), principals need to promote learning among their staffs and collect data in order to improve instruction. The use of data not only to improve
instruction, but in the evaluation of teachers has recently gained a great deal of attention. The use of student achievement data is one form of objective evaluation data to assist teachers in looking at their strengths and weaknesses. Other types of data that can be included in the evaluation process include portfolios, self-assessment, and feedback from colleagues, students, and parents.

Iwanicki (2001) states that continuous school improvement is a process allowing teachers to work in teams to address school improvement goals. "Teacher evaluation and staff development are integrated into this process... teachers must function as professionals in a climate of respect and trust, communicating their goals" (p. 59).

Sawyer (2001) found that teacher participation in goal setting helps them to become self-reflective and that they are capable of adjusting their practices when necessary. The teachers in his study described the annual goal-setting process as helping them focus on achieving progress toward those goals as well as initiating productive dialogue between the teacher and the evaluator. We need short-term successes to help us stay focused and motivated. Goals establish accountability for stakeholders, insuring that
what needs to happen actually does happen. Such goals must be "SMART" in that they are specific, measurable, attainable, results-oriented, and time-bound (Blankstein, 2004).

Danielson and McGreal (2000) encourage teachers to use both short-term and long-range goal setting that is goal directed and supports student learning aligned with state and local content standards. "These goals should be coherent and should include strategies for assessment of student learning" (p. 49).

Professional Growth Planning

In his discussion about the use of teacher professional growth plans, Schon (1983) stated that we learn not so much from our experience, but from our reflection on our experience. The North Carolina school system developed an evaluation system that combines traditional evaluation with individual professional growth activities. "Evaluation that leads to professional growth requires teachers to look honestly at their weaknesses and strengths" (Howard & McColskey, 2001, p. 48). Their system provides teachers with a structure that encourages them to gather supporting
Developing effective evaluation systems is a challenge for many school districts. Beall (1999) states the most important challenge is to sustain a climate in which effective evaluation serves to encourage and focus teachers on their professional growth and continuous improvement.

Duke (1993) recommended that school systems review their policies on teacher evaluation to identify factors that may hinder teachers' professional growth. He criticizes evaluation systems that are based on the same set of basic teaching competencies or performance standards year after year, which involve the standardization of practice rather than professional growth. "The idea of evaluating all competent teachers every year according to a common set of performance standards that, at best, represent minimum or basic expectations is little short of an institutionalized insult. Teachers and administrators both know that these evaluations are a terrible waste of time and energy" (p. 703). He goes on to say this process provides no incentive for growth. In the state of Washington, 2 out of every 3 years are devoted to evaluation for the purpose of professional growth. Multi-
year growth goals replaced the unitary teacher evaluation system.

When considering teacher professional growth goals, Fenwick (2004) calls attention to the conflict between teachers and administrators when identifying appropriate goals. Her study presented significant concerns over goal-action planning in shaping teaching practice and knowledge development, and unclear links between professional development goals and practice. Professional learning should be linked to the districts core visions and the public demands for professional accountability and measurable competency.

Those conditions and policies needed to incorporate teachers' learning into their daily work are presented in a report by Renyi (1996). This report presents the concept of creating a learning organization totally devoted to improving instruction and student achievement. The author suggests that the system in place in most schools today separates expenditures on teachers' learning from expenditures on teachers' instructional work. The goal is to integrate learning into the job of teaching. Teachers developing professional growth plans should keep in mind how these goals might influence student learning by
developing measurable goals. It is essential that school districts provide their teachers with the time and resources necessary for professional development.

Understanding the process by which teachers grow professionally and the conditions that support and promote that growth is presented in a model by Clarke and Hollingsworth (2002). They looked at empirical studies of growth models (Guskey, 1986; Clark & Peter, 1993; Hollingsworth, 1999) and suggest that some growth networks are more prevalent than others. The data they collected to date indicates that the teachers studied have exhibited professional growth through a variety of growth networks and professional growth must be linked to professional development opportunities. This interconnected model involves teacher change as a learning process and suggests the possible mechanisms by which learning might take place. Using Guskey's (1986) model of the process of teacher change, they developed an interconnected model of growth networks that identifies the specific mechanisms by which a change in one domain is associated with a change in another (see Figure 3).
The authors found that teacher professional growth can occur through a variety of networks and suggest that "professional development programs should be deliberately designed to offer participants the opportunity to enact change in a variety of forms and change sequences consistent with individual inclinations" (p. 962).
Fenwick (2004) conducted a qualitative study on the mandated use of teacher professional growth plans in the province of Alberta, Canada. The benefits described in this study included teacher commitment to their own professional development; increased teacher focus, accountability and collegiality; and teachers' self-affirmation. Concerns surfaced over goal action planning in shaping teacher practice and the development of new knowledge. There appeared to be unclear links between professional development goals and practice. An on-going conflict that tends to exist over the use of professional growth goals in a professional growth plan is the administrators suggested goals for improvement and the teachers self-defined goals for improvement. "A fine line appears to exist between honoring teachers' own identification of what they need and making suggestions to them. Administrators indicated some discomfort in balancing the need they understood to support teachers' goals and to direct them to 'appropriate' goals for a professional learning plan" (Fenwick, 2004, p.16). Danielson and McGreal suggest a professional growth plan purpose statement might state:

The purpose of the professional growth track is to
provide a structured, supportive and collaborative environment to promote professional learning that will further the district’s mission and enhance student learning. This track will provide a continuous cycle of assessment to ensure that all tenured staff continue to meet the district’s standards for effective teaching. (p.100)

The results of a survey of over 800 teachers indicated that American teachers judge the value of their professional growth by its effect on their students (Renyi, 1996). This report to the National Foundation for the Improvement of Education recommended educators need to put forth greater efforts toward making the changes we need to increase student success. Teacher professional growth plans that lack accountability for student achievement fall short of their ability to help students learn. Likewise, Koops and Winsor (2006) suggest that, in order for professional growth to contribute to a learning environment, teachers must be encouraged to step out of their comfort zones and add new teaching methods and material to their repertoire: "Evaluation must be a continuing, constructive, and cooperative process between a
teacher and his or her supervisor and aimed at the goal of providing quality instruction for students" (p. 2). They suggest that professional growth plans offer supervisors the opportunity to reinforce teacher strengths and recommendations for improvement, and suggest courses and conferences to help teachers develop new classroom strategies.

Teacher Portfolios

The teacher portfolio is a medium for teachers to track and document their accomplishments and professional growth throughout their teaching career. Bergen (1993/1994) referred to portfolios as performance-based, authentic assessments because they involve collecting information from real-life situations. Campbell, Cignetti, Melenyzer, Nettles, and Wyman (2004) define a teacher's professional portfolio as more than a collection of personal artifacts. They refer to the portfolio as being an organized, goal-driven documentation of professional growth and competence that presents tangible evidence of a teacher's knowledge and skills. This form of data is considered an authentic method of teacher assessment. Xu (2004) defined the
primary goal of teacher portfolios is "to describe, through documentation over and extended period of time, the full range of a teacher's abilities and effectiveness" (p. 199). He goes on to suggest that teachers might organize their portfolios by including: their educational philosophy and role perception, an illustration of what has been taught, an illustration of their teaching strategies, an illustration of teacher/parent partnerships, and an illustration of what they have learned.

Three types of portfolios are described by Beck and Weiland (2001): employment, assessment, and learning portfolios. They suggest that the primary purpose of the learning portfolio is the professional development of teachers. Teachers developing a learning portfolio set learning goals, reflect on what they have learned, and highlight their growth and progress toward those goals. Educational professionals involved in a cohort group at the University of Wisconsin's Professional Development Learning Community program use a portfolio to document their learning throughout the program. The portfolio includes learning goals, artifact selection, portfolio reflection and portfolio presentation.
In a study conducted by Sawyer (2001), evaluators found when they included artifacts of some aspects of teaching in addition to classroom observations it provided them with a more complete picture of the teacher's performance.

Retallick and Groundwater-Smith (1999) reported on the professional development program of The Australian Federal Government that explored the possibility of teachers gaining credit for their workplace learning as documented in their professional portfolios. The portfolios included sources of evidence such as: school and classroom plans, student work samples, student evaluations of teaching, photographs, professional journal entries, notes and letters, video and audio tapes, reports, case studies, courses attended, and articles in professional journals (p. 56). At the end of the project, the authors found that there is little evidence to suggest that portfolios are being used at the postgraduate level.

Fasanella (2002) suggests that portfolios are reflections of teachers' skill, practice, and learning style. She recommends the portfolio components include the teacher's philosophy of education, personal goals, summaries of in-services attended, the objectives and an action plan for achieving the school goals for the year,
and administrative recommendations on artifacts. King (2003) advises districts considering use of portfolios in their teacher evaluation process to clearly establish the portfolio criteria or risk that the portfolio could become "a clumsy collection of teaching artifacts that shows little relationship to critical teaching tasks or teacher reflection" (p.39). She suggests that more attention needs to be given to whether or not there is a link to student achievement in any teacher evaluation process.

At Massey University College of Education (MUCE) in New Zealand, educators have described reflective portfolios as a useful tool in assessing the progress of pre-service teachers in the graduate school of education. Jorgenson and Hansen (2004) documented the developments of the teacher portfolio process at MUCE from 1996 to 2003. The process began as a journal of professional growth that was documented through reflections supported by evidence. The requirements for the content of the portfolios were very prescriptive. The authors found that the portfolio revision process was very effective: "reworking the portfolio helps both the student and the tutor to identify problematic areas and to reach a consensus as to how to address them" (p.8). They also found that the use of best
practice exemplars resulted in continued improvement in portfolio quality of pre-service teachers. It was concluded that learning outcomes for each portfolio should be assigned and teachers should be accountable for addressing these outcomes.

In his manual for teachers, Glatthorn (1996) describes how teachers can assemble a portfolio for accountability and assessment. He set 10 standards for documenting teacher professional growth in a portfolio as shown in Figure 4. As a tool for professional development, his constructivist process is growth oriented and might be useful for teachers as professional learners. The development of a teaching portfolio is time consuming and requires teachers to be organized and focused on the task as a formative process. If implemented carefully, the portfolio process can foster a collaborative environment between teachers and colleagues and teachers and their administrators. Participating in the 360-degree process can also provide teachers with additional professional growth information to include in their portfolios.
In her review of the work of the National School Reform Faculty (NSRF), Cushman (1999) presented the benefits of reflective scrutiny of the work of educators in portfolio form. The NSRF gathered 800 participants to form "critical friends groups" made up of teachers and administrators who used the portfolio format to present, examine, and reflect on their own work in the context of predetermined portfolio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 1</th>
<th>Standard 2</th>
<th>Standard 3</th>
<th>Standard 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of subject</td>
<td>Learning and human development</td>
<td>Adapting instruction</td>
<td>Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artifacts: Workshops Transcripts</td>
<td>Artifacts: Anecdotal records Teacher constructs</td>
<td>Artifacts: Student contracts Media competence</td>
<td>Artifacts: Simulations Group work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 5</th>
<th>Standard 6</th>
<th>Standard 7</th>
<th>Standard 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivation and management</td>
<td>Communication skills</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artifacts: Case study Philosophy</td>
<td>Artifacts: Essay Research paper</td>
<td>Artifacts: Unit of study Field trip details</td>
<td>Artifacts: Rubric Peer critiques</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 9</th>
<th>Standard 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artifacts: Goals Interviews</td>
<td>Artifacts: Volunteering Awards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4. Ten standards for documenting teacher professional growth in a portfolio. (Glatthorn, 1996)
standards for adult and student learning. Participants look collaboratively at student work presented in the portfolios and become "reflective practitioners" as they turn their schools into learning communities. The portfolios are used as a medium to construct their own learning from a cycle of experience and reflection. The portfolios become evidence of professional growth in conjunction with peer coaching "to inform our work together as we look at student work and at our own practice" (Louth, as cited in Cushman, p. 748).

In her discussion on the use of professional portfolios in higher education student affairs practice, Denzine (2001) provides several questions for reflective thinking, for example:

1. Why did you include this artifact in your portfolio?
2. How did the activity help you learn something new?
3. What did you learn from this experience?
4. What strengths are demonstrated in this portfolio item?
5. In regards to this activity, would you do anything differently if you had more time?

6. What knowledge and/or skills were you required to use?

7. How would you rate your overall performance related to the activity?

8. How does this activity help you translate theory-to-practice?

Although peer evaluation and feedback are useful, the most important aspect of portfolio development is self-evaluation and critical reflection (p. 503).

