Aspiring Principals' Perspectives about Teacher Supervision and Evaluation: Insights for Educational Leadership Preparation Programs

Bret G Range
University of Wyoming

Courtney McKim
University of Wyoming

Ian M. Mette
University of Wyoming

David J. Hvidston
University of Wyoming

This qualitative study sought to understand the views of aspiring principals about teacher supervision and evaluation issues, including their perceived definitions of each, as well as concerns about performing either duty in their first administrative role. Thirty-two educational administration graduate students enrolled in an instructional leadership class participated in on-line instruction on teacher supervision and evaluation. Findings indicated participants understood the concept of formative supervision but were less clear when defining teacher evaluation. Specifically, aspiring principals used many terms associated with supervision as a role of principals when evaluating teachers. Participants' primary concerns with completing supervision and evaluation requirements during their first administrative job included having adequate time to be an instructional leader, and being able to deliver constructive feedback to low-performing teachers to influence and improve instructional practice quickly. Recommendations for university preparation programs that train pre-service principals are included.

Introduction

As university preparation programs train aspiring principals to respond to accountability mandates, the pressure to equip aspiring principals with the skills necessary to become catalysts for school improvement becomes increasingly important (Duncan, Range, & Scherz, 2011; Hernandez & Roberts, 2012; Risen & Tripses, 2008). This statement is especially valid in light of researchers who argue

teacher ineffectiveness is the greatest determinant to increased student achievement (Stronge, Ward, & Grant, 2011). As a result, it is logical to assume principals indirectly impact student achievement by leveraging their leadership responsibilities to hire, support, and develop effective teachers (Leithwood, Seashore Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004). Moreover, principals impact instructional change in schools by encouraging teachers' reflective practice, providing feedback to teachers about instruction, and creating school environments that exhibit positive instructional climates (Fink & Markholt, 2011; Ing, 2009). Through policy reform, legislators have echoed the nexus between principal leadership and teacher effectiveness and the call for well-prepared principals who can navigate schools' complex problems (American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, 2009; No Child Left Behind Act, 2002; Sappington, Baker, Gardner, & Pacha, 2010).

However, researchers postulate that although improving, curricula and methods at over 500 colleges and universities who train principals remain incongruent to school district needs and to the demands of the principalship (Levine, 2005; Mitgang, Gill, & Cummins, 2013). Orr (2006, 2009, 2011) has written extensively on this topic and explains public criticisms surrounding graduate programs in educational leadership center on candidate selection, focus, content, rigor, and retention. Orr (2006) found model principal preparation programs included revamped organizing principles, new methods by which to deliver program content, improved pedagogical practices, structured internships, and partnerships with school districts and businesses for more extensive learning opportunities.

One critical aspect of aspiring principal training is instruction on how principals can effectively coach teachers for improvement, plan effective professional development for teachers, and understand how formative supervision and summative evaluation can improve teaching (Mitgang & Gill, 2012). Collectively deemed instructional leadership (Stiggins & Duke, 2008), educational leadership curriculum at universities and colleges should include clear delineation between teacher supervision and evaluation, yet link both into a cohesive model for teacher growth (Ponticell & Zepeda, 2004; Zepeda, 2012). In light of the above, the purpose of this study was to explore the perceptions of aspiring principals enrolled in a graduate level instructional leadership class, specifically concerning their views about teacher supervision and evaluation, as well as how these views can be used to inform future graduate level content surrounding the instructional leadership construct.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for this inquiry used elements from two bodies of literature to frame the problem, namely adult learning theory and principals' ability to influence instructional change in schools. Both adult learning theory and principals' ability to influence instructional change are influential variables as aspiring principals gain knowledge about school leadership through graduate classes. First, in regards to adult learning theory, contemporary cognitive theory suggests that relevant experiences and reflection play a crucial role in developing

how teachers think and perceive their experiences (Hammond, Austin, Orcutt, & Rosso, 2001; Smylie, 1995). As a result, it is logical to assume the views aspiring principals have about supervision and evaluation outcomes might be influenced by their associations with how supervision and evaluation is administered in the schools in which they work. Aspiring principals bring preconceived assumptions regarding instructional leadership to graduate courses and incorporate what they have learned as teachers, specifically teacher supervision and evaluation from their use of explicit classroom instruction, as well as planning holistic professional development.

