

Current and Future Education Leaders' Perceptions of Race to the Top's Teacher Evaluation and Compensation Components, Before and After Implementation

This manuscript has been peer-reviewed, accepted, and endorsed by the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration as a significant contribution to the scholarship and practice of school administration and K-12 education.



Orin Smith

Orange County Public Schools

Daniel Windish

Seminole County Public Schools

Rosemarye Taylor

University of Central Florida

This longitudinal study examined the professional perceptions of educational leaders as to the fairness and impact of teacher evaluation and compensation reforms under Race to the Top. The study surveyed graduate students in education and educational leadership programs to assess changes in their perceptions from prior to RTTT implementation (2011) to the initiative's final funding year (2014). Study results revealed a negative general trajectory for perceptions of the fairness and impact of RTTT reforms between 2011 and 2014. The evaluation and compensation components, including value-added models, were viewed less favorably among administrative and instructional personnel in almost all areas surveyed.

Race to the Top (RTTT), the 2010 competitive educational reform initiative, compelled state and local educational agencies to institute systematic reforms to their educational systems that promoted student achievement in America's public schools. Competing states were asked to enumerate a vision of reforms in specific areas, such as teacher evaluation and compensation, and were awarded federal grant dollars based upon the strength of their proposals. The state of Florida received one of the largest RTTT awards, \$700 million, to implement the state's proposed reforms. This study focused on the components of RTTT dealing with teacher evaluation and compensation reform.

Although RTTT is the federal government's first attempt at compelling states to reform their teacher evaluation and compensation systems, state-level reforms have been undertaken on numerous occasions over the last several decades. In previous years, studies on teacher evaluation and compensation reform have been limited and difficult to summarize due to several factors including inconsistent types of reforms and methodological approaches to studying them (Goldhaber, 2010; Goldhaber, DeArmond, Player, & Choi, 2008; Podgursky & Springer, 2007; Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., 2006). However, Podgursky and Springer (2007) state, "While the literature is not sufficiently robust to prescribe how systems should be designed—for example, optimal size of bonuses, mix of individual versus group incentives—it is sufficiently positive to suggest that further experiments and pilot programs by districts and states are very much in order." (p. 943)

The lack of extant research related to major pieces of the RTTT reforms substantiated the need for a comprehensive look at how these particular components have impacted student achievement. Specifically, the professional perceptions of educational leaders tasked with implementing RTTT reforms needed further study to understand the real-world implications of significant educational reform initiatives. The purpose of this study was to assess educational leaders' perceptions of RTTT components of teacher evaluation and compensation, with particular emphasis on reforms enacted by the state of Florida and the extent to which those reforms aided students at the bottom of the socio-economic scale.

Using a pre-test, post-test model, researchers sought professional perceptions of educational leaders in the state of Florida both prior to, and in the final year of, reform implementation. This approach allowed the researchers to capture long-term shifts in perceptions of the reforms as they were implemented across the state. The elements in focus for this research were the teacher evaluation and compensation components of the legislation.

RTTT applicants were directed to "design and implement new performance evaluation systems for teachers and to utilize the evaluations to determine compensation, promotion and retention of teachers" (Windish, 2012, p. 11). To that end, most state applications included both administrator observations of instructional practice and a value-added model (VAM) that measured student achievement while accounting for specific student-level demographic variables (Grossman, Cohen, Ronfeldt, & Brown, 2014).

Florida's RTTT application compelled school districts to "make student growth the most significant component of compensation, ahead of years of experience and academic degrees" (Smarick, 2011, p. 62). Student growth was to be measured by student performance on standardized assessments developed for all courses offered by participating school districts (Boser, 2012).

Conceptual Framework

There is a consensus among researchers that socio-economic status (SES) impacts student achievement. Additionally, researchers have consistently found that teacher quality and the quality of their instruction can have positive impacts on student achievement regardless of SES (Goldhaber 2010; Laine, Behrstock-Sherratt, & Lasagna, 2011). The RTTT initiative leveraged this empirical evidence to facilitate major reforms to public education systems that measure and reward teacher quality (Laine et al., 2011).