Peer Review

Peer review or peer coaching was defined by Hargreaves (1994) as “a structured process for teachers to work together, usually in pairs, to improve practice” (p. 204). In their review of peer review literature, Kumrow and Dahlen (2002) found that the peer review process existed in relatively few school districts across the nation at that time. They cite results from a survey conducted by the American Federation of Teachers (1997) finding 77% of the
respondents favored peer evaluation for new teachers and 63% favored similar programs for poor performing tenured teachers. The authors mention two major drawbacks of the peer review process: (a) the expense involved which includes salary and benefits of experienced teachers to serve as reviewers as well as clerical expenditures, and (b) failure to hold poor performers accountable. They suggest that peer review programs will continue to fall short of goals and expectations until accountability is incorporated.

Peer review is a more extensive process than the traditional summative evaluation process using a standard checklist of teacher behaviors. Osburne and Purkey (1995) commented that the peer review process as conducted in the United States has traditionally been used as a vehicle to provide feedback to teachers on their strengths and weaknesses so they can make improvements. Pagani (2002) suggested that peer review be used to assess performance to help individuals improve their performance and ensure standards are being met. Identification of best practice can be shared with others when utilizing peer review as a tool for change.
Fiege and Dollase (2002) conducted a longitudinal study with 46 teachers in seven primary schools. These teachers received 9 to 10 sessions of peer-group supervision training. All seven groups showed satisfaction with peer-group supervision although those groups who experienced less success in their training were also less satisfied in some variables of the process. The authors point out that satisfaction however, is an unsure indicator for the success of this intervention and not a guarantee that participants will actually use what they have learned.

Kohut, Burnap, and Yon (2007) found that both the observers and observed in their study valued the peer observation process and they believed that the peer observation reports were valid and useful. It was noted that the observers felt more stress, (though minimal) about peer observations than the observed did.

In his study on whether or not peer observation enhanced teaching skills more than administrative evaluation, Munson (1998) found that the peer review process offered teachers more constructive feedback about their teaching. The teachers in this study also found the
peer observation process helpful in developing collegiality within the faculty.

There are few existing qualitative and quantitative studies focused on teachers' perceptions of the peer review process in public schools. There are however, many studies on the peer review process in colleges and universities (Beaty, 1998; Bernstein, Jonson, & Smith, 2000; Hutchings, 1996; Kohut, Burnap, & Yon, 2007).

In the study conducted by Kohut et al. (2007), both the observers and observees reported that they valued the peer observation process. The results indicated faculty trust in this process. The faculty reported that they were provided with suggestions for improvement and ideas for alternate teaching methods. Neither the observers nor the observees found the peer review process to be stressful.

Bernstein et al. (2000) found no significant or consistent changes in the attitudes of faculty members toward learning or in teaching methods after participation in the peer review process. "However, about a third of the participants made significant changes in some individual component of their teaching, and they typically attributed their decision to initiate change to the process of peer
review" (p. 81). The authors mention that even though there was enthusiasm for the process, only a minority of participants actually changed their teaching practices.

Lomas and Nicholls (2005) describe the main objectives of peer review as being (a) to help academics examine their teaching for the purpose of self-improvement and (b) to establish good practice as a means to enhance student learning. Their study included interviews with over 100 participants among other documents. The results of the interviewing process provided general perceptions of the peer review of teaching:

'Peer review offers the opportunity for constructive criticism in an informal and supportive environment.'

'Peer review is a time when you can reflect on ways of improving your teaching.'

'We should have started the peer review process earlier as it is so valuable. (p. 146)

In their study of evaluating the quality of teaching and learning, Douglas and Douglas (2006) found that the participating teaching staff indicated very little faith in student feedback questionnaires and they participated
reluctantly in the peer review process. The authors conclude with recommending that "in order for these processes to be successful, it is necessary to create a culture of criticism in which staff is aware that any data collected is for the purpose of improving the quality of teaching and learning and not about the assessment of teachers" (p. 12). In his study of collegiality, Wallis (2006) also found that in order for collegiality to be effective, a norm of collegiality must be nurtured at the school level if collegial practices, such as peer coaching are to be effective. Showers and Joyce (1996) explained that teachers who shared aspects of teaching, planned together and pooled their experiences, practiced new skills and strategies more frequently, and applied them more appropriately then did their counterparts who worked alone.

A study conducted at Staffordshire University reported on an evaluation of two systems of the peer review process. Hammersley-Fletcher and Orsmond (2004) compared the peer review process implemented by the School of Law to the process implemented by the School of Sciences. In the School of Law, experienced teachers were asked to volunteer as peer observers. They received training in the peer observation process which was reported to be unsuccessful.
New observers were subsequently trained by shadowing the experienced observers: "a focus group was set up of all the peer observers and they talked about the problems they were facing and the things that needed to be changed" (p. 493). In the School of Sciences, a system of trios was implemented. In this system, three teachers assume the roles of observer and observed. The focus of this system is on the "sharing and encouragement of good practice in the support of student learning" (p. 494). The authors refer to Gosling's (2000) peer review model, "that can be beneficial for all through the development of joint reflection and discussion" (p. 494). In the School of Law and the School of Sciences, participants stated they get more out of observing than being observed. Participants in both schools support the need for a structured process with timely reflective follow-up sessions. Participants in both schools commented that the process was not seen as contributing to wider school developmental initiatives.

In order for peer review/coaching to be successful, Prystash (2003) recommends that administrators have a firm understanding of teacher perceptions in order to be in a better position to provide the necessary support that will bring success to peer coaching. "Administrators must
provide training for teachers and empower teachers to make decisions about the evaluation process" (p. 156).

It is interesting to note that in the Cincinnati school system, more people have been recommended for non-renewal through peer review than administrator evaluation (Kraus as cited in Toch & Rothman, 2008). The authors also indicate that 90% of the Toledo Federation of Teachers support the peer-review system, even though the program violates the teachers union principle that only management should evaluate labor. They go on to state that "unions deny their members an opportunity to grow professionally when they oppose comprehensive evaluation systems" (p.17). This supports the earlier findings of Kersten and Israel (2005) who found the impact of teachers unions a significant impediment to effective teacher evaluation in that a number of school districts' collective bargaining agreements were found to limit the scope and substance of teacher evaluation.

360-degree Feedback

Empirical research on the use of the 360-degree feedback process is quite limited even though many large corporations, businesses, and post-secondary educational institutions have used it for many years. Some
organizations employ this feedback process for evaluative purposes while other organizations focus the process on leadership, coaching, and professional development. Waldman and Atwater (1998) list the companies that have used 360-degree feedback to include AT&T, Bank of America, Ben & Jerry's, Disney, Exxon, IBM, Levi Strauss, Xerox, and Colgate Palmolive, among others. From these examples, the authors have found that 360-degree feedback can help accomplish a variety of goals, including leadership development, culture change, and increased participation.

According to Lepsinger and Lucia (1997), companies such as IBM have incorporated feedback from direct, multi-source reports because "several studies substantiated the hypothesis that the perceptions of direct reports were accurate and had a positive impact, once the manager learned how others perceived him or her" (p.7).

Antonioni (2000), reported that the BioTech Corporation formed a 360-degree feedback project team to redesign their the 360-degree process. This team was faced with two challenges:

The first challenge the company faced was to design a developmental 360-feedback process that would help company hold employees accountable for making needed
improvements. The second was to figure out how to use multisource assessments to evaluate each individual’s productivity and results in a way that would make the data available for use in annual performance appraisals. (p.7)

They focused on core competencies such as leadership, communication, innovation, ability to manage and ability to engage in teamwork. This BioTech team developed rating procedures that clarified and assessed desired work behaviors and one that clarified and assessed work results. Raters know that individuals will be held accountable for making improvements based on the ratings. Those employees, who did not improve low-rated behaviors after two rating periods, were required to develop action plans with defined corrective goals. The company also provided training and coaching to those employees. The managers claim the process is currently working and accepted by employees.

At the University of Minnesota, Bland, Armstrong, and Vallianos (1994) studied the assessment of academic administrators utilizing colleague feedback. The participants in this study reported that they gained valuable insight toward the development of leadership skills from the feedback provided by their colleagues.
Some studies have found that the reliability and consistency of feedback can be compromised when it is used for evaluation rather than development (Fletcher & Baldry as cited in Mabey, 2001).

Studying the participants' views of 360-degree feedback, Mabey (2001) found that respondents rated their experiences with 360-degree feedback as being more effective for addressing personal and team issues and in providing much more focused staff development activities than the traditional evaluation model.

360-degree feedback is being applied in many contemporary organizations as part of their managerial development programs (Dunnette, 1998; Greguras & Robie, 1998). The United Parcel Service (UPS) organization has been one of the corporations to use the 360-Degree Feedback process. This process is used to help the employer link individual development goals with those of the entire organization for the professional growth of UPS employees. UPS trainer, H. Z. Stith (as cited in Wells, 1999) developed a half-day training course offered monthly to train managers how to give and take feedback. After interviewing several human resource managers, Wells found that many managers do not know what to do with the feedback
they get and supervisors often do not know how to give productive feedback to their employees. "There's often too much focus on getting the feedback and mining the data and too little focus on using the feedback for job-related or behavior change" (p. 84). This is very similar to the administrator/teacher supervisory relationship where the data collected consists simply of checkmarks on a list followed by several comments and placed in a personnel folder.

Mabey (2001), utilizing both qualitative and quantitative approaches, found that both the interviews and questionnaire data revealed 360-degree feedback had a transforming effect on the self-development of managers. He recommended that organizations considering the use of 360-degree feedback, as with other human resource interventions, keep in mind that "relevance, recognition and routinisation are important factors in programme success" (Meuller, as cited in Mabey, 2001, p.51).

Demirkaya (2007) warns that trust is crucial in the 360-degree performance evaluation because there are many evaluators involved. The findings from this study indicated that most of the employees had little trust in the 360-degree process as participants "did not believe the results
were utilized in management processes... they insisted that the evaluation criteria had not been accurately determined, that they were not objective, and that the evaluator's personal prejudices had a great influence in performance evaluation" (p. 232). The employees who found the process to be effective claimed the system gave priority to the corporate culture, the purpose had been clearly determined, performance interviews were conducted accurately and effectively, and they also felt the system was reliable.

Findings from a 3 year investigation (Atwater et al., 2007) show that those leaders who improved as a result of the multi-source feedback process, "were more likely to see subsequent changes in employee attitudes" (p. 303). Multi-source feedback can do more than just develop leaders; it can also have a positive ripple effect upon others in the organization. Two downsides of the process included (a) fostering defensiveness and (b) creating situations where leaders became overly concerned about pleasing their employees. Atwater (2007) states it is important that the goals of implementing multi-source feedback align with the organization's goals and personnel practices. Multi-source feedback has been designed and implemented as a developmental rather than an evaluative process. Gray-Smith
(2000) summarizes the use of multi-rater systems: "multi-rater systems provide more data than traditional supervisor-only evaluation systems on which to base performance improvement. The use of information provided by various groups would allow the school administrator a clearer picture of their job performance and allow improvement based on the information" (p. 54). For further research, she recommended to broaden the use of 360° feedback to include other positions in a school district beyond the administrative staff, such as teachers. Danielson and McGreal (2000) also mention that 360-degree systems are used extensively in the business world and have much to offer educational evaluation as well. Formal evaluations can be supplemented by parent, colleague, or student surveys. Receiving student and parent input is invaluable; however, it may sometimes be considered unreliable and one should realize that this source of input is based on perception and not necessarily fact. "It is worthwhile to remember that perception is caused by something; and, even though perception may not be factual, action is often needed to change it" (Manning, 1988 p. 147). Feedback from colleagues must also be used
cautiously as they may be affected by the halo effect or even revenge.

Koçak (2006) criticized the Turkish school system's supervisor only evaluation claiming they are not objective, reliable, or functional. He cites the 360-degree feedback process as being multi-faceted, multiple data-driven, transparent, functional, objective, valid, and reliable. The construct validity of his Teacher Performance Evaluation Inventory indicated that 23 items accounted for 71% of the total variability under 3 components: Field Knowledge, Teaching Skills, and Communication Skills. The internal consistency of these 23 items was found to be .97.

