

Kentucky Principal Perceptions of the State's New Teacher Evaluation System: A Survey Analysis

Richard L. Dodson

Murray State University

Abstract

This research examines how public school principals in Kentucky perceive their new teacher evaluation system and the proficiency exam they must take and pass in order to evaluate their staff. An online survey was developed and 308 out of an estimated 1,100 working school principals across Kentucky responded, yielding a response rate of 28%. Results showed that most Kentucky principals were not happy with the new teacher evaluation system and the proficiency test they must take. Responses suggested an average of three changes they would make to the evaluation system or the proficiency test; positive comments were rare. Targets for improvement include the software system used to enter teacher evaluations, the evaluation's student growth goals and student voice section, and more training from the state on how to use the new evaluation instrument. A majority of the principals might leave their job earlier than planned because of having to implement the new evaluation instrument; most also might leave earlier than planned because of the increased number of teacher evaluations they have to perform as part of the system or because of the increased emphasis on test scores in teachers' evaluations. Most respondents, however, agreed that using the new evaluation system has improved their school's instructional program and that the new instrument is preferable to their old teacher evaluation instrument. Most respondents felt unprepared to implement the new evaluation system.

Introduction

Since 2009, over thirty U.S. states have overhauled their teacher evaluation instruments (Ruffini, Makkonen, Tejwani,

& Diaz, 2014). Many have done so in order to meet Federal guidelines and obtain some of President Obama's \$5 billion Race To the Top money. Of these states, over 20 have either adopted entirely or created a modified version of educator consultant Charlotte Danielson's *Framework for Teaching* as their new teacher evaluation system (The Danielson Group, 2013). By 2012, fourteen states required measures of student growth and learning when evaluating teachers (National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality, 2012), although the type and specificity of regulations encompassing the use of student growth in teacher evaluation vary widely across states. While such efforts ostensibly aim to improve educational quality, experienced teachers – and administrators – often find them fraught.

Across the country, teachers are retiring, quitting, or getting fired in districts where new teacher evaluation instruments include student test scores. In Baltimore County, Maryland, alone, over 700 teachers decided to either retire or resign in 2014, about 100 more than two years earlier (Bowie, 2014). In New Haven, Connecticut, 28 teachers were fired in just their second year of teaching, largely because of low student test scores (Bailey, New Haven, 2012).

In Nevada's new teacher evaluation system, known as the Nevada Educators Performance Framework, teachers and school-level administrators earn one of four designations, from *ineffective* to *highly effective*, based on their score. The scoring system is divided into two equally-weighted parts. The first half relies almost entirely on an administrator's observations of the teacher. The second half relies exclusively on student scores from state tests (Nevada Dept. of Education, 2014). Principals reportedly were "sticker shocked" when told they must observe teachers in the classroom up to three times a year under the new policy, while teachers expressed fear over using school-wide scores for individual evaluations (Milliard, 2013). Then, in August,

2014, after the first year of implementation, over 200 teachers in the Clark County School District decided to retire, with the number of retirees expected to grow by about 20 teachers per week (Johnson, 2014).

Neighboring New Mexico is a state which modified Danielson's *Framework for Teaching*, renaming it the NMTEACH Educator Effectiveness System. In New Mexico, fifty percent of a teacher evaluation is based on student achievement, which includes standardized test scores (NMPED, 2015). Over 400 New Mexico teachers were reported leaving education, either retiring or quitting (many halfway through the school year) during just the second year of implementation of the new teacher evaluation system (Nielson, 2013). Many teachers cited either the new curriculum or evaluations using student test scores as reasons for leaving. In 2015, some Albuquerque Public Schools teachers even burned their evaluations in protest (Bush, 2015).

Significance of Study

Including high stakes testing as part of teachers' evaluations clearly is driving many out of the profession. Is the same true for administrators? While administrators themselves are not subject to evaluations based on student test scores, they do face two different types of testing hurdles. The first is that when student test scores are low, administrators themselves appear ineffective and may be held accountable. For example, in 2012, in Jefferson Parish, Louisiana, 15 public school principals were fired because of low student test scores (Waller, 2012). The second hurdle is the one addressed in this study. Administrators in some states face an additional high stakes testing challenge that comes before they can even evaluate any of their teachers. This is the case in Kentucky.