Secondly, researchers argue principals influence instructional change within schools by serving as instructional leaders which encompasses three distinct, yet connected, processes; supervision, professional development, and evaluation (Fink & Markholt, 2011; Ing, 2009; Zepeda, 2013). First, principals apply formative supervision to help teachers improve their practice, and formative supervision serves as a data collection tool concerning teachers' classroom performance (Hinchey, 2010). Formative supervision is provided when principals conduct formal and informal classroom observations and provide coaching to teachers (Downey, Steffy, Poston, & English, 2010; Ing, 2009; Range, Scherz, Holt, & Young, 2011). Second, as principals supervise, they provide professional development opportunities based on teachers' needs and wishes (Zepeda, 2012, 2013). For teachers, professional development serves two purposes, namely to remediate teachers who might be lacking various skills or to enrich teachers who are meeting expectations and desire continuous improvement. Third, principals use data collected during the formative phase of supervision, including teachers' participation and acquisition of professional development skills, to evaluate teachers' effectiveness in which principals assess teachers' merit by assigning them a rating, typically called teacher evaluation (Mathis, 2012; Stronge, 2010). For principals, teacher evaluation usually serves one purpose, either performance assessment or performance improvement, and fair teacher evaluation is contingent upon objective, agreed upon standards of practice between teachers and principals (Tuytens & Devos, 2013). When supervision, professional development, and evaluation are seamlessly linked, principals' instructional leadership has the ability to impact and change teachers' instructional practice (Ing, 2009).

Supervision
Zepeda (2013) argues principals' instructional leadership encompasses the nexus of three important behaviors; teacher supervision, teacher evaluation, and teacher professional development. Teacher supervision asks principals to be concerned with teachers' needs as opposed to the wishes of the organization for individual accountability (Glickman, Gordan, & Ross-Gordan, 2005). "When the purpose of supervision is perceived as a catalytic process to help [teachers] improve their performance, it becomes quite different from when supervision is perceived to be an autocratic, top-down exercise in quality control" (Gupton, 2010, p. 87). This view indicates principals should focus on their role as a facilitator of teachers' learning and be concerned with teachers' professional reflection and development. For example, a recent report equated principals' supervisory role as the lead coach in

schools (Ikemoto, Taliaferro, & Adams, 2012), and the success of school supervision is contingent upon the ability of principals to provide just-in-time feedback to teachers, typically after classroom observations, to promote teachers' self-reflection and provide guidance in how to improve (Donaldson & Donaldson, 2012; Fink & Markholdt, 2011; Zepeda, 2012, 2013).

During classroom observations, principals might collect data on various teaching indicators or might focus on a single teaching variable (Danielson, 2012b; Downey et al., 2010; Glickman et al., 2005; Zepeda, 2012). For example, Marzano (2012) provides 41 classroom indicators and teachers' behaviors principals might monitor and provide feedback about throughout the course of a school year. Because the primary purpose of supervision is teacher development, data collection must be routine, comprehensive, and specific in order for principals' to acquire a holistic picture of teachers' development stages and instructional needs. Due to the fact that frequent formative observation of teachers' classrooms is time-consuming, formative supervision literature advocates for the use of classroom-walkthroughs as the primary way in which principals collect data on teachers' effectiveness (Downey et al., 2010; Fink & Markholt, 2011). Classroom-walkthroughs are unannounced, frequent, short classroom observations by which principals collect instructional data on information which schools or school districts value (Marshal, 2012; Streshly, Gray, & Frase, 2012). Data are typically collected on classroom variables like congruence between lesson objective and practice, formative student assessments, engagement of students, and varied instructional practice.

Evaluation
Conversely, teacher evaluation "is used to make a judgment, often a high-stakes decision-whether to award a teacher merit pay or whether to continue or terminate a teacher's employment" (Hinchey, 2010, p. 6). Evaluation is driven by school district policy or state statute with mandates on its purpose and frequency of teacher observations (Glickman et al., 2005; Holland, 2006) and is concerned with simply holding teachers accountable for meeting performance standards (Delvaux et al., 2013). Evaluation typically takes place near the end of the school year and includes rating scales, narratives, or rubrics about a teacher's performance. A primary concern about school district practices that emphasize teacher evaluation at the expense of teacher supervision include: (a) teachers evaluated on what they perceive as invalid competencies, (b) teachers evaluated on as little as one classroom observation by principals, and (c) principals not formally trained in how to use evaluation tools (Hill & Grossman, 2013; Toch & Rothman, 2008). Marzano (2012), who argues data collected through teacher supervision was more complex than teacher evaluation, believes a limited set of data is required to assign merit, or evaluate the skill sets of teachers. Additionally, evaluation instruments used to collect teacher performance data must be reliable and valid (Glickman et al., 2005) and collect information that is more objective rather than subjective, void of principals' bias (Danielson, 2012b).

Although some argue that to be effective, principals should not be required to conduct both formative supervision and summative evaluation (Glickman et al., 2005; Holland, 2006), most school district are organized such that the onus is on

principals to undertake both roles. As a result, it is critical for principals to understand summative evaluations should be balanced with formative supervision (Mathis, 2012). Zepeda (2012) postulated that "teacher evaluation, if linked to supervision and professional development, can, indeed be a formative process" (p. 19). When principals are able to link supervision and evaluation outcomes to professional development, they alleviate the fear teachers feel when they know evaluation might end with a high stakes decision concerning their employment.