Both broad-reaching and highly political, the RTTT initiative sought to improve student achievement and bridge the learning gap between low-SES students and their more affluent peers. RTTT's grant-based structure provided funding for applying states to implement reforms in four areas: (a) adopting curriculum standards that prepare students for college and the workplace; (b) building data systems to track the progress of students; (c) recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective educators; and (d) turning around the lowest achieving schools. "RTT also contains a significant shift in focus from 'highly qualified' to 'highly effective' teachers in federal education policy and proposes the first-ever federal definition of teacher effectiveness" (McGuinn, 2010, p. 28). Smarick (2011) summarized RTTT as,

[Asking] states to measure student growth and to tie these results to individual teachers. It also asks states to develop annual teacher evaluations and include student growth as a component of each teacher's official assessment. Finally, it asks them to use these evaluations to inform a number of personnel decisions, such as tenure, removal, and compensation. (p. 61)

Many states, including Florida, developed teacher evaluation and compensation reforms that included value-added models to assess teaching quality through student academic achievement and growth (Smith, 2015). Value-added models were originally conceived as a way to identify teacher contribution to student achievement while accounting for myriad student-level characteristics that might otherwise confound a reliable assessment of teacher effectiveness. States utilizing a value-added model were not bound to a specific formula or required to incorporate specific moderating variables. For example, the state of Florida's VAM formula, developed by American Institutes of Research (n.d.), accounted for a wide range of student-level effects commonly thought to impact student achievement, with one significant omission. As stated by Smith (2015),

Even though VAMs were designed with the variable (Sanders & Rivers, 1996) and empirical data plainly demonstrates its impact on student achievement (Ladd, 2012; Lubinski & Crane, 2010; Sirin, 2005), Florida does not include a direct measure of socio-economic status as a predictor variable in the state's value-added model. (p. 56)

It should be noted that Florida's VAM formula and the variables it considers, are not necessarily representative of all value-added models used by other RTTT-funded states (Smith, 2015). That being said, the efficacy of the state's particular VAM formula may shed light on the validity of a federal educational reform model that prescribes few constructs for an evaluation system that has high-stakes implications on the educational leaders who operate under it.

Method

Population and Sample

In central Florida, two graduate education student samples were surveyed on their perceptions of Florida's Race to the Top components of teacher evaluation and compensation. These two samples consisted of 158 and 392 graduate students during 2011 and 2014, respectively. The 2011 sample included students enrolled in the Education Doctorate in Education ($n = 54$) and Education Doctorate in Educational Leadership Executive Track ($n = 104$) programs. The 2014 sample included students enrolled in the Education Doctorate in Education ($n = 110$), Education Doctorate in Educational Leadership Executive Track ($n = 95$), Educational Specialist in Educational Leadership ($n = 12$), Master's Degree in Education Leadership ($n = 165$) degree programs, and Educational Leadership certification ($n = 10$) program.

As convenience samples, these individuals were graduate students at the time of the study and were selected as we anticipated them to be more knowledgeable than the general population of instructional and administrative personnel in the areas of educational reform, learning, and development. Additionally, we believed their efforts to pursue an advanced degree in education or educational leadership implied a predisposition to fill future leadership roles within the field of education. Finally, the two populations surveyed were deemed to be similar due to their matriculation in the same or similar graduate education programs at a single university and employment in local school districts. The structure and curriculum of the graduate programs were stable during the time of the two administrations.

Of those who responded to the 2011 survey ($N = 54$), half ($n = 27$) self-identified as currently working in an administrative position and half as working in an instructional position within the field of education. Of the 2014 respondents ($N = 142$), 43% ($n = 61$) self-identified as administrative personnel, 45% ($n = 64$) as instructional personnel or staff, and 12% ($n = 17$) as other.

Instrumentation

The survey utilized was first developed and administered in 2011, prior to Florida's full implementation of the RTTT evaluation and compensation components. The 2011 survey included items for the collection of quantitative and qualitative data, through an online survey system and in-person interview protocols. Based on feedback from knowledgeable education leaders, the survey language was refined for the 2014 administration after the full implementation of Florida's RTTT reforms. Refinements to the Electronic Survey of the Fairness and Impact of Teacher Evaluation and Compensation Components of Race to the Top included the addition of qualitative items to encourage greater participation than the interview method yielded in the 2011 administration. (See Appendix A).