In 2009, Kentucky legislators passed Senate Bill 1, which allowed the state to adopt a comprehensive system of educational reform. With this came the adoption of a teacher evaluation system that all public school districts must use. Kentucky then became one of those states that adapted Danielson's *Framework for Teaching*. The Kentucky Department of Education (KDE), called its version of Danielson's model the Teachers Professional Growth and Effectiveness System, or TPGES. By the end of the 2015 school year, all Kentucky public school districts must be using the Danielson model to evaluate their teachers unless they have another evaluation instrument that is approved by the state. According to a member of the state-wide committee that adapted TPGES for Kentucky public schools, only one school district in the state, Kenton County School District, has gained approval to use its own evaluation tool (M. McMillen, personal communication, March 23, 2015).

The Framework for Teaching model, which has been described as "research-based set of components of instruction, grounded in a constructivist view of learning and teaching" (Illinois Education Association, 2012), includes four teaching domains: Planning and Preparation, Classroom Environment, Instruction, and Professional Responsibilities. A fifth domain – Student Growth – was considered for inclusion by Kentucky, but in 2014 it was eliminated as one of the domains that Kentucky teachers would be evaluated on. However, parts of it, particularly student test scores, remain an integral part of the teacher evaluation system in the form of student growth goals and student growth percentiles (Kentucky Department of Education, 2014).

Danielson had teamed up with Teachscape, a company that delivers web-based learning content, to provide the teaching evaluation methods and instruments in her evaluation system (Teachscape, 2011). It also provides the proficiency exam and training for observers. KDE requires

Kentucky evaluators (or evaluator observers, as the state calls them) to complete the Teachscape Proficiency Observation Training. The system, KDE explains, “allows observers to develop a deep understanding of how the first four domains of the Kentucky Framework for Teaching are applied in observation” (2013, p. 7). Before evaluating their staffs, Kentucky evaluator observers must complete three Teachscape training sections and pass a final proficiency assessment. The Kentucky Teachscape evaluator observer’s proficiency test has two stages. If they do not pass a stage on the first try, they must wait 24 hours before retaking the assessment. Participants have two opportunities to pass the test in one license year. As KDE explains, “given that high-stakes personnel decisions will be made using the data from the observations, the standards required are quite challenging”: observers must be “accurate and consistent in applying the rubric and be able to demonstrate this at a high level” (KDE, 2013, p. 7).

So, before making “high-stakes personnel decisions” regarding their staffs, Kentucky principals are themselves subject to a high-stakes assessment. What effect has this new system had on principals? Anecdotal evidence suggests that some Kentucky principals are retiring earlier than expected because of the stress of passing the proficiency test and the increased number of evaluations required by TPGES.

Similar angst has surfaced among Illinois administrators, whose evaluator proficiency test is similar to Kentucky’s. Like their neighbors to the south, Illinois evaluators have two attempts to demonstrate proficiency. If an evaluator does not successfully complete the test on the first round, the Illinois State Department of Education offers face-to-face remediation to help them prepare for the second round. This introduces further stress: “... if a principal doesn’t pass, it can impact their pride and confidence. They have to tell their superintendent and school that they haven’t

passed and can't evaluate in their school. So it's both high stakes and very personal," one principal said (Illinois Education Association, 2012). While the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) acknowledges concerns about the number of evaluators passing the test, ISBE stands by the stringent process (Illinois Education Association, 2012).

Research Questions

Recognizing that performing and completing proper teacher evaluations is essential for the success of schools, this study examines how Kentucky principals perceive their new teaching evaluation system. This research addresses the following questions:

1. What perceptions do Kentucky principals have regarding the way the state department of education trained them to perform teacher evaluations based on the Framework for Teaching system?
2. What perceptions do Kentucky principals have regarding the way the state department of education trained them for the Teachescape proficiency exam?
3. What perceptions do Kentucky principals have regarding the way their principal preparation programs trained them to perform teacher evaluations based on the Framework for Teaching system?
4. What changes, if any, can be made to improve the Framework for Teaching system?
5. What changes, if any, can be made to improve the Teachescape proficiency exam?
6. Is there a relationship between Kentucky principals quitting or retiring earlier than expected and the implementation of TPGES?