Professional Development
Zepeda (2012, 2013) has written extensively on how effective principals bridge the gap between supervision and evaluation, two processes that have polar outcomes through teachers' eyes, by carefully assessing and planning for the professional development needs of teachers. Professional development includes both formal and informal learning opportunities teachers engage in that positively impact their instructional performance (Devaux et al., 2013; Richter, Kunter, Klussman, Ludtke, & Baumert, 2011). As Danielson (2012a) posits, a significant piece of teachers' professional responsibility is to "be involved in a career-long quest to improve practice" (p. 24). Principals share this responsibility as they supervise and evaluate teachers and provide professional development opportunities to teachers based on teachers' desires or needs (Zepeda, 2012). Professional development might be principal directed, as in the cases of new or struggling teachers, or it might be teacher self-directed as in the case for veteran, high performing teachers. Principals have a powerful impact on teachers' professional development as they control resources needed to carry out extended learning, influence the time teachers' require to study new information with peers, and create differentiated professional development opportunities for teachers based on need (Sledge & Pazey, 2013). For example, Hargreaves (1997) found that effective professional learning for teachers included opportunities for teachers to learn collaboratively rather than in isolation and professional learning was sustained and revisited over time. Principals have direct control over such variables, because at the school level, principals allocate the time needed for teachers to collaborate and serve as catalysts who spearhead school wide professional development efforts throughout the year. Additionally, Eraut, Alderton, Cole, and Senker (1998) point to the importance of principals' leadership and teachers' professional development by illuminating workplace factors like management style and school climate as factors that hinder or enhance professional learning. Again, principals have direct influence on how they choose to supervise teachers and the learning cultures they create and support in schools (DuFour & DuFour, 2012). Finally, and most importantly, Tuytens and Devos (2011) found that principals who engaged in active leadership supervision, meaning they routinely visited classrooms and followed up those observations with feedback and goal setting, had a powerful impact on teachers' professional learning.

Obstacles to Performing Instructional Leadership
Fink and Markholt (2011) argued the primary responsibility of principals is to ensure teachers are delivering instruction that is aligned to standards, engaging to students, and leads to increased student achievement. It is logical to assume most

practicing principals understand the importance of instructional leadership, especially in light of policymakers who continue to try and intervene regarding how teachers are supervised and evaluated (Anderson, 2012). However, research routinely highlights the notion that principals spend the least amount of time during their work day engaged in activities that fit within the instructional leadership construct (Camburn, Spillane, & Sebastian, 2010; Reeves, 2006). For example, Horng, Klasik, and Loeb (2009) found organizational management issues like budgeting, administrative paperwork, administering discipline, and creating schedules compromised time principals spent visiting teachers' classrooms. As Horng et al. surmised, "the relatively little time principals devoted to instruction is somewhat surprising given the research and district emphases on the principals as the instructional leader of the school" (p. 20).

Similarly, Kersten and Israel (2005) framed the problem of administrative time requirements from a different perspective and found principals spent an exorbitant amount of time supervising and evaluating novice teachers, which in turn took time away from coaching opportunities they might provide to veteran teachers. In sum, Kersten and Israel described time as a significant barrier as principals attempt to engage in instructional leadership because most supervise too many employees and evaluation tools are too cumbersome. Finally, a barrier routinely highlighted within the literature surfaces as a result of principals' responsibilities to supervise marginal or incompetent employees. In these instances, researchers report the stress principals feel supervising subpar employees causes many school leaders to simply ignore the problems ineffective teachers create (Painter, 2000; Range, Duncan, Scherz, & Haines, 2012; Zirkel, 2010).

Summary of Literature

In sum, university preparation programs are charged with developing aspiring principals, including providing them with instructional leadership skills to serve as change agents in schools they will eventually lead. This responsibility includes providing aspiring principals a framework by which to create supervisory and evaluative philosophies and an understanding of how teacher professional development links both philosophies together. As graduate students delve into instructional leadership coursework, it is important for educational leadership faculty to understand the knowledge, dispositions, and fears students bring to class about teacher supervision and evaluation, as such pre-conceived ideas about supervision and evaluation will interact with aspiring principals' responses to class curricula. After a comprehensive literature review, one manuscript was uncovered that explored similar issues to those presented in the study (Ponticell & Zepeda, 2004). Ponticell and Zepeda found aspiring principals did not differentiate between supervision and evaluation, equating both processes as the same, and viewed legal requirements of completing supervision and evaluation as the driver behind their importance. As a result, the authors used a similar lens to understand aspiring principals' views about teacher supervision and evaluation.

Context and Methods

The study took place in a Western state at a four-year university that offered a master's degree in educational administration which was required by the state department of education for students' seeking principal licensure. Data were collected from graduate students enrolled in one master's level course, entitled *Leadership for Instruction*, and data collection occurred over two semesters. *Leadership for Instruction* focuses on the principal as instructional leader and includes modules on teacher supervision, teacher evaluation, and integration of both responsibilities with professional development. In spring 2013, 14 students were enrolled in the class which followed a hybrid format because students were required to attend both face-to-face classroom meeting and participate in online discussion threads. In summer 2013, 18 students were enrolled in class and the class was taught in a completely online format.