Student evaluations of teaching effectiveness have been studied for many years at the post secondary level and more recently at the K-12 level (Koçak, 2006; Manatt & Benway, 1998; Manatt & Kemis, 1997). Wilkerson et al. (2000) discovered that student ratings of teachers were the best predictor of student achievement on district-developed, criterion-referenced tests and showed the strongest positive relationship to student achievement when compared with those of principals and teachers (p.179). In this same study, the researchers were disappointed to find
that neither the principal ratings nor principal summative evaluation showed a significant relationship to student achievement in reading. "Students provided more valid feedback than teachers or principals if student achievement is the validity measure" (p. 187). A profile analysis conducted by Marsh and Bailey (1993) concluded that "instructors have distinct profiles of strengths and weaknesses that are highly generalizable and that students are apparently able to discriminate their instructors' strengths and weaknesses" (p.11). The validation study performed by Wilkerson et al. found that students provided more valid feedback than teachers or principals when the measure is student achievement. Wilkerson's earlier study (1997) indicated that the best predictor of student achievement was the student ratings of teacher effectiveness rather than the principal's evaluation. The National Ministry of Education in Turkey conducted a study of 467 teachers, 346 principals, and 813 superintendents. The results showed that most participants indicated that teachers performance evaluations should be built upon multiple data sources including superintendents, other teachers, students, the teacher himself/herself, and parents (Kocak, 2006).
Claiming the overarching purpose of teacher performance evaluation is to improve performance, Manatt and Kemis (1997) state that this "ceremonial" approach does not meet this expectation. They recognize public school districts taking on the challenge of creating 360-degree feedback for educators. They are convinced that done right, this process can be the foundation to school transformation efforts. Dr. Manatt and colleagues from the School Improvement Model (SIM) project office at the University of Iowa have conducted the 360-degree feedback process for school districts across the country: Florida, Oregon, Arizona, and Wyoming. Teachers annually examine their 360-degree data sets to develop professional growth goals that are focused on improved performance for themselves and/or their students. Their progress toward meeting those goals are assessed by the building principal.

After participating in the 360-degree feedback process himself, Santeusanio (1998), Superintendent of Danvers Public Schools in Massachusetts, implemented the process with his administrators and teaching staff. He has found that those who participated in the process liked it and believe the process to make the performance appraisal
conference more meaningful. He points out that in his
district, the 360-degree feedback process has:

1. More precisely identified and measured standards
   for the superintendent, administrators, and
   teachers;
2. Stimulated collegiality and trust among
   administrators and teachers;
3. Shifted administrators' roles from judge and jury
   to coach and mentor; and
4. Led to specific behavior change for professional
   improvement. (pp. 31-32)

He cautions that the process can sometimes cause
administrators to become defensive but believes the process
will improve with experience.

Peterson, Wahlquist, Bone, Thompson, and Chatterton
(2001) improved upon their evaluation system by creating an
innovative teacher evaluation program that utilizes several
data sources including parent surveys, student surveys,
student achievement data, documentation of professional
activity, teacher tests, reports from administrators,
action-research results, and National Board of Professional
Teaching Standards certification. They suggest that
allowing teachers to choose which data to present for
evaluation is an important feature of their program. It was reported that 84.5 percent of the teachers in their district liked the new process.

Some concerns with the 360° feedback process have been previously noted: participants may feel singled out, participants may receive unconstructive or hazardous feedback, feedback may be delivered in an insensitive manner, and too much negative feedback may be delivered without on-going support and follow-up (Wimer, 2002). Cheney and Bremley (2007) identified six pitfalls in using multi-rater feedback: having ambiguous objectives, sending the wrong message, poor positioning, choosing the wrong instrument for the job, failing to develop an action plan following feedback, and lack of follow-through. Prior to implementation of the 360-degree feedback process, schools should take these issues and pitfalls into consideration.

The single source evaluative feedback provided during the annual performance review of teachers may not be the best way to identify teacher strengths and weakness. This process may not be the most effective way for teachers to develop and attain performance goals or identify staff development needs. When employees are observed from several angles however, they can develop a more complete
and accurate picture of themselves by reflecting on their own strengths and weaknesses. Since the multi-rater feedback process is becoming more popular as a human resource development tool, its use in school districts might also be beneficial. The 360-degree feedback method used for the professional growth of teachers may be another option for school districts' to consider for use in the annual performance review process.

Summary

The review of the literature presented a framework addressing the research questions on the effectiveness of the 360-degree feedback process in K-12 education in providing teachers with feedback to assist them in the development of professional growth goals and identifying professional development needs. This chapter presented an overview of current best practices in the annual performance review of teachers and provides a rationale for breaking away from the traditional views of teacher evaluation. The 360-degree feedback process is a non-traditional alternative to the single source administrator feedback which may not be the most effective way to assist teachers in identifying professional growth and
professional development goals. The 360-degree feedback process has been used in organizations as a human resource tool and may be another option for use in the annual performance review of teachers.
Chapter III
METHODOLOGY

Overview

This chapter describes the research methodology used for the study. The chapter is divided into five sections which describe the setting, the methodology including instrumentation, data collection, and data analysis. A qualitative methodology was chosen to describe how a pilot project to introduce the 360-degree feedback process in a K-12 school district was implemented. Open-ended questions from pre and post surveys were also analyzed. A quantitative methodology was used to analyze the teacher participant's perceptions of the feedback they receive from the traditional single-source evaluation method to the feedback they received from the 360-degree process.

Setting

This pilot project took place in a large suburban district in the central Hudson Valley region of New York State which is representative of other New York State suburban school districts. In this district, there are
nine elementary schools, three middle schools and one high school with a total population slightly more than 10,000 students. There are 786 teachers currently employed in the district.

A pilot program to implement the 360-degree feedback process in collaboration with RISE at Iowa State University was implemented in the fall of 2007. Twelve initial volunteers were selected by a random sampling method. A table of random numbers was used (Witte & Witte, 2007) to identify the first 12 participants from the district data base of personnel. This was stratified by gender and grade level. After the first 12 participants completed the process, 15 additional participants volunteered to participate in the process. Teachers were permitted to participate in the process at any time during the school year. The 2007 pilot project was completed with 27 participants. Students, parents, and colleagues completed surveys provided by RISE consultants at the University of Iowa. The results of the survey responses were confidentially provided by RISE staff to each participating teacher who considered using the feedback to develop future professional growth plans.
Methodology

This descriptive study utilized a non-experimental, quantitative and qualitative design to compare teachers’ experiences with the traditional single-source feedback obtained from the summative annual performance review process to the feedback obtained from the 360-degree feedback process. A qualitative methodology addressed Research Question 1: How was the 360-degree feedback program implemented in a New York State suburban school district? The qualitative analysis was conducted by analyzing the open ended questions included on all surveys to further address each research question. A quantitative analysis was conducted based upon the responses obtained from the pre and post study surveys completed by the 27 teachers participating in the pilot project. These responses attempted to address the remaining 4 research questions:

To what extent does the traditional single-source feedback method of evaluation provide useful feedback to teachers?

To what extent does the 360-degree feedback model provide useful feedback to teachers?
To what extent does the 360-degree feedback model compare to the traditional single-source feedback model toward assisting teachers in developing professional growth goals?

To what extent does the 360-degree feedback model compare to the traditional single-source feedback model toward assisting teachers in developing professional development needs?

This detailed description of how the 360-degree feedback process was implemented in a K-12 district and the analyses of survey responses provides information that can assist other school districts with the implementation of the 360-degree feedback process as an option in the annual performance review of teachers.

RISE, an action research center at Iowa State University, provided surveys and data sets to this participating district. Team feedback for evaluation has been investigated for three decades at Iowa State University. The previous research of Dr. Richard Manatt has been cited in more recent works on the use of 360-degree feedback in K-12 education (Kocak, 2006; Smith, 2000; Wilkerson, 1997). Research on the use of the 360-degree feedback is limited in the field of K-12 education and is
recommended for further study by the authors cited above. Based upon the previous use of the Iowa State model and research recommendations, this approach to studying the use of the 360-degree feedback process in public education was the most suited approach for this project.

**Instrumentation**

The 360-degree feedback pilot project utilized teacher-to-teacher, parent-to-teacher and student-to-teacher feedback questionnaires provided by RISE (see Appendix A). Participating teachers also completed electronic pre and post study questionnaires comparing 360-degree feedback with traditional single-source evaluative feedback (Gray-Smith, 2000; see Appendix A). All surveys utilize a Likert scale for responses: 1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Disagree, 4 = Strongly Disagree. The majority of the items adopted for use on the feedback instruments were selected from the pool of valid, reliable, and legally discriminating items identified in previous studies. The findings of previous research conducted by refining the survey questionnaires will be accepted for the purpose of this study (Omatoni, 1992; Weber, 1992; Wilcox, 1995; and Wilkerson, 1994). Each of the instruments had a Cronbach
Alpha reliability of +0.08 or better. The remaining items were developed by the local school district in response to local concerns, and therefore had not been previously tested for validity or reliability. The survey data was obtained from RISE for the pilot and will be analyzed for this study.

The school district’s professional growth plan (PGP) and formal observation forms are the instruments utilized district wide for the annual performance review of teachers. The PGP is limited to tenured teachers who may choose this format over the formal observation checklist model as stipulated in the teacher’s union contract. Non-tenured teachers must be evaluated twice a year by the formal observation method. The formal observation checklist criteria are identical for tenured and non-tenured teachers. Tenured and non-tenured teachers participated in the 360-degree feedback process. Tenured teachers had the option of using their feedback reports to develop professional growth plans. Non-tenured teachers who participated in the 360-feedback process were also formally evaluated by their building administrator as per the teachers union contract with the school district. Both
the PGP and formal observation checklist include administrator feedback and recommendations. The 360-degree feedback process can provide another option available for the annual review of both non-tenured and tenured teachers.

Data Collection

During the fall of 2007 the 360-degree feedback pilot project was implemented in collaboration RISE staff. As part of the pilot project, 27 teachers completed a pre-study questionnaire (Gray-Smith, 2000) regarding the nature of feedback they received from the traditional teacher evaluation format. This survey was modified slightly from the original used at RISE and therefore has not been tested for validity and reliability. The pre-study survey was posted electronically for the participating teachers. Teachers responded to questions that were focused on obtaining their perceptions of the quality of feedback they receive from the current, single source evaluation method: The traditional evaluation system provides (a) feedback on the promotion of sound educational principles; (b) feedback on the effective performance of job responsibilities; (c) feedback on the fulfillment of the
district and school goals; and (d) feedback that promotes professional goals. Participants respond on a Likert type scale that they Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree to the survey statements.

The 360-degree consultant collected the parallel surveys from the students, parents, and colleagues of the participating teachers. Confidentiality and anonymity was maintained with all surveys collected for this project; respondents were asked not to write their names on the surveys. All adult surveys and student surveys (except the primary K-2 survey) utilize a Likert scale for responses: 0=Never; 1=Not often; 2=Sometimes; 3=Usually; 4=Almost always. The K-2 survey utilizes happy face, neutral face, and sad face icons.

The 25 item Parent Feedback to Teachers survey include statements such as: The teacher is available to meet with me about my child; The teacher helps motivate my child to work to my child's potential; My child learns in this classroom. This survey includes 7 statements under the heading Communication, 7 statements under the heading Classroom Environment, 6 statements under the heading Curriculum and Instruction, 2 statements under the heading
Assessment and Evaluation, and 3 statements under the heading Homework.

The Teacher-to-Teacher Feedback survey includes statements such as: My colleague willingly contributes ideas and observations that help our team/department improve; My colleague makes a positive contribution to students and school climate; My colleague speaks about students in a professional manner.

The questions on the Student Feedback to Teachers surveys vary between grade levels K-2, 3-6, 6-8, and 9-12. At the primary level (K-2) students are asked to respond to statements such as: I enjoy my school day; The work is not too hard for me, not too easy; it is just right for me; My teacher is fair with everybody. All other student surveys utilize the Likert scale described above. The Student to Teacher Feedback survey 3-6 includes statements such as: My school day is interesting; My teacher writes things on my papers that help me learn; My teacher lets us try new ways to learn. Statements on the grades 6-8 survey include: My teacher provides materials and resources that enhance learning; My teacher encourages me to evaluate my own learning, My teacher provides helpful feedback. The high
school (grades 9-12) Student Feedback to teachers includes statements such as: My teacher gives me feedback on my performance; My teacher is available to help me during class time and other times during the school day; My teacher looks at our work, as we are doing it, to see if we understand the lesson.

After the surveys were collected and electronically analyzed at the RISE office, confidential reports identifying teacher strengths and weaknesses were prepared for the participating teachers. The participating tenured teachers had the option to utilize the feedback reports to prepare their annual professional growth and professional development plan. Participating teachers assumed responsibility for the follow-through of their plan as they would with the traditional professional growth process. The non-tenured teachers proceeded with a formal evaluation as per contract; however they had the opportunity to utilize their feedback data to determine professional development needs. The participating teachers completed a post-study survey to compare the teacher's perspective of the 360-feedback process from the feedback they received on previous performance evaluations. For example, participants
were asked to respond to the following statement: The 360-degree feedback process provides: (a) feedback on the promotion of sound educational principles; (b) feedback on the effective performance of job responsibilities; (c) feedback on the fulfillment of the district and school goals; and (d) feedback that promotes professional growth. This survey was distributed electronically as was the pre-study survey.