Method

Participants

Working school principals across Kentucky received an email letter with an electronic link to a survey on Survey Monkey. The survey was first directly e-mailed to each superintendent of school districts in the state, requesting that they forward the survey to all of their principals. The survey was then directly e-mailed to all Kentucky public school principals whose email address could be obtained. An introduction letter to the principal accompanied the survey link. The survey used a Likert-scale attitude measure, as well as forced choice (yes/no) and open-ended questions. Questions examined principal perceptions of the TPGES teacher evaluation system, known as Framework for Teaching, as well as the Teachscape proficiency test each administrator must pass in order to evaluate teachers (see Appendix for a copy of the survey).

Results

There were 308 responses out of an estimated 1,100 principals, yielding a response rate of 28%. This surpasses the average external on-line response rate of 10 to 15% (SurveyGizmo, 2010; PeoplePulse, 2013).

Respondent Demographics

Of the 308 responses, all said they worked in public schools, with one each in a public magnet school and a charter school. 54% were elementary principals and the next highest numbers were nearly the same with both middle/junior high and secondary principals at around 25% each. Sixty-five percent of the respondents were new or relatively new principals with over 37% having been a principal for less than 4 years and nearly 28% having been a principal for less than 8 years. Slightly more females than males completed the survey and over half were either aged 41 and 45 or 46 to 50. Over

Table 1 Participant Demographics

N = 308		Percentage of Respondents		Percentage of Respondents	
<i>Gender</i>			<i>Highest level of Ed.</i>		
	Female	50.3		Masters degree + 15	86.7
	Male	49.7		Masters degree	8.1
				Doctoral degree	5.2
<i>Age in years</i>			<i>Years as a principal</i>		
	41 - 45	26.7		0 - 4	37.3
	46 - 50	25.7		5 - 8	27.6
	51 - 55	17.9		9 - 12	15.3
	31 - 35	8.1		13 - 16	14.3
<i>School setting/ location</i>			<i>Type of school</i>		
	Rural	53.4		Public	99.4
	Town	17.1		Charter	0.3
	Urban	15.7		Magnet	0.3
	Suburban	15.1			
<i>Instructional level</i>					
	Elementary	54.4			
	Middle/Junior	25.6			
	High Secondary	24.9			
	(Pre) K-12	3.3			

half (53%) of the respondents were principals in rural school settings, and most had a masters degree plus 15 hours of coursework. In sum, the average respondent was a female between the ages of 41 and 45, leading a rural, elementary public school, and who has at least a masters degree plus 15 hours (see Table 1).

Nearly 90% of respondents completed their principal preparation program (PPP) in Kentucky. Principals also trained in Indiana, Tennessee, Florida, Georgia, Massachusetts, Nebraska, Ohio, and South Carolina. The largest group of respondents attended Western Kentucky University, followed by Murray State University and then Eastern Kentucky University (see Table 2). Other Kentucky institutions included (in descending order of attendance rate): Morehead State University, University of Louisville, Union College, University of Cumberlands, University of Kentucky, Northern Kentucky University, and Bellarmine University. Out-of-state institutions included: Indiana University-Southeast, Xavier, Lincoln Memorial University, University of Tennessee, Harvard University, University of Dayton, University of North Florida at Jacksonville, East Tennessee State University, University of West Georgia, Marshall University, University of South Florida, Austin Peay State University, University of Nebraska at Omaha, Florida Gulf Coast University, Indiana University, and Clemson University.