The study followed a qualitative method and can best be characterized as phenomenological grounded in constructivism as the researchers were interested in how aspiring principals understand the phenomena of supervision and evaluation (Hatch, 2002). The study was designed to answer the overarching question, "What are aspiring principals' views of teacher supervision and evaluation?" by answering the following sub-questions: (1) How do aspiring principals define teacher supervision and evaluation; (2) What role do aspiring principals see principals having in supervision and evaluation of teachers?; and (3) What concerns do aspiring principals have concerning teacher supervision and evaluation? Data collection occurred during two semesters (spring and summer 2013) from graduate students enrolled in the instructional leadership course. To collect data, the researchers created five online discussion threads used in the online platform which accompanied the class. All 32 students consented to participate in the study and students' open-ended responses to the five questions were harvested and coded at the completion of the data collection period. To code the qualitative data, the researchers read over respondents' answers several times to get a general feel for emerging ideas and then open-coded respondents' answers resulting in complete thoughts. Next, the researchers axial coded respondents' complete thoughts to create themes by which to draw conclusions and make inferences (Marshall & Rossman, 2011).

Findings

In order to understand aspiring principals' views of teacher supervision and evaluation, qualitative data were analyzed and the findings were categorized by supervision and evaluation. The results first highlight how aspiring principals defined supervision and evaluation and provide participants' insights into how effective principals might engage in either activity. The findings section concludes by highlighting the concerns expressed by participants as they ponder implementing supervision and evaluation during their first administrative job assignment.

Defining Supervision

When aspiring principals were asked to define effective teacher supervision, three main ideas emerged: supervision is a *frequent process culminating in timely feedback and differentiated among teachers*, supervision should be *focused on growth and improvement*, and supervision is contingent upon *building trusting relationships*. Aspiring principals perceived supervision as a *frequent process culminating in timely feedback and differentiated among teachers*. For example, one student said effective supervision is "an ongoing process that is differentiated by teacher". Another student commented that supervision should be ongoing and needs to take into account what level teachers are in their career. He further went on to discuss teachers have different needs based on where they are in their teaching career, and because of this, supervision should be ongoing and tailored to the individual. Another respondent stated supervision should start early and should consider strengths and weaknesses with the ultimate goal of learning. Overall, aspiring principals stated "one size does not fit all" when it comes to effective supervision. In regards to timely feedback, respondents believed teachers required "constant feedback on their performance". Students stated frequent feedback helps teachers "reach their personal goals and the goals the principal has given them".

Aspiring principals also stated effective supervision should be *focused on growth and improvement*. They stated the goal of supervision is to "promote professional growth in teachers" and this starts with educational leaders who expect growth and improvement. Respondents stated supervision based on growth "allows teachers to find areas to continually improve". This growth is critical in having strong teachers who are aware of the areas in which they need improvement. One important part of identifying areas of improvement is providing feedback so "teachers know exactly what principals observing" which might generate ideas for improvement. After providing feedback, principals "should suggest professional development" for areas in which the teacher could improve.

Another key idea of effective supervision is the role it plays in *building trusting relationships*. Respondents stated effective supervision should be based in a trusting relationship, because without trust, "it is hard to have a supervision process" that is effective. One component of building a trusting relationship is designing a supervision process that is "non-threatening". To do this, respondents described conversations about instruction after classroom observations that were authentic, comfortable, and safe. Another component is valuing the supervisor/supervisee relationship so teachers feel they are part of the process and are able to "think about what they would improve". Aspiring principals said "the supervision process should also be a collaborative effort between" principals and teachers so teachers feel comfortable expressing their concerns about their own instruction and appreciate working closely with principals to improve their practice. As one respondent posited, 'Teachers, being human, need to feel appreciated and respected for the important work that they do."

Principal's Role in Supervision

When aspiring principals were asked about principals' role in supervision, three main ideas emerged which discussed how principals should *supervise all teachers*

and provide feedback, *build trust and respect*, and *have knowledge of the curriculum*. Aspiring principals discussed how principals should *supervise all teachers* not just a select few. In order for this to occur, principals must "be present in teachers' classrooms often". This may require principals to "put their feelings aside" so they effectively supervise all teachers fairly. In addition to fairly supervising teachers, principals need to "provide all teachers with equal opportunities to succeed and improve" which is contingent upon *feedback* that must be given multiple times which requires principals to be in classrooms daily.

Another important component of supervision is *building trust and respect*. Aspiring principals discussed how important it to "build collegial trust and respect". Trust and respect cannot feel superficial and it must be on a "level which values the endless labor the teacher invests". One way to build trust is to provide encouragement while cultivating a relationship between teachers and principals. This relationship "should be built on commitment of continuous school improvement and of excellence". When a culture of trust and respect is built it "makes teachers feel like leadership really has concern" for teachers' continued growth.