Data Analysis

The null hypothesis ($H_0$): The 360-degree feedback process will not provide useful feedback as the single-source feedback of the traditional method of teacher evaluation was tested. A comparison of the 360-degree feedback system and the traditional single-source feedback evaluation was made conducting a frequency distribution to determine the number of times participating teachers responded agree or disagree on their questionnaires.

A paired t-test was used to test the difference between the two sample means to determine if the difference is significant. A frequency distribution shows the significance, mean, and standard deviation to organize and summarize the numerical data. The frequency accounts for
the number of responses for each survey item. The mean is a measure of central tendency arrived at by adding all the scores for the response and dividing by the total number. There were four choices: strongly agree valued as 1; agree valued at 2; disagree valued at 3; and strongly disagree valued at 4. The standard deviation provides an overall measurement of how much participants' scores differ from the mean score of their group (Pyrczak, 2006).

Since the population sample size was relatively small, the Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test was used to determine if the difference between the pre-study questionnaire and post-study questionnaire scores are greater than would occur by chance: 

\[ Z = \text{the smaller of } R_+ \text{ or } R_- \]

Summary

In the fall of 2007 a pilot project to obtain public feedback as an option for the professional growth of teachers was implemented in a large suburban school district in New York State. The Research Institute for Studies in Education at Iowa State University collaborated with this researcher on the use of the 360-degree feedback process as the format for this pilot project. Permission was granted from the superintendent of schools to use the
pilot project data for this study. Twenty-seven K-12 teachers participated in this project to provide their perceptions of the quality of feedback they receive from the traditional single-source evaluation method to the quality of feedback they received from the 360-degree feedback process. The survey instruments used for this project were provided by RISE and have been used throughout the country in K-12 education for several decades. This chapter described the research methodology, the setting, instrumentation, data collection and data analysis used for the study. Both qualitative and quantitative methodologies were used to analyze the teacher participant’s perceptions of the feedback they receive from each method.

Chapter IV presents the research findings, data analyses and study outcomes.
Chapter IV
RESEARCH FINDINGS
Overview

The 360-degree feedback process was implemented in a suburban K-12 school district as a pilot project to determine if this process could offer teachers a useful alternative to the traditional single-source summative evaluation method to improve instruction and ultimately student achievement. Teachers currently are evaluated annually using two options: an observation check list or a professional growth plan. Both options provide feedback from a single source which is the building administrator. Douglas and Douglas (2006) recommended a triangulation of information to monitor and manage the quality of education including the use of feedback surveys. Feedback from students, parents, and colleagues as well as the administrator can provide teachers with more insight toward professional growth than a single source evaluation model. As stated earlier, the Wilkerson study (1997), among others, indicated that student ratings of teachers were the best predictor of student achievement and showed the strongest positive relationship to student achievement when compared with those of principals and teachers.
This chapter summarizes the results of the data analysis for the research questions posed in this study:

How was the 360-degree feedback program implemented in a suburban school district?

To what extent does the traditional single-source feedback method of evaluation provide useful feedback to teachers?

To what extent does the 360-degree feedback model provide useful feedback to teachers?

To what extent does the 360-degree feedback model compare to the traditional single-source feedback model toward assisting teachers in developing professional growth goals?

To what extent does the 360-degree feedback model compare to the traditional single-source feedback model toward assisting teachers in developing professional development needs?

This non-experimental, descriptive study utilized both qualitative and quantitative methodologies to answer these research questions. Researchers at the Research Institute for Studies in Education at Iowa State University have been investigating team feedback for three decades. Dr. Richard Manatt and colleagues (1997, 1998) studied the use of 360-
degree feedback in K-12 education and researchers at RISE continue to consult with school districts across the nation (Arizona, Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Mississippi, Missouri, Wyoming, Colorado, Kansas, Texas, Wisconsin) as well as with other countries (Taiwan, Germany, Ethiopia). Riverhead, NY was the first and only other New York state school district to utilize this model. Based upon the previous use and research of the Iowa State model in public education, collaboration with RISE consultants resulted in the implementation of the pilot project in this suburban school district. RISE consultants provided all survey instruments, data processing, and data sets for this project as well as the confidential detailed feedback reports to participating teachers. RISE consultants also provided SPSS (Statistical Packet for the Social Sciences) data sets to this researcher for analysis. To protect the confidentiality of teacher participants, the RISE consultant assigned numerical values to replace participant names. Data sets listed each participant by number.

The qualitative data was provided by describing how the process was implemented in a K-12 school district as well as from the feedback responses to the open-ended questions
included on the surveys. The quantitative data was obtained from surveys completed by the 27 participants in the pilot project.

Qualitative Research Results

Research Question 1: How was the 360-degree feedback program implemented in a suburban school district?

In an effort to expand annual performance review opportunities in this district, this researcher requested and received permission to implement a district wide public feedback pilot project with the collaboration of consultants from Iowa State University's Research Institute for Studies in Education. District psychologists, social workers, and guidance counselors also assisted with implementing the project. The first step was to identify teacher participants for the project. A database of district teachers was provided to this researcher by the Office of Human Services and the table of random numbers was used (Witte & Witte, 2007) to identify participants for the project. This list was stratified by grade level and 27 teachers volunteered to participate in the project. Table 1 shows the percentage of teacher participants by assignment area. Of the participants, 22%
were teachers from the primary K-2 level, 29.6% were from the intermediate 3-5 level, 25.9% were from the middle school (6-8) level, and 4 participants were from the 9-12 high school level. Two participants were teacher support staff (special education, etc.) servicing one or more levels of education. All 27 participants completed the process and returned both pre and post study surveys.

The RISE consultant prepared the teacher-to-teacher, parent-to-teacher, and student-to-teacher surveys for distribution. This researcher served as a liaison between RISE consultants and district participants for distributing confidential survey packets. Participating teachers completed an on-line survey (Gray-Smith, 2000) in order to obtain their perceptions of the quality of feedback they receive annually from the traditional, single source method of teacher performance review (see Appendix A).

Ten of the 27 participants provided written comments regarding the quality of feedback they received from the traditional feedback process. A common theme emerges from these responses which highlight the lack of effectiveness of the traditional model to assist teachers in improving upon their weaknesses:
Weaknesses should be discussed...absolutely not punitively but as an opportunity for the teacher to become more effective to his/her students and the overall school community.

The greatest shortcoming of the traditional evaluation process is too little guidance toward improvement...there is insufficient advice given concerning how to improve weaknesses.

Feedback is often vague...one to two observations a year can not adequately reflect a teacher's capabilities or inadequacies.

The traditional process is not detailed in specific areas of strength and weakness such as areas of the curriculum that may be taught well as well as areas that need growth.

Comments on the traditional evaluation offer a springboard for discussion, but can be viewed as being negative rather than a tool to be used in mapping out a growth strategy.

Other comments related to the traditional observation process were critical of the process:

The traditional evaluation process is not effective in looking at what a teacher does on a daily basis.

Administrators vary greatly on their use of the evaluation.

My many positive evals (evaluations) and PGPs (Professional Growth Plans) had little relevance to or impact upon my educational practice... I have been complacent about my positive evaluations that are predominantly just as irrelevant and off-base.

A performance should be recognized as a year long process. Often we are given needs improvement on professionalism while we meet every aspect of being a professional on the evaluation. It has been very un-
clear these past few years and very little has been done to improve the climate.

Table 1

Percentage of Participants by Assignment Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This percentage had been rounded and therefore does not total 100%
*Other teaching staff participating might include special education, remedial, speech teachers etc.

Survey packets from RISE were then distributed to teacher colleagues, parents, and students of participating teachers.

Teacher-to-Teacher Feedback

The district database was also used to randomly select colleagues from the same building, level or subject area to complete confidential feedback surveys for participants.
(see Appendix A). Packets were sent by this researcher to potential feedback providers who were instructed to refrain from putting their names on completed surveys. Self-addressed return envelopes were included in each survey packet. Feedback providers were given a required date of return for their surveys. After the given deadline, all returned packets were sent to the RISE office at Iowa State University for data processing. Table 2 indicates the number of teacher-to-teacher feedback returns. A feedback return rate of 70.4% from colleagues was obtained from the K-12 participant population. The greatest return rate of 98% was from the 3-5 intermediate level colleagues compared to the lowest rate of return from the grades 6-8 and 9-12 colleagues, 36% and 59% respectively. Only 20 of the 56 surveys sent at the 6-8 grade level were returned, and only 19 of the 32 surveys sent were returned from the 9-12 level. Even though the sampling was stratified by grade and content area from the high school, being such a large high school of over 200 teachers, it is possible that teaching colleagues could have received a survey to complete for someone they do not work with from year to year making it difficult to provide feedback.
Table 2

Teacher-to-Teacher Feedback by Grade Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Sent</th>
<th>Returned</th>
<th>% Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage Total Colleague Return 70.4

*Other teaching staff participating might include special education, remedial, speech teachers etc.

Parent-to-Teacher Feedback

From the student class lists provided by the participating teachers, every-other student's parents were sent a feedback survey (see Appendix A) to complete; a self-addressed stamped envelope for return was included. Approximately one-half of the parents from each class were sent a packet from this researcher who labeled and stamped each envelope. Feedback providers were given a required date of return for their surveys. After the given deadline, all confidential returned packets were sent to the RISE office at Iowa State University for data processing. Despite the relatively high return rate from
the total parent population (64.2%) receiving feedback surveys to complete, the returns from the parents of the middle level grade 6-8 teachers were disappointing (29%) suggesting that some of these teachers did not receive sufficient feedback from the parents of their students to assist them in making informed decisions.

Table 3

Parent-to-Teacher Feedback by Grade Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Sent</th>
<th>Returned</th>
<th>% Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage Total Parent Return 64.2

*Other teaching staff participating might include special education, remedial, speech teachers etc.

The return data indicates that each grade 6-8 participating teacher received feedback from three or fewer parents. The high school return rate of 43% can be misleading. The data indicates that the 4 participating teachers received feedback from approximately 4 of the 10 parents receiving
feedback surveys to complete. One might surmise that the parents of elementary students are more involved in their children's school than the middle and high school parents are. The inclusion of self-addressed stamped envelopes did not result in a strong return rate of surveys at the grade 6-12 levels. Participating teachers suggested on their return surveys that: "having parents complete feedback surveys electronically placed on the teacher's web page, during conference days or open houses might have resulted in more parental feedback."

*Student-to-Teacher Feedback*

Participating elementary teachers provided their class lists and middle/high school teachers provided a class list from two periods of their choice. Participating teachers collected permission slips from the parents of the students in each class to obtain permission for their children to complete a feedback survey (see Appendix A). School support staff: psychologists, social workers, or guidance counselors from the appropriate buildings arranged time with participating teachers to administer student surveys while the teacher was absent from the room. Students who did not return their permission slips or whose parents did
not provide permission for participation were engaged in an alternative activity at the time of survey administration. Although a number of students did not return permission slips, only two parents district wide requested their children not participate in the classroom feedback survey activity. All students with parental permission present in class during the scheduled time for survey completions handed in a feedback survey. Support staff administering the surveys reported no difficulties with the process. Students were instructed to refrain from putting their names on the survey. Survey administration time for grade K-2 students was 15-25 minutes; administration time for all other grades was 5-10 minutes. Support staff returned student surveys in the confidential return envelope provided. All confidential returned packets were sent to the RISE office for data processing.

Project Completion

After receiving all packets, RISE consultants prepared and sent a confidential feedback report to each participating teacher. Each participant had the option to use the feedback to develop professional growth goals and
identify professional development needs for the following school year. Two weeks after receiving their feedback packets, teacher participants completed an on-line survey (see Appendix A) in order to obtain their perceptions of the quality of feedback they received from the 360-degree feedback process.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Feedback by Each Grade Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Participating Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KG2 6 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 8 208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8 7 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12 4 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other* 2 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 27 529</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage Total Student Return 100

*Other teaching staff participating might include special education, remedial, speech teachers etc.

Ten of the 27 participants provided written comments regarding the quality of feedback they received from the 360-degree feedback process. Many of the comments included on the surveys were critical of the process:
I felt colleagues that I work with should have been asked to complete the survey as well as a random selection of fellow teachers...2 parent responses do not adequately represent what I do in my classroom...a larger sample would have been more helpful.

...there were too few participants who responded...some questions were answered by only one or two participants...I feel the small sample size compromises the validity of the study.