Results showed that nearly two out of three respondents (66%) agreed that using the new evaluation system has improved their school's instructional program, and over 71% said that the new instrument is a better teacher evaluation instrument than their old teacher evaluation instrument. However, a large majority of respondents (72%) said that the principal preparation program they completed did not prepare them well for the implementation of the evaluation system, and over half (56%) said the state department of

education did not provide adequate training to them for the implementation of the new instrument. Nearly 3 out of 4 principals (72%) said that the state department also has not provided adequate training for teachers on how they will be evaluated under the new system. Results also show that, for a large majority of respondents (81%), the new evaluation instrument has increased the number of teacher evaluations they must perform during the school year.

Table 2 Respondents' Principal Preparation Programs (PPPs)

N = 308		Percentage of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
PPP State		PPP School	
Kentucky	89.9	Western	20.8
Indiana	0.04	Kentucky U.	
Other states	0.06	Murray State U.	17.3
		Eastern	
		Kentucky U.	16.2

The added burden is not without consequence: over half of the principals (54%) stated that they might leave their job earlier than planned because of having to implement the new evaluation instrument, and most (84%) have heard of other administrators who plan to leave their jobs because of the new TPGES evaluation instrument. With what exactly do they take issue? A little more than half (52%) said they might leave earlier than planned because of the increased number of teacher evaluations they have to perform as part of TPGES. In addition, nearly half (48%) said they might leave earlier than planned because of the increased emphasis on student test scores in teachers' evaluations. In sum, principals expressed dissatisfaction with both the increased workload and the substance of the new evaluation system.

TPGES Evaluation Instrument

There were 555 responses to recommended changes for the TPGES evaluation instrument. The most common responses (over 100) centered around the required database all evaluators must use to enter their teachers evaluations, known as CIITS (Continuous Instructional Improvement Technology System). All comments regarding CIITS were negative, wanting it either jettisoned outright or “fixed” and made easier to use. Comments included: “Get rid of CIITS;” “CIITS is terrible & ruins TPGES;” “Please make CIITS more reliable;” “CIITS is terrible. You can’t fly a plane until it is built;” “CIITS doesn’t work...fix it;” and “[Use] a more user friendly format (CIITS is NOT good!”).

The next most common theme of responses (over 55) revolved around the inclusion of student growth goals, including test scores, in teacher evaluations. Again, all responses were negative and sought the elimination of student growth goals, as a basis for teacher evaluation. Suggestions included: “Ditch student growth goals;” “Less emphasis on test scores;” “Look at student growth but do not tie it directly to school or teacher performance;” and “Get rid of student growth goal – data not available for deadlines, should be discussion points only.”

In addition, several respondents called for eliminating or revising the “student voice” section of the evaluation system. In this section, teachers’ students rate their teacher’s performance in surveys. Comments included: “Eliminate Student Voice as accountable data;” “Student voice is not a good measure;” “Some kind of student voice survey, student test score data needs to be added for all levels not just grades 3-12 and all contents;” and “The Student Voice Survey questions need to be revised and more closely aligned to Teachscape components.”

The next two most common themes of responses (over 50 each) focused on the amount of time and paperwork

necessary to complete teacher evaluations. Comments included: “Not so much tediousness;” “Way too labor intensive;” “Shorten the form;” “I spend about 10 times the amount of time on a TPGES Evaluation than what I formerly did with the old system, while the system is adequate, the time requirement is unrealistic for someone in a school setting...as a result, I think evaluators around the state will find ways to cut time and end up making it less effective;” “It takes more time than administrators have to give;” “Paperwork is mind-blowing; it is excessive;” “[Have] fewer required observations;” “Amount of time for administrators is extreme;” “Record/data keeping are excessive when a school has a high number of teachers in building;” and “The instrument isn’t the problem. It’s the time it takes to implement the system.”