Finally, aspiring principals touched on the significance of principals *knowing the curriculum*. When principals have an understanding of the curriculum, they are "respected by other educators". Knowing the curriculum is not only important to gain respect, but also to effectively supervise teachers. Respondents stated principals who understand the curriculum know "whether the teacher is on the right track" and can effectively supervise teachers. If principals are not aware of the curriculum, it is hard to provide a fair evaluation of teachers' talents.

Defining Evaluation

When aspiring principals were asked to define effective teacher evaluation, two main ideas emerged; evaluation should be a *formal summative* process that is *connected to professional development*. When asked to define principal evaluation, aspiring principals discussed how the process is a *formal* and *summative*. Participants discussed how "evaluation is a more summative process" compared to supervision. They defined evaluation as "a formal process through which the principal checks to see the results of his/her supervision". Since evaluations feel like a check-up on teachers, they view evaluation as having higher stakes. One way to ease teachers' fears is to utilize a formal supervision model that is linked to professional development. Once teachers have identified areas for improvement, they can decide on professional development that will benefit them. An effective evaluation process assesses the impact of professional development and allows principals to make a decision on whether "a teacher is meeting the criteria to continue employment in the district".

Aspiring principals stated one important component of evaluation is the *connection to professional development*. Participants stated teacher evaluation should offer opportunities for growth. This growth opportunity typically involves professional development and teacher evaluation should be connected to this professional development. One participant stated, "Effective evaluation is purposefully linking supervision and professional development". One way to ensure

a connection between teacher evaluation and professional development is to have evaluation tools that assess best practices. The data collected from these tools can be used to determine what professional development would benefit teachers the most. Connecting professional development to evaluation ensures teachers are provided with opportunities to improve their instruction.

Principal's Role in Evaluation

When aspiring principals were asked to discuss the role principals play in evaluation, three main ideas emerged. Aspiring principals said evaluation of teachers should be *comprehensive and focused on effectiveness*, provide *helpful feedback*, and feel *authentic*. Participants expressed teacher evaluations should be *comprehensive and focused on effectiveness*. Principals should ensure observations and evaluations are frequent. The evaluations do not need to be long, but good evaluations should show a picture of how a teacher performs on a daily basis. Evaluations "should be comprehensive, cohesive, and focused on improving teacher's effectiveness". One important component of a comprehensive teacher evaluation system is the post-observation conference. A post-observation conference allows principals and teachers to discuss what occurred in the classroom and plan next steps to improve teacher effectiveness. The end goal of a comprehensive evaluation requires dialogue between principals and teachers that leads to improvement in student achievement.

During evaluations, principals should also provide *helpful feedback*. This feedback should challenge teachers to reflect and should be given "routinely throughout the year". One participant said, "I believe an effective evaluation should also consist of immediate, valuable feedback that gives a teacher the means for growth". Respondents believed feedback should help teachers establish professional goals and evaluations should establish plans to achieve these goals.

Finally, principals should ensure teacher evaluations feel *authentic*. Evaluations should be open and honest. Being open includes being "honest about things that are going well and not going well". During evaluations, principals should build a respectful, trustful relationship which enables teachers to feel like they matter and allows principals to be open and honest during evaluations. When respect is established, both teachers and principals can focus on the goal of improving student learning. For example, one participant stated one "aspect of teachers' evaluation and observation I found the most eye opening is how important the authenticity is to the process".

Concerns

When aspiring principals were asked what concerns they had about effective teacher supervision and evaluation themes that emerged were the worry of not having *enough time* to effectively supervise and evaluate teachers, *motivating teachers*, earning *respect*, giving *timely feedback* when responding to ineffective teaching. Aspiring principals were worried how they would have *enough time* to balance both supervision and evaluation with other duties. Another concern mentioned was how to *motivate teachers*. Participants were mainly worried about

being able to motivate teachers "who are on their way out". The third concern mentioned was *earning respect* as respondents were worried about the age gap between themselves and teachers. Specifically, respondents were concerned with gaining respect from teachers who are older and possibly more experienced. Finally, respondents mentioned a primary concern was how to provide *timely feedback* and respondents worried they would not be able to give constructive feedback to low-performing teacher in a diplomatic manner.

Discussion and Conclusions

This qualitative study was designed to illuminate aspiring principals' perceptions about instructional leadership issues they will encounter as they accept their first administrative roles. Specially, the study sought to uncover aspiring principals' beliefs about supervision and evaluation, how they perceive effective principals accomplish each task, and understand their reservations about undertaking their conflicting roles. In the end, it was the researchers hope aspiring principals' insights into supervision and evaluation might help inform educational leadership university faculty as they design instructional leadership coursework.