Quantitative items were designed in a Likert-type format with an intuitive numerical scale for ease of analysis by the researchers. Respondents were asked to rate their level of knowledge of RTTT on a unipolar scale: 1 (*no knowledge*), 2 (*little knowledge*), 3 (*moderate knowledge*), 4 (*great knowledge*), and 5 (*expert knowledge*). Next, respondents were asked to rate the fairness of the reforms on a numerical scale: 1 (*extremely unfair*), 2 (*unfair*), 3 (*fair*), and 4 (*extremely fair*). The following item inquired about respondents' change in perceptions of RTTT, from prior to implementation to the date of the study on the following Likert-type scale: 1 (*much less unfavorable*), 2 (*somewhat less favorable*), 3 (*no change*), 4 (*somewhat more*

favorable), and 5 (*much more favorable*). Respondents were then asked to rate the extent to which they perceived RTTT to have improved the educational system in the state of Florida on the following scale: 1 (*not at all improved*), 2 (*somewhat improved*), 3 (*improved*), and 4 (*greatly improved*). The final Likert-type item asked respondents to rate their perceptions of RTTT's impact on student achievement and growth as, 1 (*strong negative impact*), 2 (*negative impact*), 3 (*no impact*), 4 (*positive impact*), or 5 (*strong positive impact*). As recommended by Dillman, Smyth, and Christian (2009), non-response options (*I don't have enough information* and *not applicable*) were added off-scale, for each of the above survey items, to align the conceptual and visual midpoints of the scale and reduce the potential of negatively skewed responses.

The mixed method study allowed the researchers to gather quantitative data and qualitative comments, through interviews in 2011 and qualitative survey items in 2014, to draw conclusions regarding the participants' perceptions (Johnson, Onwuegbuzie, & Turner, 2007). Although the 2011 qualitative items were administered in an interview, they were administered in 2014 as open-ended survey items to attempt to increase item response rates and gather more information.

Procedures

An invitation to participate in the study was sent by university doctoral program coordinators to graduate students in 2011 and in 2014. The invitation included a link to the electronic survey. Program coordinators reminded the students two times for each administration to complete the survey. The response rate in 2011 was 34.2% and 36.22% in 2014.

Analysis

The following research questions were used to guide this study. The statistical tests used to analyze data related to each research question are also noted.

Research Question 1: To what extent, if any, is there a relationship between administrative and instructional personnel's self-reported knowledge of RTTT and the perceived fairness of RTTT requirements concerning teacher evaluation and compensation?

To analyze the data gathered for research question one, two Pearson Product-Moment Correlations were used.

Research Question 2: To what extent, if any, is there a difference between administrative and instructional personnel's perceptions of the impact of RTTT teacher evaluation and compensation components on student achievement/growth?

Research Question 3: To what extent, if any, is there a difference in the perceptions of administrative and instructional personnel who have different self-reported school poverty percentages about the impact of RTTT teacher evaluation and compensation components on student achievement/growth? Data for research questions two and three were analyzed using One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).

Research Question 4: To what extent, if any, have administrative and instructional personnel changed in their perceptions of RTTT evaluation and compensation components, from the time RTTT was first implemented to the date of this study? For the 2014 administration this fourth research question was added to assist us to validate our findings from a comparison of the 2011 and 2014 data. Research question four was also analyzed using a one-way ANOVA.

The 2014 administration included four open-ended survey items, modified from the 2011 in-person interview items, to add detail that improved our understanding of the quantitative data related to each research question.

1. “How has your professional perception of RTTT’s fairness changed from 2011 to today?” (Research Question 1).
2. “How has your professional perception of RTTT’s impact on student achievement/growth changed from 2011 to today?” (Research Question 2).
3. “In your experience, how does school poverty relate to teachers’ and administrators’ evaluations under the new performance evaluation system?” (Research Question 3).
4. Respondents were asked if their professional classification had changed since 2011. Those providing an affirmative response were asked, “How has your change in professional classification impacted your perception of RTTT?” (Research Question 4).

Responses to the open ended survey items were imported to an Excel file that allowed for identification of patterns of responses. The constant comparison method was used to organize responses into categories and then the categories were given identifiers representing the themes that emerged.