In addition, there were nearly 50 responses that centered around the specific Danielson evaluation rating categories. Under Kentucky’s Framework for Teaching model, evaluators rate teachers as either Exemplary (score of 4), Accomplished (score of 3), Developing (score of 2), and Ineffective (score of 1) in four teaching domains. Using CIITS, Exemplary was scored as a 4, Accomplished a 3, Developing a 2, and Ineffective a 1. Principals expressed concern regarding the evaluation rubric itself, the evaluation format, and the underlying domains. Comments included: “More guidance on evidences for Domains 1 & 4;” “Take the score off! Eval system narratives are ok but telling a teacher she/he is developing or a two is not effective coaching;” “There should be an area between 2-3 and 3-4. Much of the evidence overlaps and makes it difficult to know just where to rate a teacher;” “Remove Domain 1;” “Increased focus on Domains 2 (The Classroom Environment) and 3 (Instruction);” and “[I] feel like I am looking to check boxes rather than assessing the quality of the teacher.”

The next most common theme of responses (nearly 40) centered on the number of observations that evaluators must conduct. All responses called for fewer evaluations to be required during the school year. Comments included: "Reduce number of observations-eliminate peer observations;" "3 observations per year for all non-tenure is too many. This is more demanding than KTIP!" and "Stop requiring the mini observations to be documented so that we don't have to do all of the typing, watching CIITS sit there and spin, etc., and I will be freed to visit ALL of the classrooms in my building more often."

Nearly 20 respondents called for more training on the new evaluation system, especially for teachers. Comments included: "Better teacher training resources;" "Provide more training, guidance to teachers and administrators;" "Have the state provide user friendly resources to teachers to help them reference and understand the new evaluation system better;" and "Better direction and professional development from the state."

There were over 20 responses wanting the TPGES evaluation instrument removed altogether. Many responses also revealed the high stress levels experienced by administrators as a result of having to implement a new evaluation along with their other duties. Comments included: "The amount of meetings I had to have with teachers kept me from doing my complete job;" "The work load is really tough;" "I feel Ky teachers and administrators were not adequately trained because the state department did not know what they wanted from the TPGES system to begin with;" "The number required is too much to effectively do my job as principal;" "The process is overwhelming and the time put into all the pieces is unreasonable;" "I spend over 5 hours per evaluation. The time spent is extremely taxing on me, my job availability, and my family;" "I feel my job has now become a desk job from the amount of meetings and paperwork;" and

“The overall magnitude of TPGES is too much. Needs to be totally reworked.”

It is important to note that of the 550 responses concerning the new teacher evaluation system, only 14 were positive. Comments included: “I like the new evaluation instrument – I would just give it more time and allow it to work!” “Great system! I truly believe it will improve administrator’s evaluators of teachers;” “Easy to understand instructions;” It is a great opportunity to become more effective teachers;” and “Framework for Teaching is excellent!” One mixed response noted, “No changes [need to be made], we just need more resources. Difficult to be instructional leader and manage the campus, work data, oversee assessments, work ball games.”

Proficiency Exam

Nearly every respondent (over 99%) had taken the proficiency test, and 88% passed it on the first try. Nearly all of the respondents (over 94%) found the proficiency exam very difficult or somewhat difficult to pass, and a majority (56%) said it was not fair and should be changed.

There were 367 responses to recommended changes for the Teachscape proficiency exam, which all administrators in the state must pass in order to evaluate their staff. The most common responses (over 100) focused around the quality of the videos and sound used for test takers to view the various lessons they had to observe in order to evaluate the teacher. All of the comments about the videos and sound used were negative. Comments included: “Some of the videos were EXTREMELY hard to watch;” “Videos are very unclear and hard to hear and see;” “Change the DAMN videos and make it more real-time and life-like. We should not be held accountable for videos when we cannot hear side conversations, etc.;;” “Videos are hard to understand...can’t get a feel of the classroom;” and “It is nearly impossible to

hear and see everything in the videos, yet we are expected to rate as if we can.”

The next most common theme (over 60 responses) revolved around the time needed to train for and then take the test. According to an official at Kentucky Association of School Administrators (KASA), required initial evaluation training takes 12 hours and it is offered through KASA over a two day period (K. Murphy, personal communication, April 9, 2015). The proficiency test then takes another six hours to complete. It covers Danielson’s Domain 2 (The Classroom Environment) and Domain 3 (Instruction) only. All comments regarding this testing process were negative and sought changes. Examples included: “The amount of time dedicated to practice and exams is startling. While [it is] important to have conversations around consistency, fairness, and lack of bias, the training is simply too burdensome;” “Shorten it. It required twenty-five hours of time for me to pass;” “Time needed to study should be less;” “Takes way too much time. Shorten it!” and “Too lengthy. Two 3 hour tests is ridiculous.”