Questions on the survey were irrelevant to support services that take place in the resource room...questions did not apply to this class...questions should be modified.

I don't give homework so questions that do not apply are not helpful.

Having an outside agency mediating didn't really enhance confidentiality (I know whose comments are whose)...it made the process slower and less focused on my content.

Positive comments included:

The student survey results were helpful.

The final reports from parents and other teachers were helpful, thank you.

I was pleasantly surprised by the results.

I really liked the process...I would like a survey instrument built into my teacher web account, class newsletter that is grounded in my context and pre-selected, targeted building or district goals.

The feedback was helpful...with some clear areas that I can improve.
Quantitative Research Results

Research Question 2: To what extent does the traditional single-source feedback method of evaluation provide useful feedback to teachers?

The surveys to evaluate teachers' perceptions of the traditional feedback method was designed by RISE researchers in 1999. The survey questions were positioned under four headings:

Promotion of sound educational principles.
Information provided by knowledgeable personnel.
Useful feedback reports.
Enhanced information.

These pre-study surveys were completed in the fall of 2007. The survey responses were rated on a Likert Scale:
1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Disagree, and 4=Strongly Disagree.

Response percentages of the traditional single-source feedback were obtained for the teacher surveys completed electronically as indicated in Table 5; all 27 participants completed the survey. The results of the survey detailed on Table 5 indicate that the teacher participants Agree or Strongly Agree that the traditional single source
evaluative feedback provides adequate feedback on all of the criteria except three.

Of the respondents, 55.6% believe that the summative reports provided by the traditional single source feedback do not adequately assist teachers in improving their job performance, 61.5% of the respondents believe that the traditional feedback process is not focused on student behaviors and 70.3% of the respondents do not perceive the traditional process to be focused on student achievement.

Table 6 presents the frequency distribution, the mean and the standard deviations for each of the statements on the traditional evaluation model "promoting sound educational principles" ranging from 2.230-2.296, the responses were between "Strongly Agree" and Strongly Disagree."

Table 7 shows the results for the traditional evaluation model under the second heading "information provided by knowledgeable personnel". The frequencies, means and standard deviations for the teachers perceptions of the supervisor only process meeting the criteria that feedback is given by knowledgeable personnel. Again the
Table 5

Participants Perceptions of the Traditional Single-Source Feedback Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Agree or Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Disagree or Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides feedback on the promotion of sound educational principles.</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides feedback on the effective performance of job responsibilities.</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides feedback on the fulfillment of district and school goals.</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides feedback that promotes professional growth.</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback is provided by personnel with the knowledge needed to identify strengths and concerns.</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback is provided on the effective performance of job responsibilities.</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback is provided to guide future professional development.</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports are practical for the improvement of job performance.</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengths are identified.</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaknesses are identified.</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instrument matches the job responsibilities of the person evaluated.</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process is focused on teacher behaviors</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process is focused on student behaviors</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process is focused on student achievement</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Completed Survey: 27 (100%)
Table 6

Frequency Distribution of Traditional Evaluation Perceptions: Promotion of Sound Education Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The traditional evaluation system provides:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. feedback on the promotion of sound educational principles</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.259</td>
<td>.6559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. feedback on the effective performance of job responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.230</td>
<td>.7646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Feedback on the fulfillment of the district and school goals</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.269</td>
<td>.7775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. feedback that promotes professional growth</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.296</td>
<td>.7753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
range was from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree."
One respondent reported that he/she Strongly Disagreed that the feedback provided through the traditional method is provided by people knowledgeable with the work. The range of means was between 2.037 and 2.444 indicating that overall, respondents perceived the feedback they receive from the traditional model is provided by knowledgeable personnel.

Table 8 indicates the frequency distribution results of the traditional method to "provide teachers with useful reports." Responses ranged from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree" with the means ranging from 2.038 and 2.555. One respondent Strongly Disagreed that the reports from the traditional method are practical for improving job performance and 3 respondents Strongly Disagreed that the traditional instrument matches the job responsibilities of the person evaluated.

The final statement on the survey asked respondents if they believe the traditional evaluation process focuses on teacher behaviors, student behaviors, and student achievement. Of the respondents, 88.9% reported that the traditional evaluation process is focused on teacher
Table 7

**Frequency Distribution of Traditional Evaluation Perceptions: Information Provided by Knowledgeable Personnel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Feedback is provided:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. by personnel with the knowledge needed to identify strengths and concerns</td>
<td>2.037</td>
<td>.6493</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. feedback on the effective performance of job responsibilities</td>
<td>2.259</td>
<td>.7121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Feedback to guide future professional growth</td>
<td>2.444</td>
<td>.6979</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

*Frequency Distribution of Traditional Evaluation Perceptions: Useful Reports/Feedback*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. With the traditional evaluation system:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. reports are practical for the improvement of job performance</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.6405</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. strengths are identified</td>
<td>2.038</td>
<td>0.5987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. weaknesses are identified</td>
<td>2.148</td>
<td>0.6015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. the instrument matches the job responsibilities of the person evaluated</td>
<td>2.407</td>
<td>0.7970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
behaviors, 88.5% respondents find the traditional process to focus on student behaviors. More striking is the perception that the traditional process focuses on student achievement: 29.6% respondents "Strongly Agree" or "Agree;" 70.3% of the respondents "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree." The frequency distribution for this criterion is listed on Table 9.

Research Question 3: To what extent does the 360-degree feedback model provide useful feedback to teachers?

The post-study surveys (360-degree feedback) were completed in the spring of 2008. The survey questions were exactly the same as the pre-study survey and positioned under the exact same four headings as the post study survey:

Promotion of sound educational principles
Information provided by knowledgeable personnel
Useful feedback reports
Enhanced information.

These survey responses were also rated on a Likert Scale: 1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Disagree, and 4=Strongly Disagree.
Table 9

Frequency Distribution of the Perceptions of the Focus of the Traditional Evaluation Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. The traditional evaluation process is focused on:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. teacher behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. student behaviors</td>
<td>2.730</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. student achievement</td>
<td>2.851</td>
<td>.948</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response percentages of the 360-degree feedback model were obtained for the teacher surveys completed electronically as indicated in Table 10. The post-study surveys indicate that the teacher participants "Agree" or "Strongly Agree" that the 360-degree feedback process provides adequate feedback on all criteria.
The survey results for the 360-degree feedback for the “promotion of sound education principles” were slightly more positive than the traditional feedback. The response range is from “Strongly Agree” to “Disagree”, the mean rating ranging from 1.923-2.115. Table 11 presents the frequency distribution, the mean and the standard deviation for the 360-degree feedback data. One can conclude that the 360-degree feedback model is perceived to “promote sound educational principles” better than the traditional single-source summative evaluation model.

Table 12 lists the frequencies, means and standard deviations for the teachers’ perceptions of the 360-degree feedback process meeting the criterion that “feedback is given by knowledgeable personnel.” The responses range from 2.000-2.230 indicates that respondents “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree.” As with the traditional model, one respondent found the 360-degree feedback model does not provide information by knowledgeable personnel. Neither model proved stronger than the other in providing information by knowledgeable personnel.
Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Agree or Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Disagree or Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides feedback on the promotion of sound educational principles.</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides feedback on the effective performance of job responsibilities.</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides feedback on the fulfillment of district and school goals.</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides feedback that promotes professional growth.</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback is provided by personnel with the knowledge needed to identify strengths and concerns.</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback is provided on the effective performance of job responsibilities.</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback is provided to guide future professional development.</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports are practical for the improvement of job performance.</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengths are identified.</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaknesses are identified.</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instrument matches the job responsibilities of the person evaluated.</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 360-degree feedback process enhances the traditional system.</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process is focused on teacher behaviors</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process is focused on student behaviors</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10 (continued)

Participants Perceptions of the 360-Degree Feedback Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The process is focused on</th>
<th>66.7% Agree or Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student achievement</td>
<td>25.0% Disagree or Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Completed Survey: 27 (100%)

The ability of the 360-degree feedback to provide useful reports is provided on Table 13 which shows the results for this criterion. The participants perceive the 360-degree process to provide useful reports, and to identify strengths and weaknesses. One participant "Strongly Disagreed" that the instrument matches the job responsibilities of the person being evaluated. The 360-degree feedback model proved to be slightly stronger on this criterion than the traditional feedback model.

The teachers' perceptions of the 360-degree feedback process focusing on teacher behaviors, student behaviors, and student achievement are indicated on Table 14. The means ranging from 1.416-2.250. All of the respondents indicated they find the process to focus on teacher behaviors, 3 participants did not respond to this statement. Fifteen respondents believe the 360-degree model is focused on student behaviors, 8 respondents disagree. Of the participants, 22 "Agreed" or "Strongly
Agreed" that this model is focused on student achievement, where only 5 participants "Disagreed." The 360-degree feedback proved to be stronger in its focus on teacher behaviors, student behaviors, and student achievement than the traditional model.

Comparisons

A T-test for Paired Samples was performed to compare the means from the survey results of the traditional method to the survey results of the 360-degree feedback method and to determine if there is a significant difference between the means or if the differences are due to sampling errors created by random sampling.

Table 15 presents the means, t-scores, degrees of freedom and significance level of each of the survey items. There was a significant difference between the means of the pre-study and post-study survey on 7 of the survey statements. The 360-degree feedback model proved to be significantly better than the traditional model on the following criteria:

Providing feedback on the effective performance of job responsibilities (t=2.092, df=24, p=.047).

Provides feedback that promotes professional growth (t=2.518, df=25, p=.019).
### Table 11

**Frequency Distribution of 360-Degree Feedback Perceptions: Promotion of Sound Education Principles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. feedback on the promotion of sound educational principles</td>
<td>2.076</td>
<td>.6275</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. feedback on the effective performance of job responsibilities</td>
<td>1.923</td>
<td>.4835</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Feedback on the fulfillment of the district and school goals</td>
<td>2.115</td>
<td>.5883</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. feedback that promotes professional growth</td>
<td>1.923</td>
<td>.74421</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12

Frequency distribution of 360-Degree Feedback Perceptions:
Information Provided by Knowledgeable Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Feedback is provided:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. by personnel with the knowledge needed to identify strengths and concerns</td>
<td>2.230</td>
<td>.6516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. feedback on the effective performance of job responsibilities</td>
<td>2.038</td>
<td>.5987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Feedback to guide future professional growth</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>.6928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13

Frequency distribution of 360-Degree Feedback Perceptions: Useful Reports/Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. With the 360-degree feedback system:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. reports are practical for the improvement of job performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.192</td>
<td>.6939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. strengths are identified</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.961</td>
<td>.6621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. weaknesses are identified</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.038</td>
<td>.5987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. the instrument matches the job responsibilities of the person evaluated</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>.7483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14

Frequency Distribution of the Perceptions of the Focus of the 360-Degree Feedback Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Question</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. The 360-degree feedback process is focused on:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. teacher behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. student behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. student achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 360-degree feedback enhances the traditional system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feedback to guide future professional development (t=2.483, df=25, p=.020).

Provides reports that are practical for the improvement of job performance (t=2.391, df=25, p=.025).

The system is focused on teacher behaviors (t=2.846, df=23, p=.009).

The system is focused on student behaviors (t=2.806, df=21, p=.011).

The system is focused on student achievement (t=2.436, df=23, p=.023).

The differences on the remaining 7 criteria were found not to be statistically significant.

The Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test indicated the 360-degree feedback model provided participants with more actionable feedback than the traditional feedback model (see Table 16). The difference in all of these ranks is negative which indicates that the posttest scores (360-degree feedback), are ranked higher than the pretest scores (traditional single-source feedback model). The results on eight criteria were found to be greater than would occur by chance:

Feedback on the effective performance of job responsibilities (z= -2.00, p =.046).

Feedback that promotes professional growth (z= -2.29, p= .022).
Table 15

Paired Samples T-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a. Feedback on the promotion of sound educational principles</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>1.296</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. Feedback on the effective performance of job responsibilities</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td>2.092</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.047*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Feedback on the fulfillment of district and school goals</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.891</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d. Feedback that promotes professional growth</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>2.518</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.019*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Feedback is provided by personnel with the knowledge needed to identify strength and concerns</td>
<td>-.192</td>
<td>-1.044</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Feedback is provided on the performance of job responsibilities</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>1.659</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c. Feedback to guide future professional development</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td>2.483</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.020*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. Reports are practical for the improvement of job performance</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>2.391</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.025*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. Strengths are identified</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c. Weaknesses are identified</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d. The instrument matches the job responsibilities of the person evaluated</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>1.897</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. The system is focused on teacher Behaviors</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>2.846</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.009*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. The system is focused on student behaviors</td>
<td>.545</td>
<td>2.806</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.011*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c. The system is focused on student achievement</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>2.436</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.023*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .050 level.
Feedback to guide future professional development ($z = -2.27$, $p = .023$).