Findings

For the first three research questions, 2011 and 2014 survey results were analyzed independently and then compared to consider differences between the two studies. The addition of the fourth research question in 2014 helped to establish a baseline of comparison for our analysis of changes in perceptions that used responses from different samples with different sample sizes. Respondents to the 2014 survey were presented opportunities to relate their perceptions of the fairness and impact of RTTT, particularly in relation to students living in poverty. The open-ended questions served to expand our understanding of the quantitative findings related to each research question.

Research Question 1

Respondents’ perceptions of the fairness of RTTT’s teacher evaluation and compensation reforms were compared to their self-reported level of knowledge (LOK) of the reform. In both pre-implementation and post-implementation survey administrations, no statistically significant correlation was identified between perceptions of the teacher evaluation reform and LOK ($p > .05$). However, when considering compensation reforms, a small, yet statistically significant, positive correlation was identified for post-condition respondents in 2014. To wit, over time, as respondents’ level of knowledge of RTTT increased, so too did their self-reported perceptions of the compensation reforms, $r(99) = .240, p < .05$.

Responses to the qualitative item “How has your professional perception of RTTT’s fairness changed from 2011 to today?” ($N = 94, 68\%$) centered on the use of value-added models in the evaluation and compensation reforms ($f = 57, 60.6\%$) particularly related to school-level or team-level VAM scores ($f = 10, 17.5\%$). The mix of variables a model considered ($f = 5, 8.8\%$) was also mentioned as a concern for these respondents. Reform components were perceived to be poorly communicated and the impact on the classroom was noted by 19, or 20.2%, of respondents. The majority of these respondents ($n = 14, 73.7\%$) expressed limited or no

knowledge of the specifics of local reform efforts. Inconsistent or unclear expectations were of concern to approximately a fourth of these respondents ($f = 5, 26.3$).

Research Question 2

Pre-implementation and post-implementation perceptions of five selected RTTT components analyzed by professional classifications (administrative and instructional), were considered as two separate groups using a one-way ANOVA for 2011 and 2014 data sets. A third ANOVA determined if the variances for each RTTT component, between the two survey administrations, was statistically significant.

The 2011 survey found statistically significant differences on four of the five RTTT components: using student test data in teacher evaluations, $F(2, 47) = 19.084, p = .000$; using school-level or team-level VAM scores for teachers of traditionally non-tested subjects or levels $F(2, 47) = 10.057, p = .000$; including administrator observations of core practices, $F(2, 44) = 4.567, p = .016$; and providing teachers at low-performing schools salary enhancements, $F(2, 39) = 3.591, p = .037$. Data from the 2014 survey administration produced nearly opposite results. A statistically significant relationship was identified for only the second RTTT component, which provided for the use of school-level or team-level VAM scores for teachers in non-tested subjects, $F(2, 100) = 3.335, p = .040$.

The third ANOVA, considered pre-implementation to post-implementation variances among the RTTT components, found two components to have significantly different ($p < .05$) results from 2011 to 2014. The components providing for the use of school-level VAM scores in lieu of an individual score for teachers in traditionally non-tested subjects, $F(1, 151) = 8.542, p = .004$; and for providing salary enhancements for teachers in low-performing schools, $F(1, 132) = 12.763, p = .000$, were statistically significant.

Supporting qualitative data were gathered from responses to the survey item “How has your professional perception of RTTT’s impact on student achievement/growth changed from 2011 to today?” ($N = 84, 61\%$). The majority of responses to this item ($f = 46, 55\%$) indicated a more negative perception of RTTT’s impact on student achievement in 2014, than in 2011; eighteen respondents (21%) indicated no change in their perception; thirteen (15%) indicated they did not know; and seven (8%) indicated a more positive perception of RTTT.

Research Question 3

Differences in respondents’ perceptions by their school’s student poverty level (FRL) were assessed using an ANOVA for the 2011 and 2014 data sets, with FRL as the independent variable and impact scores of the five RTTT components as the dependent variable. For 2011 respondents, the school-level VAM component was found to be statistically significant, $F(3, 46) = 3.336, p = .027$. Using a Tukey HSD post-hoc analysis, the difference within responses for the school-level VAM component were between respondents in the 75-100% FRL category and those who selected N/A; however, the small sample size for the two groups ($n = 10$ and $n = 7$, respectively) limits the strength of any conclusions that could otherwise be drawn from the relationship. In the 2014 data no significant relationships ($p < .05$) were identified between FRL and RTTT components, indicating that the relationship between respondents’ perceptions of the RTTT components were not related to the size of the FRL population at their schools.