When participants' responses are viewed through the lens of teacher supervision, aspiring principals' views align with many researchers who have described formative supervision (Danielson, 2012b; Glickman et al., 2005; Ing, 2009; Looney, 2011; Marzano, 2012; Ponticell & Zepeda, 2004). Specifically, aspiring principals' described supervision as a frequent, differentiated process based on the developmental levels of teachers and contingent upon trusting relationships between principals and teachers. As a result, participants' responses align more to a formative purpose of teacher assessment, an approach that is concerned with improvement of teaching and eliminating fear from the improvement process so teachers feel comfortable to change their practice based on feedback from principals (Delvaux et al., 2013; Gordon, 2006). In regards to feedback, aspiring principals acknowledged how important specific feedback is to formative supervision and expressed concerns they might not be able to deliver constructive, useable feedback that impacted teachers' practice. These perceptions are not unfounded as researchers have reported frequent feedback is necessary if improvements in instruction are desired (Ovando & Ramirez, 2007), yet traditional teacher assessment instruments do no assist principals in providing feedback that is actionable and specific (Hill & Grossman, 2013). Thus, many principals lack the pedagogical backgrounds and consulting skills to deliver feedback to teachers which they consider effective (Donaldson & Donaldson, 2012).

Aspiring principals' description of teacher evaluation is less in-line with researchers descriptions of summative evaluation (Hinchey, 2010; Stronge & Tucker, 2003; Tuytens & Devos; 2013), and as a result, aligns with the findings of Ponticell and Zepeda (2004). Participants' described evaluation as a summative event intended to assess teachers' total performance and highlighted how evaluation should be linked to supervision through professional development, perceptions which align with evaluation literature (Gordon, 2006; Range et al., 2011; Zepeda, 2012). However, respondents used many of the key words

researchers use to describe supervision as opposed to evaluation. For example, aspiring principals used the terms *observations* and *evaluations* interchangeably within their descriptions of evaluation, contradicting the formal definition of summative evaluation. Simply, respondents believed every time principals observe teachers' classrooms they were performing teacher evaluations. However, observations are usually viewed as formative supervision strategy principals use to collect comprehensive data when assessing teachers' total evaluation (Hill & Grossman, 2013; Ing, 2009). Additionally, participants believed a role of principals within the evaluation construct was facilitating effective post-observation conferences, even though post-observation conferences are usually associated with the clinical supervision model and a primary tool in providing formative feedback to teachers.

Participants mentioned providing appropriate feedback to teachers as a result of evaluations, which contradicts literature that equates summative evaluation to a onetime event when teachers receive their yearly merit rating. Feedback and coaching are the primary outcomes of formative supervision and neither should be associated with assigning judgment when they are shared with teachers. When these findings are synthesized with Ponticell and Zepeda (2004), they illicit a question that seems to stem from simple semantics: "Is it important for university preparation programs to distinguish between supervision and evaluation, because in practice, many school districts do not differentiate either process for practitioners?" The researchers argue it is important for aspiring principals to understand the difference between teacher supervision and teacher evaluation for one reason; graduate students who become practicing school leaders will influence policymakers who simply view teacher evaluation as a one-time, episodic event. As Range (2013) argues, policymakers "fixate on evaluation and neglect supervision" and thus they tend to allocate more resources to teacher assessment systems that label the performance of teachers rather than support resources that build the capacity of principals to deliver high-impact, formative supervision" (p. A6). As a result, preparation programs that train school leaders about the differences between teacher supervision and evaluation are educating administrators who will serve as the primary catalyst that influence reform efforts that view teacher evaluation myopically through the use of only student assessment scores. In sum, aspiring school leaders should understand total teacher evaluation as a holistic process using multiple measures to assess teachers' performance.

In sum, how can results from this study assist university preparation programs that train aspiring principals as they develop instructional leadership curricula? First, university programs need to present a thorough explanation of how teacher supervision and teacher evaluation are different, including their polar outcomes. Programs need to instill in graduate students how important principals' supervisory role is, complete with a focus on coaching, relationship-building, and professional development. Second, because participants voiced their primary concern was having adequate time to provide instructional leadership, university programs should explicitly teach time management skills to graduate students. For example, preparation programs might have discussions about "time-wasters" during principals' workdays through the use of journals to document actual time

spent engaged in instructional versus managerial tasks (Streshly et al., 2012). The most logical place for the use of time journals would be within the supervised internship requirements most educational leadership programs require of potential graduates (Risen & Tripses, 2008).

Additionally, programs should provide candidates with time management strategies concerning two issues which can overwhelm new principals, namely handling the volume of e-mail they receive and creating protocols to ensure meetings are action oriented and productive. Finally, aspiring principals were concerned about providing useful feedback in a timely fashion that remediated marginal teaching. As a result, university preparation program might respond in two ways. First, the primary way teachers receive feedback about their teaching is after principals' observations and many school districts utilize classroom-walkthroughs to assist principals in collecting instructional data on a variety of classroom variables for the sake of time. As a result, it is important for preparation programs to understand the classroom walk-through expectations of the school districts in which their graduates typically find employment and teach those supervisory practices within their coursework. By doing so, programs provide aspiring principals an early glimpse into the forms local school districts use to formatively supervise teachers, as well as, acquaint aspiring principals with instructional foci of local districts. Second, preparation programs should explicitly teach feedback delivery protocols to aspiring principals so they feel equipped to deliver assessment about teachers' practice. Feedback protocols should include instruction on removing personal bias after observing teachers' classrooms and interpreting observation data with teachers that causes them to reflect about their practice (Fink & Markholt, 2011; Ovando, 2005).