Provides reports that are practical for the improvement for job performance ($z = -2.20$, $p = .027$).

The instrument matches the job responsibilities of the person evaluated ($z = -1.99$, $p = .046$).

The system is focused on teacher behaviors ($z = -2.42$, $p = .015$).

The system is focused on student behaviors ($z = -2.44$, $p = .015$).

The system is focused on student achievement ($z = -2.01$, $p = .044$).

Each test is significant to the .050 level indicating these results are not just due to chance at that level. The results of the remaining six criteria also show the ranks as negative which indicates that the posttest scores (360-degree feedback), is ranked higher than the pretest (traditional single-source feedback model), however these results were found not to be significant at the .050 level.

Research Question #4: To what extent does the 360-degree feedback method compare to the traditional single-source feedback method toward assisting teachers in developing professional growth goals?
Table 4 shows that 66% of the respondents agree that the traditional feedback method "provides feedback that promotes professional growth," compared to 84.6% of respondents who reported the 360-degree process promotes professional growth. Based on the results of the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed Ranks Test, the difference in the ranks is negative: \( Z = -2.29 \), which indicates that the posttest score, the 360-degree feedback model is ranked higher. The teachers participating in the 360-degree process found it to be significantly more effective \((p = .022 < .050)\) in providing feedback that promotes professional growth than the traditional single source feedback method.

Research Question #5: To what extent does the 360-degree feedback method compare to the traditional single-source feedback method toward identifying professional development needs?

Referring to Table 4, 51.8% of participating teachers believe that the traditional single-source feedback method "provides feedback to guide future professional development." Again the participants found the 360-degree
Table 16

Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean Rank (traditional/360)</th>
<th>Z-Score</th>
<th>2-tail probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a. Feedback on the promotion of sound educational principles</td>
<td>7.5/9.1</td>
<td>-1.29</td>
<td>.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. Feedback on the effective performance of job responsibilities</td>
<td>6.5/7.1</td>
<td>-2.00</td>
<td>.046*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Feedback on the fulfillment of district and school goals</td>
<td>5.8/6.07</td>
<td>-.884</td>
<td>.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d. Feedback that promotes professional growth</td>
<td>6.0/7.9</td>
<td>-2.29</td>
<td>.022*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Feedback is provided by personnel with the knowledge needed to identify strengths and concerns</td>
<td>8.7/9.4</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Feedback is provided on the performance of job responsibilities</td>
<td>5.5/6.1</td>
<td>-1.60</td>
<td>.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c. Feedback to guide future Professional development</td>
<td>8.5/10.5</td>
<td>-2.27</td>
<td>.023*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. Reports are practical for the improvement of job performance</td>
<td>7.0/9.0</td>
<td>-2.20</td>
<td>.027*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. Strengths are identified</td>
<td>6.4/6.5</td>
<td>-.566</td>
<td>.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c. Weaknesses are identified</td>
<td>8.2/7.8</td>
<td>-.646</td>
<td>.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d. The instrument matches the job responsibilities of the person evaluated</td>
<td>8.8/7.7</td>
<td>-1.99</td>
<td>.046*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. The system is focused on teacher behaviors</td>
<td>.00/4.0</td>
<td>-2.42</td>
<td>.015*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16 (continued)

Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean Rank (traditional/360)</th>
<th>Z-Score</th>
<th>2-tail probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4b. The system is focused on student behaviors</td>
<td>4.5/6.9</td>
<td>-2.44</td>
<td>0.015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c. The system is focused on student achievement</td>
<td>11.6/9.5</td>
<td>-2.01</td>
<td>0.044*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .050 level.

feedback method to be better on this criterion: 76.9% “Agreed” or “Strongly Agreed” to this statement. The difference in the ranks is negative: Z = -2.27 p = .023 ≤ .050 which indicate that the posttest score, the 360-degree feedback model is ranked significantly higher. One can conclude that teachers who completed the 360-degree feedback process found that it was more effective in identifying professional development needs. In other words, the results are not just due to chance at that level of significance.

A final statement was added on the 360-degree feedback survey which asked respondents to provide their perception of the 360-degree feedback process as enhancing the traditional single-source feedback process. Table 17 presents the frequency distribution for this statement.
Four respondents "Strongly Agreed," and 18 of the respondents "Agreed," 5 respondents "Disagreed." Overall the teacher participants perceived the 360-degree feedback process enhanced the traditional evaluation system currently in use.

Table 17

| Frequency Distribution for the Perceptions of Enhancement of the Traditional System |
|-----------------------------------------|---|
| Strongly Agree                          | 4 |
| Agree                                   | 18 |
| Disagree                                | 5 |
| Strongly Disagree                       | 0 |
| Total                                   | 27 |

Chapter Summary

The data obtained for this study included both qualitative and quantitative analysis of survey responses to gain teachers perceptions of the feedback they receive from the traditional single-source evaluative feedback to the feedback they received from the 360-degree feedback process. Frequency distributions for all survey statements were provided as well as the results of the Paired Samples T-test and the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test to
determine if these differences were significant or due to chance.

The data presented in this chapter indicated that the participating teachers are somewhat satisfied with the traditional single-source evaluative feedback currently in use, but found the 360-degree process to be more effective especially in providing them with: feedback on the performance of job responsibilities, feedback that promotes professional growth, feedback to guide future professional development, reports that are practical for the improvement of job performance, an instrument that matches the job responsibilities of the person evaluated, a system focused on teacher behaviors, a system focused on student behaviors, and a system focused on student achievement.

The data and statistical analysis suggests that even though the participants in this study appear to be somewhat satisfied with the feedback they obtain from the traditional single-source method in use, they found the 360-degree process to be more effective on the criterion measured. Therefore the null hypothesis (H₀): The 360-degree feedback process will not provide useful feedback as the single-source feedback of the traditional method of teacher evaluation, is rejected.
Chapter V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This study investigated the use of the 360-degree feedback process as an option to the single source traditional evaluative feedback for the professional growth of teachers. Results from a 360-degree feedback pilot study were analyzed to determine the effectiveness of this process in a K-12 educational setting. This study sought to understand teachers' perceptions of the quality of feedback they receive from the traditional evaluative feedback to feedback they receive from a multi-source feedback process.

Summary of Research and Literature Review

According to Schmoker (2006), the single greatest determinant of learning is not socioeconomic factors or funding levels, it is instruction; teachers do make a difference. Instructional improvements begin in the classroom where teachers continuously work to improve based on knowledge gained from available data. Bedwell (2004) asserts if teachers make quality instructional decisions on
a daily basis, then instruction will improve. As noted earlier, Marzano (2003) stated that many researchers agree that the impact of decisions made by individual teachers is far greater than the impact of decisions made at the school level.

U.S. public schools were criticized by the National Commission on Excellence in Education in 1983. Their report "A Nation At Risk" claimed U.S. public schools are failing our nation's children and challenged the federal government to implement reform efforts. In response to that challenge, The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 sought to hold schools accountable by imposing mandates and regulations for school improvement. More recently Noguera (2004) presented criticisms stating "there is a pervasive, dismaying lack of "quality control" in schools, without which we have little reason to believe that schools will improve" (p.30). Improving instruction and employing effective accountability measures is a challenge for school leaders today. Several researchers have noted that school administrators do not have a common, formal mechanism to accurately gauge the content teachers are teaching or how effectively they are teaching it (Elmore, 2000; Evans, 1996; Marshall, 2005; Marzano, 2003).
A review of the research and literature on the teacher evaluation process for more than three decades criticizes current teacher evaluation methods (Aseltin et. al. 2006; McGreal, 1983; Peterson, 2000; Prybolo, 1998; Scriven, 1981; Thomas, 1979; Toch & Rothman, 2008). It has been suggested that school systems need to evaluate their teacher evaluation process in order to bring it into alignment with their mission, vision, values and goals as well as provide a meaningful exercise for both the principals and the teacher. Holland and Garman (2001) claim that there is little to no evidence supporting the claims that evaluative supervisory visits to classrooms support instructional improvement. They question the legitimacy of supervisory visits being a professional practice for improvement of instruction or a legally mandated practice for evaluation of teaching. Reeves (2006) also warns leaders that "effective and ineffective practices are the result not of random chance, but of deliberate choice" (p.166). The Kersten and Israel (2005) study found the current summative evaluation process to be too vague or too generic to be of any substantive use. Comments from administrators in their study reflect the lack of effectiveness of the traditional process:
The evaluation system is out of date and has not changed in decades;

The system is not comprehensive enough to have any real impact;

The criteria for ratings were inadequately defined and inconsistently interpreted; and,

Although a district-wide process is in place, it does not yield any meaningful feedback for teachers [italics added]. (p. 58)

Danielson and McGreal (2000) found six deficiencies in current teacher evaluation systems and provided recommendations for school districts toward the improvement of these systems. Danielson mentions the potential benefits of feedback from parents, teachers, and colleagues in this process. Saywer (2001) found in his study in Nevada, teachers complained that there was no collaboration and their evaluation process provided them with very little productive feedback. King (2003) suggested that K-12 school districts need to break away from traditional views of teacher evaluation by reviewing the research and literature and provide teachers with more options within this process. Included in her recommendations are such
options as professional growth plans based on measurable goals, peer review and coaching, professional portfolios and the use of 360-degree feedback process in the development of professional growth goals.

The idea that teachers performance evaluations should be built upon multiple data sources is supported in the literature by Kocak (2006), Douglas & Douglas (2006), Marzano (2003), Danielson & McGreal (2000), and Gray-Smith (2000). Danielson and McGreal recognize the value of 360-degree feedback systems as a data collection option in the teacher evaluation process. Student ratings of teachers show the strongest positive relationship to student achievement when compared with those of principals and teachers (Wilkerson, 1997; Manatt & Kemis, 1997; Manatt & Benway, 1998; Koçak, 2006). This is also corroborated by Peterson (2000) who found that data from student surveys and questionnaires can be highly reliable due to the large numbers of students as reporters. If the feedback process is done right, it can be the foundation to school transformation efforts (Manatt & Kemis, 1997).

There is very little research on the use of the 360-degree feedback process in K-12 public education. There have been several recommendations suggesting further study
of this process in schools, as it may be another viable option for districts to consider for the professional growth of teachers toward student achievement. The literature review provided insight to the history and processes of teacher evaluation and provided a framework for this study.

Methodology

This researcher used both qualitative and quantitative measures in a non-experimental survey design. Surveys were provided by the Research Institute for Studies in Education (RISE) at Iowa State University.

The research design and methodology had several limitations and delimitations. This study was confined to one suburban school district in the state of New York; therefore the results could not be generalized to any other group. Participant responses were based upon their personal experiences with the 360-degree feedback process compared to the traditional single-source feedback model. As with many survey studies, the return rate limited the amount of feedback obtained for teacher use.
Summary of Findings

This researcher served as a liaison for the participating district and consulted with RISE researchers at Iowa State University in order to implement the 360-degree feedback process. The pre-and post study survey statements were the same and positioned under four headings to obtain participants' views of the traditional feedback method compared to the 360-degree feedback method: (a) the promotion of sound educational principals, (b) information provided by knowledgeable personnel, (c) provides useful feedback reports, and (d) enhanced information. The findings from this study are based on the researcher's experience with the pilot project implementation, and a summary of the participants' responses to the survey statements and their responses from the open-ended survey questions.

Research Question 1

How was the 360-degree feedback program implemented in a suburban school district?

Researchers at the University of Iowa have been studying the use of 360-degree feedback in public education for many years (Gray-Smith, 2000; Manatt & Benway, 1998; Manatt & Kemis, 1997; Wilkerson, 1997). It was because of
this experience and expertise they were chosen to assist with the implementation of a pilot project in this school district. This researcher served as the liaison and received information, advice, and support from RISE consultants throughout the process via telephone and e-mail. The primary difficulty encountered during the implementation of the pilot was obtaining participants. Using the random sampling method to obtain teacher volunteers was very time consuming; approximately 1 in every 30 contacts responded positively. The others responded with comments such as “no thank you,” not at this time,” “I don’t think parents and students should be evaluating teachers,” “this is illegal,” “our contract prohibits parent evaluations of teachers,” “I was advised not to.” Smith, Ball and Lintos (1990) claim that the “adversarial nature between teacher unions and management—those groups united in the daily pursuit of education—are pitted against one another” (p.1). They remind readers that collaboration is not about being nice, but it involves changing roles and patterns of behavior. This is supported by Kersten and Israel (2005) who reported that administrators indicated the impact of unions and the pre-
dominant culture of schools are significant impediments to effective teacher evaluation.