From responses to the survey item “In your experience, how does school poverty relate to teachers’ and administrators’ evaluations under the new performance evaluation system?” ($N = 74$, 52%), three primary categories were identified: (a) Thirty-five (47%) of these respondents raised the issue of the challenges students in poverty must overcome to succeed in a high-stakes learning environment; (b) one fourth of these respondents ($n = 20$) indicated that teaching in low-SES schools presents more non-content related challenges for teachers than are experienced by peers working in high-SES school; and (c) while 16 (22%) of these respondents referenced the idea that VAM does not effectively account for the negative effects of poverty.

Research Question 4

Ratings of the change in perceptions of RTTT, from prior to implementation to the date of the 2014 survey, the sample average was between somewhat less favorable and no change ($M = 2.56$, $SD = 1.095$). This self-reported change in perceptions is in line with our previously reported results that indicated educational leaders held more negative views of RTTT reforms in 2014 than they did prior to implementation.

The survey item “How has your change in professional classification impacted your perception of RTTT?” was used to provide insight into the relationship between professional classification and perceptions of RTTT from a different angle; focusing on individuals who had changed roles during the three-year implementation of RTTT. Qualitative findings from the survey item found half ($n = 10$) of respondents indicating their change in professional classification had no impact on perceptions of RTTT, 25% ($n = 5$) indicated a negative shift in perceptions of RTTT as a result of their change in role, 20% ($n = 4$) reported their change in professional classification having a mixed effect on their perceptions of RTTT, and only one respondent indicated a positive shift in their perceptions after their change in professional classification.

Discussion

The focus of this mixed-methods study was to find out the opinions and perceptions of educational leaders on the RTTT teacher evaluation and compensation components both prior to and after implementation. Comparisons among the opinions of leaders divided by self-reported LOK, professional classification, and self-reported school poverty percentages were conducted both prior to implementation and in the final year of reform implementation. In addition, an examination of changes in perceptions was done to determine if educational leaders had changed their opinions and perceptions of the RTTT teacher evaluation and compensation components.

Research Question 1

No statistically significant relationships were found in the quantitative data between self-reported LOK of the RTTT evaluation component and its perceived fairness in 2011 or 2014. However, a positive correlation existed between the LOK and perceived fairness of compensation reforms in the 2014 survey administration. This suggests that the more that was understood about the compensation components of RTTT, the fairer that component was perceived by respondents. When considering level of knowledge and professional classification, an interesting finding emerged. Results from an independent samples T-test, comparing professional classification

(school district-based administrative and instructional personnel) and level of knowledge found a statistically significant difference ($p = .000$) between the two variables. This finding indicates that “a breakdown in communication existed between the school district- and school-levels, where pertinent information related to RTTT implementation would otherwise have been shared” (Smith, 2015, p. 113). A failure of communication related to RTTT reforms was also a repeating theme within the qualitative data from the 2011 and 2014 surveys.

Both quantitative and qualitative data suggested that the levels of understanding of these components among educators in the field were lower than what might be expected, given the sheer size of the RTTT reforms. In both 2011 and 2014, many respondents suggested that their level of knowledge was low and/or the communication regarding the components from school district, state and federal agencies was unclear. This lack of understanding would certainly impact opinions of the fairness of these reforms.

Research Question 2

When perceptions between instructional and administrative personnel were compared in 2011 as to the impact of the RTTT teacher evaluation and compensation reform components on student achievement, statistically significant differences ($p < .05$) were found for two of the identified reform elements: (a) using a school-level value-added model score instead of individual scores for teachers that teach traditionally non-tested subjects; and (b) salary enhancements for teachers that work in low-performing schools. Data from 2014 survey administration found no statistically significant relationships between professional classification and any of the five identified components of RTTT reforms. This would indicate that the perceptions of administrative and instructional personnel were becoming less distinct as time went on, to wit, their perceptions were more united after almost four years of implementing the reform elements in their school districts. Further, when comparing the mean ratings on each of the five RTTT elements from 2011 to 2014, the average rating on four of the five elements decreased. “This finding indicated that not only were educational leaders more unified in their perceptions but those perceptions were more negative” (Smith, 2015, p. 115) in 2014 than prior to RTTT implementation in 2011.