References

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. (2009). In *GovTrack.us (database of federal legislation).* Retrieved from http://www.govtrack.us/congress/bill.xpd?bill=s111-1

Anderson, J. (2012, February 20). States try to fix quirks in teacher evaluation. *New York Times*, p. 1.

Camburn, E. M., Spillane, J. P., & Sebastian, J. (2010). Assessing the utility of a daily log for measuring principal leadership practice. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 4*6(5), 707-737

Danielson, C. (2012). It's your evaluation: Collaborating to improve teacher practice. *Education Digest, 77*(8), 22-27.

Danielson, C. (2012). Observing classroom practice. *Educational Leadership, 70*(3), 32-37.

Delvaux, E., Vanhoof, J., Tuytens, M., Vekeman, E., Devos, G., Petegem, P. V. (2013). How may teacher evaluation have an impact on professional development? A multilevel analysis. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 36*(1), 1-11.

Donaldson, M. L., & Donaldson, G. A. (2012). Strengthening teacher evaluation: What district leaders can do. *Educational Leadership, 69*(8), 78-82.

Downey, C. J., Steffy, B. E., Poston, W. K. Jr., & English, F. W. (2010). *Advancing the three-minute walk-through: Mastering reflective practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

DuFour, R., & DuFour, R. (2012). *Essentials for principals: The school leader's guide to professional learning communities at work*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.

Duncan, H. E., Range, B. G., & Scherz, S. (2011). From professional preparation to on the job development: What do beginning principals need? *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation, 6*(3). Retrieved from http://cnx.org/content/m40890/latest/

Eraut, M., Alderton, J., Cole, G., & Senker, P. (1998). *Development of knowledge and skills in employment*. Brighton, UK: University of Sussex Institute of Education, Education Development Building.

Fink, S., & Markholdt, A. (2011). *Leading for instructional improvement: How successful leaders develop teaching and learning expertise*. Hoboken, NJ: Jossey-Bass.

Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordan, J. M. (2005). *The basic guide to supervision and instructional leadership*. Boston: Pearson.

Gordon, S. P. (2006). Teacher evaluation and professional development. In J. H. Stronge (Ed.)., *Evaluating teaching* (pp. 268-290). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Gupton, S. L. (2010). *The instructional leadership toolbox: A handbook for improving practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hammond Darling, L., Austin, K., Orcutt, S. & Rosso, J. (2001). *How people learn: Introduction to learning theories*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.

Hatch, J. A. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in education settings*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Hargreaves, A. (1997). From reform to renewal: A new deal for a new age. In A. Hargreaves, & R. Evans (Eds.), *Beyond educational reform. Bringing teachers back in* (pp. 105-125). Buckingham: Open University Press.

Hernandez, R., & Roberts, M. B. (2012). Graduates' voices on principal preparation. *Journal of Studies in Education, 2*(4), 98-107.

Hinchey, P. H. (2010). *Getting teacher assessment right: What policymakers can learn from research*. Boulder, CO: National Education Policy Center.

Hill, H. C., & Grossman, P. (2013). Learning from teacher observations: Challenges and opportunities posed by new teacher evaluation systems. *Harvard Educational Review, 83*(2), 371-401.

Holland, P. (2006). The case for expanding standards for teacher evaluation to include an instructional supervision perspective. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 18*(1), 67-77.

Horng, E. L., Klasik, D., & Loeb, S. (2009). *Principal time-use and school effectiveness*. Stanford, CA: Institute for Research and Educational Policy and Practice.

Ikemoto, G., Taliaferro, & Adams, E. (2012). *Playmakers: How great principals build and lead great teams of teachers*. New York: NewLeaders.

Ing, M. (2009). Using informal classroom observations to improve instruction. Journal of *Educational Administration, 48*(3), 337-358.

Kersten, T. A., & Israel, M. S. (2005). Teacher evaluation: Principals' insights and suggestions for improvement. *Planning and Changing, 36*(1&2), 47-67.

Leithwood, K., Seashore Louis, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning*. New York: Wallace Foundation.

Levine, A. (2005). *Educating school leaders*. Washington, DC: Education Schools Project.

Looney, J. (2011). Developing high-quality teachers: Teacher evaluation for improvement. *European Journal of Education, 46*(4), 440-455.

Marshal, K. (2012). Let's cancel the dog-and-pony show. *Phi Delta Kappan, 94*(3), 19-23.

Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. B. (2011). *Designing qualitative research* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Marzano, R. J. (2012). The two purposes of teacher evaluation. *Educational Leadership, 70*(3), 14-19.

Mathis, W. (2012). *Research-based options for education policy making: Teacher evaluation*. Boulder, CO: National Education Policy Center.

Mitgang, L., & Gill, J. (2012). *The making of the principal: Five lessons in leadership training*. New York: The Wallace Foundation.

Mitgang, L., Gill, J., & Cummins, H. J. (2013). *Districts matter: Cultivating the principals urban schools need*. New York: The Wallace Foundation.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425 (2002).

Orr, M. T. (2006). Mapping innovation in leadership preparation in our nation's schools of education. *Phi Delta Kappan, 87*(7), 492-499.

Orr, M. T. (2009). Program evaluation in leadership preparation and related fields. In M. D. Young & G. Crow (Eds.), *Handbook of research on the education of school leaders* (pp. 457-498). New York: Routledge.

Orr, M. T. (2011). Pipeline to preparation to advancement: Graduates' experiences in, through, and beyond leadership preparation. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 47*(1), 114-172.

Ovando, M. N. (2005). Building instructional leaders' capacity to deliver constructive feedback to teachers. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, *18*(3), 171-183.

Ovando, M. N., & Ramirez, A. (2007). Principals' instructional leadership within a teacher performance appraisal system: Enhancing students' academic success. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 15*(3), 213-231.

Painter, S. R. (2000). Principals' perceptions of barriers to teacher dismissal. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, *14*(3), 253-264.

Ponticell, J. A., & Zepeda, S. J. (2004). Confronting well-learned lessons in supervision and evaluation. *NASSP Bulletin, 88*(639), 43-49.

Range, B. G. (2013, June 2). The most important part of teacher evaluations. *The Casper Star Tribune*, p. A6.

Range, B. G., Duncan, H. E., Scherz, S. D, & Haines, C. A (2012). School leaders' perceptions about incompetent teachers: Implications for supervision and evaluation. *NASSP Bulletin, 96*(4), 302-322.

Range, B. G., Scherz, S., Holt, C. R, & Young, S. (2011). Supervision and evaluation: The Wyoming perspective. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Accountability*, *23*(3), 243-265.

Reeves, D. B. (2006). *The learning leader: How to focus school improvement for better results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Richter, D., Kunter, M., Klusmann, U. Ludtke, O., & Baurnett, J. (2011). Professional development across the teaching career: Teachers' uptake of formal and informal learning opportunities. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*(1), 116-126.

Risen, D. M., & Tripses, J. S. (2008). Designing principal preparation internships to strengthen school leadership. *Journal of Scholarship and Practice, 5*(3), 4-10.

Sappington, N., Baker, P. J., Gardner, D., & Pacha, J. (2010). A signature pedagogy for leadership education: Preparing principals through participatory action research. *Planning and Changing, 41*(3/4), 249-273.

Sledge, A., & Pazey, B. L. (2013). Measuring teacher effectiveness through meaningful evaluation: Can reform models apply to general education and special education teachers? *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 1-16. doi: 10.1177/08884064133489839

Smylie, M. A. (1995). Teacher learning in the workplace. Implications for school reform. In T. R. Guskey, & M. Huberman (Eds.), *Professional development in education. New paradigms and practices*. New York & London: Teachers College Press.

Stiggins, R., & Duke, D. (2008). Effective instructional leadership requires assessment leadership. *Phi Delta Kappan, 90*(4), 285-291.

Streshly, W. A., Gray, S. P., & Frase, L. E. (2012). *The new school management by wandering around*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Stronge, J. H. (2010). *Evaluating what good teachers do: Eight research-based standards for assessing teacher excellence*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

Stronge, J. H., & Tucker, P. D. (2003). *Teacher evaluation: Assessing and improving performance*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

Stronge, J. H., Ward, T. J., & Grant, L. W. (2011). What makes good teachers good? A cross-case analysis of the connection between teacher effectiveness and student achievement. *Journal of Teacher Education, 62*(4), 339-355.

Toch, T., & Rothman, R. (2008). *Rush to judgment: Teacher evaluation in public education*. Washington DC: Education Sector.

Tuytens, M., & Devos, G. (2011). Stimulating professional learning through teacher evaluation: An impossible task for the school leader? *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*(5), 891-899.

Tuytens, M., & Devos, G. (2013). The problematic implementation of teacher evaluation school policy: School failure or governmental pitfall. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 1-20. doi: 10.1177/1741143213502188

Zepeda, S. J. (2012). Instructional leadership*: Applying tools and concepts* (3rd ed.). Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

Zepeda, S. J. (2013). *The principal as instructional leader: A practical handbook* (3rd ed.). Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

Zirkel, P. (2010). Teacher tenure is not the real problem*. Phi Delta Kappan, 92*(1), 76-77.