The recommendations from Atwater's (2007) 3 year study suggested the multi-source feedback process must be embedded in the personnel practices of the organization and to implement the multi-source feedback as a developmental growth process not as an evaluative process. These two suggestions might help to prevent the defensiveness as noted above. Manatt and Kemis (1997) recommended that teachers can benefit by examining their 360-degree data sets to develop professional growth goals that are focused on improved performance for themselves and their students, this process need not be evaluative.

Despite some resistance, 27 participants took advantage of the opportunity and offered such comments as: "sure, I'd love to participate," "count me in," "I think this is a good idea," "I am eager to find out what type of feedback I get," "this is a good professional growth idea."

The 27 participants completed the pre-study electronic surveys, which results show a general satisfaction with the traditional evaluative feedback method. Participants do not feel the traditional method provides them with reports that are: practical for the improvement of job performance,
focused on student behaviors, or focused on student achievement.

Confidential survey packets were mailed out to parents including a self-addressed, stamped envelope for return. The parent survey return rate was quite a bit higher for the elementary level (K-2=80%, 3-5=88%), than for the middle and high school levels (6-8=29%, K-12=43%) despite the inclusion of self-addressed stamped envelopes. All confidential return packets were sent to RISE for data processing.

Building school psychologists, social workers and guidance counselors arranged time with the classroom teachers to administer student surveys. Classroom teachers dismissed themselves from the class and all students present on the day of administration completed the surveys unless they did not have parental permission. Students who did not return their permission slips did not complete a survey. A total of 529 students completed student-to-teacher surveys. Support staff administering the surveys placed them in confidential return envelopes to be sent to RISE for processing.

A random sample of colleagues from each participants building were sent a survey for completion which were
returned in a confidential envelope also sent to RISE for processing. The colleague feedback was also disappointing at the middle school level (36% return rate). This limited the amount of colleague feedback provided to the seven middle school participants.

The resistance noted above could possibly be a factor in the low teacher-to-teacher response. Demirkaya (2007) warned that trust is crucial in the 360-degree process and that personal prejudices may have an influence. The fact that defensiveness is often an issue is supported by Santeusanio (1998) who believes this improves with continued use of the 360-degree process.

At the RISE facility at Iowa State University, consultants processed all returned surveys. Individual confidential reports were sent to each of the 27 participants exclusively. District or building administrators or this researcher were not provided with a copy of these teacher confidential reports. RISE consultants provided this district with data sets for use with SPSS (Statistical Packet for the Social Sciences) for analysis. All participant names were replaced by numbers assuring complete confidentiality. Permission was granted
by the participating superintendent of schools to use these data sets for the purpose of this research.

Participants were given approximately 2 weeks to reflect upon their feedback reports prior to completing the post-study electronic surveys. Results of this survey showed the teachers were somewhat more satisfied with the 360-degree feedback than the traditional single-source evaluative feedback.

**Research Question 2**

*To what extent does the traditional single-source feedback method of evaluation provide useful feedback to teachers?*

There were no positive comments offered regarding the traditional method from the open-ended questions on the survey. The teacher participants report that the traditional method is not effective in looking at teachers' daily work. They also find that administrators vary greatly on how they use the formal observation process, the observation check list and the professional growth option. A shortcoming of the traditional method is that it provides little guidance toward improvement and feedback is vague. They find the processes to have little relevance or impact
on their educational practice and receive many irrelevant and positive evaluations. In other words, the participants in this study agree with Peterson (2000) that the vast majority of teachers find the traditional observation checklists less than professionally meaningful. Aseltine et al. (2006) also contend that this method rarely helps teachers make a direct link with their professional growth and student learning needs.

The pre-study survey indicated that the teachers are generally satisfied with the traditional method on most of the survey criteria. The results of the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test indicate that the traditional method is not as effective as the 360-degree method on all criteria. The traditional method was found to be significantly less effective on eight of the 14 survey criteria. Most disconcerting is that only 29.6% of the participants find the traditional method to be focused on student achievement.

Research Question 3

To what extent does the 360-degree feedback model provide useful feedback to teachers?
The most frequent complaint of the 360-degree process from participants was the lack of responses from colleagues and parents which was indicated in Tables 2 and 3. Another issue that surfaced was that some of the survey questions were inappropriate for a particular respondent, for example: "My teacher gives appropriate homework." Some teachers do not give homework therefore they believe this statement not to be helpful. A final criticism was the fact that having an outside agency involved with the process made the process slower than might have occurred if surveys were not sent out of district for processing.

Several positive comments about the 360-degree process were noted. Respondents generally liked the process and found the final report to be helpful, especially the student survey results. This supports the findings of Peterson et al. (2001) claiming that data from student surveys and questionnaires can be highly reliable due to the large numbers of students as reporters. It was noted that the process offered some clear areas that can assist teachers with improvement.

A Wilcoxon Matched-Pair Signed-Ranks analysis indicated that eight of the survey criteria were ranked significantly higher than the traditional method: feedback on the
performance of job responsibilities, feedback that promotes professional growth, feedback to guide future professional development, reports that are practical for the improvement of job performance, the instrument matches the job responsibilities of the person being evaluated, the system is focused on teacher behaviors, the system is focused on student behaviors and the system is focused on student achievement. Each test was significant to the .050 level indicating the results are not just due to chance.

Contrary to the traditional method, the 360-degree feedback process is perceived as being more focused on student achievement. Of the 27 participants, 66.7% agreed to this statement which was found to be statistically significant on the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed Ranks Test ($z= -2.01$, $p= .044$). The negative direction of the $z$ score represents the post-test results (360-degree). In light of this finding, one might conclude that the feedback obtained from the surveys provided teachers with information to improve instruction and therefore student achievement. Since the vast majority of the returned surveys were from students, one might conclude that student feedback has an impact on instruction. This data supports the statement by Wilkerson et.al. (2000): "students provide more valid feedback than
Research Question 4

To what extent does the 360-degree feedback model compare to the traditional single-source feedback model toward assisting teachers in developing professional growth goals?

The 360-degree feedback method was found to be significantly more effective in providing feedback that promotes professional growth $z = -2.29, p = 0.022$. The negative direction of the $z$ score represents the post-test results (360-degree). This finding supports the work of Smith who found the multi-rater system provides more data than the traditional method on which to base performance improvement.

Research Question 5

To what extent does the 360-degree feedback model compare to the traditional single-source feedback model toward assisting teachers in identifying professional development needs?
In the study conducted by Mabey (2001), respondents rated their experiences with 360-degree feedback as providing much more focused staff development suggestions than the traditional model. His findings are supported in this study as the 360-degree process was found to be significantly better in assisting teachers in identifying professional development needs $z = -2.27, p = .023$.

Discussions and Conclusions

Participants in this project were asked if the 360-degree process enhances the traditional system, 81.5% agree that this model indeed enhances the single-source traditional evaluation system. The 360-degree feedback process has been successful in organizations, but little research to date is available to determine its effectiveness in K-12 education. The results of this study suggest that this process has much to offer as an option in the annual performance review of teachers. This process along with data collecting and goal setting, professional growth plans, teacher portfolios and peer reviews are all options for district leaders to consider as they evaluate their current teacher evaluation procedures.
The participants in this project found the multi-source feedback process to be significantly more helpful than the traditional method in a number of areas, among them is developing professional growth goals, identifying professional development needs, and focusing on student achievement. Certainly student achievement must be at the forefront of the annual performance review of teachers. Manatt et al. (1997) claimed the overarching purpose of teacher performance evaluation is to improve performance. Based upon the outcomes of this study, the 360-degree feedback process is a viable option for consideration as schools leaders look to expand their teacher evaluation options toward improved student achievement.

Implications for Practice, Policy, and Research

Recommendations for Practice

Based upon the outcomes of this study, recommendations for practice include the following:

The 360-degree feedback process should be used as an option for the annual performance review of teachers.

School districts should consider discontinuing the use of
the word "evaluation" that suggests a top down, non-collaborative approach. Performance review and professional growth are among some of the alternatives to be considered.

Teachers and administrators should conference about the survey questions to be included on all surveys.

The confidentiality process should be maintained for all completing surveys.

Administrator should also complete the confidential survey as a colleague in the process.

Teachers should be the sole recipients of survey results to develop professional growth plans and professional development needs.

Teachers and administrator should pre-conference to discuss the professional growth goals and development needs. All goals should be specific, measurable, actionable, realistic, timely (SMART) and focused on student achievement.

Teachers and administrators should occasionally conference to determine progress toward goals.

Minimize the summative evaluation process and maximize the formative processes.
The traditional observation check list should be carefully reviewed and differentiated based on years of service, instructional level and/or content area. It should also include a rubric for scoring to improve consistency between evaluators as well as provide teachers with clear expectations for performance.

The traditional observation check list should not be the sole method of teacher annual performance reviews. One observation per year is grossly inadequate to guide a teacher's professional growth. A combination of methods must be considered.

Recommendations for Policy

New York State Education Department officials need to investigate the evaluation procedures used in schools today. Barth (2001) boldly stated “schools are not capable of improving themselves...they will never reform themselves. Only powerful outside presences will lead to that.” A school “at rest will remain at rest until acted upon by and outside force” (Newton as cited in Barth pp.xx, xxii). The fact that the majority of school districts in this county (61% of survey respondents) in New York State still rely on
the observation check list for the evaluation of teachers, lends credence to Barth's statement. New York state and others must insist the annual performance review of teachers' primary purpose is student achievement and hold teachers accountable by employing research based evaluation procedures. The New York State School Law Handbook (2002) requires school districts to develop a professional performance review plan in collaboration with teachers, pupil personnel professionals, administrators and parents selected by the superintendent. This plan must also describe how the district trains staff who perform professional performance evaluations in the use of good evaluation practices (8 NYCRR 100.2(o)(2) (iii) (a)(2) and 8 NYCRR 100.2(o)(2)(iii)(b)(5)). Districts in this state and others must be held accountable to these regulations.

The University should review supervision courses. Most are based on the old model of supervision and do not include options such as peer review, portfolios, 360degree feedback or a triangulation of methods.

District level policy makers need to employ several methods for the annual performance review of teachers. As previously suggested by Douglas and Douglas (2006), a
triangulation of information must be sought to monitor and manage the quality of education. The 360-degree feedback method has shown to offer promise as an alternative. Evaluation methods that promote collegiality between teachers and their administrators, colleagues, students, and their parents support a culture of learning and professional growth. Public education policy makers need to take a serious look at the political nature of school governance in relation to school culture and teacher unions. As pointed out in the Kersten and Israel (2005) studies, "these factors contribute to a culture that supports status quo and squashes risk-taking and innovation" (p.61). It is a conflict of interest when teacher unions control the evaluation process; districts need to exercise caution when negotiating the teacher evaluation process. Policies should call for methods that differentiate between non-tenured teachers and tenured teachers as well as content area teachers. Districts must tie staff development directly to student data and professional growth plans for teachers. Despite his harsh statement, Barth (2001) also encourages school districts by
stating "if the conditions are right a school can transform itself" (p. xxv).

Recommendations for Research

More school districts should pilot a similar study to provide information on the effectiveness of the 360-degree feedback process compared to the traditional evaluative methods in use.

What, if any correlation exists between the feedback process and student achievement? A study focusing on the survey items found to be effective toward improving student achievement would enhance this process.

Conduct a longitudinal study following teachers using the 360-degree feedback process and their students to determine the impact of goal development and professional development on student achievement.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the findings from this study provide insight into the use of the 360-degree feedback process in the public school sector. The process has been shown to provide participating teachers with reports that assist
them in developing professional growth plans, guiding professional development needs and feedback that focuses on student achievement. The benefits of 360-degree feedback for improving teaching and ultimately student achievement merits further research, piloting and implementation.
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Appendix A

Survey Instruments
APPENDIX A

Traditional Evaluative Feedback Survey
(Gray-Smith, 2000)

1. Traditional System
Please indicate your reaction to the traditional evaluation process provided solely by your administrator.

1. The traditional evaluation system provides:
   
   a. feedback on the promotion of sound educational principles. 
   b. feedback on the effective performance of job responsibilities. 
   c. feedback on the fulfillment of the district and school goals 
   d. feedback that promotes professional growth. 