Qualitative results show that despite three years of implementation, most educational leaders have either the same perception of the components on student achievement or a more negative perception. With only 8% of respondents having a more positive perception of the impact on student achievement, clearly many educational leaders remain skeptical about the extent to which these particular components are helping to improve instruction and student achievement.

Research Question 3

As was found in the analysis of research questions one and two, the data for research question three indicated generally homogenous perceptions of RTTT reforms among the respondents based upon self-reported school poverty percentages. A pattern emerged from the qualitative data wherein educational leaders believed that SES should impact how VAM scores are calculated. Many respondents believed that the RTTT components did not properly account for the negative effects of poverty. Educational leaders from both high- and low-SES schools reported this sentiment, and along with the quantitative data this shows that more educational

leaders believe that the selected components of the RTTT reforms do not positively impact students, regardless of economic demographics. Educational leaders' perceptions related to student achievement and SES are well documented in the literature, so much so that, as concluded by Smith (2015),

Educators are right to perceive student poverty as a significant hurdle in the learning process. Further, an evaluation system that seeks to compensate for student-level variables, yet fails to adequately account for SES, may not be effective at identifying quality learning environments or improving learning outcomes. (p. 117)

Research Question 4

After 3 years of implementation, the qualitative data indicated an increase in the number of educational leaders that have a more negative view of the RTTT reforms concerning teacher evaluation and compensation. Additionally, a change in professional classification, from instructional to administrative positions, did not necessarily alter the perceptions of those leaders on the selected components. When it did, however, the qualitative data suggested that very few gain a more positive view of the reforms. This is consistent with findings reported earlier that indicated educational leaders, regardless of professional classification, had developed very similar perceptions and opinions of evaluation and compensation reforms from RTTT.

Limitations

The purposive sample of graduate students in one central Florida University is a limitation that prevents the findings' generalizability to other populations. However, given the unique variable of being a graduate student, the findings may reflect perceptions of others within the larger group of educators with advanced degrees.

The small sample size from the 2011 survey administration is also a limitation worth considering. A sample size of 158 would constitute only a small fraction of the broader population of educational leaders with advanced degrees, thus limiting the generalizability of the pre-test findings as well as any comparisons with the post-test data.

Finally, given the fact that RTTT reforms are still in their early years of full implementation, the effectiveness of said reforms may not be fully observable for years in the future. Any early predictions, regardless of the quality and quantity of data upon which they are made, are still predictions. Evidence of the real-life impact of RTTT on student achievement and growth, as well as educational leaders' perceptions of the reforms, will need extensive further study in the coming years.

Conclusions and Implications for Policy

We identified three findings from this study that impact policy and practice.

1. The communication strategies and systems adopted by large organizations, like school districts, must be more adept at disseminating critical and timely information from top to bottom within the organization. Respondents to both surveys reported limited knowledge or confusion surrounding specific requirements of their school district's RTTT evaluation and compensation reforms. The fact that many respondents to the 2014 survey indicated little knowledge of the reforms or uncertainty of the reforms should be of concern to

school district administrators tasked with rolling out new evaluation and compensation systems to their schools.

2. In the past, educational leaders in the field have been skeptical of major educational reform efforts, such as RTTT and NCLB before it. This lack of confidence in the reforms may stem from a perception that the priorities created by these reforms do not align with the empirical evidence in scholarly literature or with best practices utilized in the classroom. If policy makers are serious about improving the quality of our public schools they must make a more concerted effort to listen to research-based evidence as well as the perceptions and opinions of educational leaders in the field who will ultimately be responsible for implementing reform legislation. As is evidenced by the findings from this study, educational leaders have a precise and cogent understanding of the factors that drive student achievement and growth. Moreover, that knowledge is directly aligned with the most current research that exists in the fields of education, educational reform, and learning and development.
3. The prevalence and persistence of childhood poverty must be addressed. Elected officials, genuinely interested in improving public education, should look outside of the educational system for the policies in most need of reform. As stated by Smith (2015), While educational reform policies may be effective at improving life outcomes for children in poverty over the long-term, changes in social policies that support those in poverty have a greater likelihood of short- and intermediate-term benefits for poor families, and more specifically for poor children, whose academic achievement is frequently handicapped by limited family resources. (Smith, 2015, pp. 129-130)

No educational reform will ever be effective at significantly improving educational outcomes if we allow approximately half of public school students (Layton, 2015) to languish in poverty. To succeed at raising student achievement for all children, the U.S. must ensure that socially equitable policies, which truly level the playing field, are adopted and sustained. Without equitable public policy priorities the U.S. will continue its fall from prominence as the land of opportunity for all.

References

- American Institutes of Research (n.d.). *Florida Value-Added Model Technical Report*. Retrieved from <http://www.fldoe.org> .
- Boser, U. (2012). *Race to the top: What have we learned from the states so far? A state-by-state examination of race to the top performance*. Center for American Progress. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED535605> .
- Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2009). *Internet, mail, and mixed-mode surveys. The tailored design method*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Goldhaber, D. (2010). *Teacher pay reforms: The political implications of recent research*. CEDR Working Paper 2010. University of Washington, Seattle, WA. Retrieved from [http://www.cedr.us/papers/working/CEDR%20WP%202010-4 Teacher%20Pay%20Reforms%20\(8-23-10\).pdf](http://www.cedr.us/papers/working/CEDR%20WP%202010-4%20Teacher%20Pay%20Reforms%20(8-23-10).pdf) .
- Goldhaber, D., DeArmond, M., Player, D., & Choi, H. J. (2008). Why do so few public school districts use merit pay? *Journal of Education Finance*, 33(3), 262-289.
- Grossman, P., Cohen, J., Ronfeldt, M., & Brown, L. (2014). The test matters: The relationship between classroom observation scores and teacher value added on multiple types of assessment. *Educational Researcher*, 43(6), 293-303. doi:10.3102/0013189X14544542
- Johnson, R. B., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Turner, L. A. (2007). Toward a definition of mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(2), 112-133. doi: 10.1177/1558689806298224 .
- Laine, S., Behrstock-Sherratt, E., & Lasagna, M. (2011). *Improving Teacher Quality: A Guide for Education Leaders*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Layton, L. (2015, January 16). Majority of public school students are in poverty. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com>
- Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. (2006). *Options for studying teacher pay reforms using natural experiments*. Washington, D.C.: Mathematica Enterprise Institute. Retrieved from <http://mathematica-mpr.org/publications/PDFs/teacherpayreform.pdf>
- McGuinn, P. (2010). *Ringing the bell for K-12 teacher tenure reform*. Washington, D.C.: Center for American Progress. Retrieved from https://www.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/issues/2010/02/pdf/teacher_tenure.pdf
- Podgursky, M., & Springer, M. G. (2007). Credentials versus performance: Review of the teacher performance pay research. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 82(4), 551-573. doi: 10.1080/01619560701602934
- Smarick, A. (2011, Winter). Diplomatic mission. *Education Next*, 11(1), 56-63.
- Smith, O. (2015). *Central Florida educational leaders' professional perceptions of race to the top components concerning teacher evaluation and compensation*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida).
- Windish, D. H. (2012). *Central Florida educational leaders' professional opinions of the race to the top grant components concerning teacher evaluation and compensation prior to implementation*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida).

Appendix

Survey of the Fairness and Impact of Teacher Evaluation and Compensation Components of RTTT

1. What is your gender?
Female
Male
Prefer not to disclose

2. In which Graduate Degree Program are you enrolled?
Ed.D. in Education
Executive Ed.D. in Educational Leadership
Ed.S. in Educational Leadership
M.Ed. in Educational Leadership
Modified Core in Educational Leadership
Other

3. Current Professional Classification:
School District-based Administrator
School-based Administrator (principal, assistant principal, dean)
Instructional (classroom teacher, counselor, dean, specialist)
School District-based Instructional Coach
School-based Instructional Coach
Other (Please Specify) _____

4. Current School Level where Employed or Interned:
Elementary
Middle
K-8
High
School District
Higher Education (College or University)
Other (Please Specify) _____
N/A

5. Current Percentage of Free/Reduced Lunch at School where Employed or Interned:
0 -24
25 - 49
50-74
75-100
I Don't Have Enough Information
N/A

6. Current School District where Employed, if applicable:

Brevard County

Flagler County

Lake County

Orange County

Osceola County

Polk County

Seminole County

Florida Virtual School

Other (Please Specify) _____

N/A

For the following three items, please select the response that best fits your role prior to implementation of RTTT (in 2011).