2. With the traditional evaluation system, feedback is provided:

2. With the traditional evaluation system:

3. With the traditional evaluation process is focused on:

4. Please add any additional comments regarding your experience with the feedback obtained from the traditional teacher evaluation/PGP process.
Arlington Central School District
Teacher-to-Teacher Feedback

Teacher Name

Rating Scale
0=Do Not Know, Does Not Apply  1=Never  2=Not Often
3=Sometimes  4=Often  5=Very Often

1. My colleague maintains collaborative and cooperative relationships with fellow teachers.
2. My colleague participates in and supports team/departmental/committee decision making.
3. My colleague uses helpful avenues and methods to resolve workplace concerns or problems.
4. My colleague demonstrates caring and respect for her fellow teachers.
5. My colleague demonstrates a positive attitude in working with others in the school.
6. My colleague willingly contributes ideas and observations that help our team/department improve.
7. My colleague has helped me improve professionally. I am learning from this person.
8. My colleague shares ideas, methods and resources.
9. My colleague makes a positive contribution to students and school climate.
10. My colleague is receptive to new ideas.
11. My colleague is a good listener and values the ideas of others.
12. My colleague speaks about students in a professional manner.
13. My colleague does her fair share of our team/department/committee work.

COMMENTS

1. 1 1 2 2 2 3 3 3 4 4 4
2. 3 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
3. 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
4. 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
5. 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
6. 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
7. 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
8. 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3
9. 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
10. 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
11. 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
12. 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
13. 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3
14. 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
15. 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
16. 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
17. 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
18. 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
19. 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
20. 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
Arlington Central School District
Parent Feedback to Teachers

Teacher Name __________________________ Grade __________

Directions: The statements below are designed to find out your perceptions about your child's teacher and experiences in the classroom. Please answer all of the statements on both sides of this survey. Use a number 2 pencil to completely darken the bubble for your response.

0 = Never 1 = Not often 2 = Sometimes 3 = Usually 4 = Almost Always 5 = Do not know

Communication
1. The teacher is available to meet with me about my child.
2. The teacher communicates openly, honestly, and frankly with my child and me.
3. The teacher shares information with me in an understandable, friendly, non-threatening manner.
4. The teacher provides verbal communication, which is clear, concise, positive, and easy to understand.
5. The teacher responds to my communications in a timely manner.
6. The teacher keeps me informed of classroom activities and student progress.
7. I am satisfied with the opportunities I have for input and involvement in this classroom's activities.

Classroom Environment
8. Discipline is administered fairly in this classroom.
9. The teacher creates a feeling of unity and enthusiasm in this classroom.
10. The teacher treats all students fairly regardless of gender, race, and ethnicity in this classroom.
11. The teacher is concerned about my child as an individual.
12. The teacher encourages understanding and cooperation in this classroom.
13. The teacher helps motivate my child to work to my child's potential.

Curriculum and Instruction
14. My teacher's classroom is orderly and safe.
15. Educational programs are administered fairly in this classroom.
16. This classroom's curriculum is appropriate for my child.
17. The teacher holds a high expectation for my child's learning.
18. I know what is expected of my child in this classroom.
19. My child likes to go to this class.
20. My child learns in this classroom.

OVER→
Directions: The statements below are designed to find out your perceptions about your child's teacher and experiences in the classroom. Please answer all of the statements on both sides of this survey. Use a number 2 pencil to completely darken the bubble for your response.

0 = Never 1 = Not often 2 = Sometimes 3 = Usually 4 = Almost Always 5 = Do not know

Assessment and Evaluation
21. I am satisfied with the extent the teacher evaluates my child's progress in this classroom.
22. The teacher assesses my child in the manner in which my child best learns in this classroom.

Homework
23. My child should have homework in this class.
24. My child is given an appropriate amount of homework to help him/her succeed.
25. My child’s homework is meaningful which helps him/her succeed in this classroom.

Comments:
Arlington Central School District
Student Feedback to Teachers
Lower Elementary Questionnaire (K-2)

Name:

1. I enjoy my school day. 🙁 🙂 🙂

2. My school day is interesting. 🙁 🙂 🙂

3. I listen in class. 🙁 🙂 🙂

4. We talk about what we are learning. 🙁 🙂 🙂

5. The work is not too hard for me, not too easy; it is just right for me. 🙁 🙂 🙂


7. My teacher has work ready for us. 🙁 🙂 🙂

8. My teacher makes us follow the rules. 🙁 🙂 🙂

9. My teacher is fair with everybody. 🙁 🙂 🙂

10. My teacher wants me to keep busy in class. 🙁 🙂 🙂

11. I work in class even if the teacher is not watching. 🙁 🙂 🙂

Over
12. I can get help from the teacher when I need it.

13. My teacher tells me I do good work.

14. My teacher tells me where I can find information to help me.

15. My teacher is ready for class when it is time to begin.

16. I know what the teacher wants us to do.

17. My teacher is easy to understand.

18. My teacher has us learn hard lessons in small steps.

19. My teacher will explain new things in a way that is easy to learn.

20. My teacher tells us what new things we can learn.

COMMENTS:
Arlington Central School District
Student Feedback to Teachers
Upper Elementary Questionnaire (3-6)

NOTE TO STUDENTS: Please remember that completing this form is voluntary. You may keep this form if you decide not to participate.

Directions: The statements below are designed to find out more about your class and teacher. This is not a test. Do not put your name on this paper. Please answer all the statements. Students are not allowed to ask any questions during the survey.

Response Scale
0=Never 1=Not often 2=Sometimes 3=Usually 4=Almost always

1. My work is interesting.
2. My school day is interesting.
3. We go back over some lessons when we finish them.
4. If I don’t finish my work at school my teacher has me finish it at home.
5. My teacher provides material and resources that enhance learning.
6. My teacher writes things on my papers that help me learn.
7. My teacher makes me feel good when I do good work.
8. I can get help from my teacher.
9. I have enough time to finish my work.
10. I understand the rules and the consequences.
11. I know what to do with my time when I complete an assignment.
13. My teacher knows me well.
14. My teacher lets us try new ways to learn.
15. My teacher has us work at the right pace.
16. My teacher tells us what new things we can learn in each lesson.
17. My teacher will explain new things in a way that is easy to understand.
18. My teacher is available to help me when I need help.
19. My teacher uses a variety of classroom activities and learning materials.
20. My teacher is ready to teach each day.

COMMENTS:
Arlington Central School District
Student Feedback to Teachers Grades (6-8)

Name:

NOTE TO STUDENTS: Please remember that completing this form is voluntary. You may keep this form if you decide not to participate.

Directions: The statements below are designed to find out more about your class and teacher. This is not a test. Do not put your name on this paper. Please answer all the statements. Students are not allowed to ask any questions during the survey.

### Response Scale

0 = Never  
1 = Not often  
2 = Sometimes  
3 = Usually  
4 = Almost always

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>My teacher creates a classroom environment that allows me to learn.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>My teacher treats me with respect.</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>My teacher communicates high expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>My teacher provides opportunities in class to solve problems.</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>My teacher provides materials and resources that enhance learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>My teacher encourages me to discover my own questions.</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>My teacher demonstrates helpful strategies or skills for my learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>My teacher is knowledgeable about his/her subject area.</td>
<td>9.</td>
<td>My teacher provides opportunities to take responsible risks in our learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>There are opportunities to reflect on my learning in my class.</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>My teacher encourages me to evaluate my own learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>My teacher provides opportunities to get feedback from my classmates.</td>
<td>13.</td>
<td>My teacher allows for some individual choices, decisions, and learning activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>My teacher allows me to demonstrate my learning in a variety of ways.</td>
<td>15.</td>
<td>We use class time effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>My teacher provides for both individual and group work.</td>
<td>17.</td>
<td>My teacher evaluates my learning in a variety of ways.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>My teacher evaluates both my responsibility and effort.</td>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I get helpful feedback from my teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>My teacher gives appropriate homework.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS:
Name:

NOTE TO STUDENTS: Please remember that completing this form is voluntary. You may keep this form if you decide not to participate.

Directions: The statements below are designed to find out more about your class and teacher. This is not a test. Do not put your name on this paper. Please answer all the statements. Students are not allowed to ask any questions during the survey.

Response Scale  
0=Never  1=Not often  2=Sometimes  3=Usually  4=Almost always

1. The class work provided is interesting.
2. The students are asked questions.
3. The assignments given are related to the subject we are studying.
4. We discuss and summarize each lesson we have just studied.
5. My teacher tells us how we can use what we have already learned to learn new things.
6. My teacher maintains discipline in our classroom.
7. My teacher returns tests and assignments quickly.
8. My teacher gives me feedback about my performance.
9. My teacher knows a lot about this subject.
10. My homework helps me to learn the subject being taught.
11. My teacher makes materials and worksheets for us to use.
12. My teacher uses a variety of classroom activities and resources.
13. The films or videotapes we watch help us learn about the subject we are studying.
14. My teacher tells the class about library/media materials that will help us learn about the subject we are studying, when appropriate.
15. My teacher is well organized.
16. My teacher likes it when we ask questions.
17. We work in different groups depending upon the activity in which we are involved.
18. My teacher encourages us to look at problems in new ways and find new ways to solve problems.
19. My teacher is available to help me during class time and other times during the school day.
20. My teacher looks at our work, as we are doing it, to see if we understand the lesson.

COMMENTS (Write your comments on the back.)
APPENDIX A

360-Degree Feedback Survey
(Gray-Smith, 2000)

1. 360-Feedback Process
Please indicate your reaction to the 360-degree feedback process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. The 360-degree feedback process provides:</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. feedback on the promotion of sound educational principles.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. feedback on the effective performance of job responsibilities.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. feedback on the fulfillment of the district and school goals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. feedback that promotes professional growth.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. With the 360-degree feedback process, feedback is provided:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. With the 360-degree feedback process, feedback is provided:</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. by personnel with the knowledge needed to identify strengths and concerns.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. on the effective performance of job responsibilities.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. to guide future professional development.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. With the 360-degree feedback process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. With the 360-degree feedback process:</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. reports are practical for the improvement of job performance.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. strengths are identified.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. weaknesses are identified.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. the instrument matches the job responsibilities of the person evaluated.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The 360-degree feedback process is focused on:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. The 360-degree feedback process is focused on:</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. teacher behaviors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. student behaviors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. student achievement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Enhanced information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Enhanced information</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The 360-degree feedback Process enhances the traditional system.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Please add any additional comments regarding your experience with the feedback obtained from the 360-degree feedback process
Appendix B

Permission To Use Data
July 28, 2008
Mr. Frank Pepe, Superintendent of Schools
Arlington Central School District
696 Dutchess Tpk.
Poughkeepsie, NY 12603

Dear Mr. Pepe,

As you are aware, I am a student at Seton Hall University College of Education in the Department of Educational Leadership, Management, and Policy Executive Ed.D. program. As part of my doctoral requirements, I am planning on utilizing the district 360-degree feedback data obtained through Iowa State University’s Research Institute for Studies in Education (RISE). The title of my dissertation is: The Use of 360-Degree Feedback® Compared to Traditional Evaluative Feedback for the Professional Growth of Teachers.

The purpose of the study is to gain knowledge about the use of the 360-degree feedback method in K-12 education and to determine if this method of feedback is effective in assisting teachers develop professional growth goals and identifying professional development needs. This study will compare the 360-degree multi-source feedback method to the traditional single-source feedback method of evaluation. The effectiveness of each process in assisting teachers in identifying professional growth goals and identifying professional development needs will be examined.

I understand that the RISE Office at Iowa State University has completed collecting the data for the 360-degree feedback pilot project. I am writing to request your permission to use the data sets from this project for my doctoral dissertation.

All of the data and records regarding this study will be kept strictly confidential. Participant names and schools are not indicated on the data sets, they will not be referenced in the dissertation.

I would appreciate a letter granting permission for me to use the RISE data sets on the district’s letterhead for verification. You may e-mail the letter to me at jmahar@acsdny.org or send it via inter-office mail.

Your support and assistance in this endeavor are greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Jo-Anne Mahar
Researcher, Seton Hall University
September 24, 2008

Mrs. Jo-Anne Mahar
Principal
LaGrange Elementary School

Dear Ms. Mahar,

I am writing in response to your letter dated July 28, 2008. I grant you permission to use the data from the 360-Degree Feedback Method in K-12 education that you have gathered as part of your research as a doctoral student at Seton Hall University.

I understand that you will be utilizing this information for your doctoral dissertation to determine if this method of feedback is effective in assisting teachers develop professional growth goals and identify professional development needs. Further, I understand that all data and records regarding this study will be kept strictly confidential and that participant names and schools will not be referenced at all in the dissertation.

I would like to wish you the best in your endeavors. Please contact me should you need anything further.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Frank V. Pepe Jr.
Superintendent of Schools

Committed to the success of each child.