Please select the response below that best matches your pre-RTTT Professional Classification:

7. Pre-RTTT School Level:

Elementary

Middle

K-8

High

School District

Higher Education (College or University)

Other (Please Specify) _____

N/A

8. Pre-RTTT Percent of Free/Reduced Lunch at the school where employed or interned:

0 - 24

25 - 49

50 - 74

75 - 100

I Don't Have Enough Information

N/A

9. From where have you received your information on RTTT? Select all that apply.

- School District
- Graduate Classes
- State Conferences
- Educational Journals/Publications
- Email Communication from RTTT
- Professional Organizations
- Guest Speakers
- Collective Bargaining Unit
- FLDOE
- Email Blasts
- Colleagues
- Webinars
- Media/News
- U.S. DOE
- Other (Please Specify) _____

10. Rate your knowledge of Race to the Top using the following scale:

- Expert Knowledge (Can facilitate a seminar on RTTT)
- Great Knowledge
- Moderate Knowledge
- Little Knowledge
- No Knowledge (I have not heard of RTTT)

11. Based on your knowledge of RTTT, rate the FAIRNESS of the initiative concerning the following two items:

	Extremely Fair	Fair	Unfair	Extremely Unfair	I Don't Have Enough Information	Not Applicable
Teacher Evaluation					•	•
Teacher Compensation					•	•

12. To what extent has your perception of RTTT changed from prior to implementation in 2011 to today?

	Much More Favorable	Somewhat More Favorable	No Change	Somewhat Less Favorable	Much Less Favorable	I Don't Have Enough Information	Not Applicable
Compared to 2011, today my							

perception of RTTT is...							
--------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

13. In your experience, to what extent have the RTTT teacher evaluation and compensation components improved the quality of public education in the state of Florida?

	Greatly Improved	Improved	Somewhat Improved	Not At All Improved	I Don't Have Enough Information

14. Rate the IMPACT of the following RTTT components on student achievement and growth.

	Strong Positive Impact	Positive Impact	No Impact	Negative Impact	Strong Negative Impact	I Don't Have Enough Information
The first 50% of Teacher Evaluation/Appraisal is based on student performance on a Statewide Assessment (VAM).						•
The first 50% of Teacher Evaluation/Appraisal, for those who teach a subject or level in which students are not tested, is based on school-wide or team performance (VAM).						•
The second 50% of Teacher Evaluation/Appraisal is based on administrator observations of core effective practices and at least one additional metric.						•
Teachers may be able to optionally participate in a separate performance pay scale (Performance Pay).						•

Teachers at the lowest performing schools may be offered recruitment and retention salary enhancements.							
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

15. Have you been assessed under RTTT's requirements for professional evaluation and compensation?

- Yes
- No

Answer question if “Yes” is selected for “Have you been assessed under RTTT's requirements for professional evaluation and compensation?”

16. Do you believe your evaluation was fair?

- Yes
- No

17. How has your professional perception of RTTT's FAIRNESS changed from 2011 to today?
(Narrative Response)

18. How has your professional perception of RTTT's IMPACT on student achievement/growth changed from 2011 to today?
(Narrative Response)

19. Has your professional classification changed since 2011?

- Yes
- No

Answer question if “Yes” is selected for “Has your professional classification changed since 2011?”

20. How has your change in professional classification impacted your perception of RTTT?
(Narrative Response)

21. How does your perception of RTTT compare with other professionals with whom you have had related discussions?
(Narrative Response)

22. In your experience, how does school poverty relate to teachers' and administrators' evaluations under the new performance evaluation system?
(Narrative Response)

Thank you for taking the time to complete this electronic survey!