Over 20 comments addressed the state requirement that evaluators pass a follow-up proficiency test during each of the two years following implementation of the new system. Known as calibration, this occurs after the administrator passes the initial proficiency test and is required for continuing certification. All responses were negative. Comments included: “If the proficiency exam is passed, I do not believe evaluators should be required to retake it or calibrate every year;” “Recalibrating and recertifying is ridiculous. Just another way to make money;” “HAVING TO GO THROUGH THE ENTIRE PROCESS TO GET RECERTIFIED IS OVERKILL;” “Offer practice for continued calibration of observation skills;” “The recertification process needs to be re-evaluated so that you don’t have to do the complete 20 hours next time;” “Not

require principals to retake the exam every year;” and “Take it/pass it ONCE ONCE ONCE ONCE.” Aside from the burden of testing, the test itself may lack validity. One principal noted, “I studied and I took the exam but I still don’t feel prepared to fully implement TPGES.”

Part of the problem seems to be a perceived lack of objectivity in the instrument. Over 30 administrators found the scoring of the test too subjective. Comments included: “Too much subjectivity;” “Look fors are based on ‘experts’...even with rubrics [it is] still subjective at times;” “Too subjective still – interpretation of rubric versus what [is] observed;” “To me it is too subjective. Some videos are much easier than others so it is the luck of the draw;” “Some of the justifications provided are contradictory or dare I say ‘biased’; and “Very subjective material; should be objective.”

Over 15 principals called for the system to be eliminated completely. Many responses also revealed the amount of stress administrators are feeling as a result of having to pass the proficiency exam. Comments included: “Getting through the proficiency exam itself is enough to drive new principals over the edge;” and “Decrease the stress attached to passing the exam by offering more chances to pass.”

A current administrator in the state emailed me after taking the survey and said, “I really appreciate you sending out this survey. I am fearful that unless there are significant changes in what is expected from principals and teachers, there will be a mass exodus. I have been a principal for 17 years and our school is proficient and in the top 10 percent for high progress—thanks to the hard work and commitment from all. We are expected to ‘fix’ everything with little or no staff and funding is cut each year. I have in 27 years now and can retire, but I will stay a few more years or until I feel it is time to pass the ‘shell’ to another dedicated person, I pray that someone will step up when it is time.”

Similarly, another respondent emailed me, saying, “I am actually looking at retiring this year and one of the factors is the TPGES. The Danielson work is very strong and is valuable for our teachers. We have really focused on 3B questioning, not just developing our teachers as good questioners but also our students. CITTS is the real problem along with district 50/50 that required written documentation. You have your CITTS work then repeat it in the district paperwork. It’s really a shame because we really have an opportunity to have an impact on teaching and learning and the process gets in the way. My 2 cents.” For some, then, TPGES represents not simply an annoyance but a driving force shaping career decisions.

Also noteworthy is that of the over 365 responses (about the proficiency test that administrators must pass), only 5 were positive. These included: “Good tool;” “I have no problems with framework instruments and testing to complete evals;” “I have no issues with the proficiency exam;” and “[No changes] suggested, I think it is rigorous, but rightfully so.”

Discussion and Recommendations

This study clearly shows that most Kentucky principals are not happy with the new teacher evaluation system and the proficiency test they must take to implement the system. Over 900 responses were made by principals regarding changes they would make to either the evaluation system or the proficiency test; fewer than 20 of these comments were positive. Despite the unhappiness that Kentucky principals display towards the Kentucky Framework for Teaching model and the exam, the study also shows that almost all principals would rather use the new evaluation system than their old teacher evaluation system. In fact, only one respondent suggested bringing back their old evaluation system.

Principals want the data software system, CIITS, either eliminated or fixed and they also want student growth goals and the student voice section either restructured or removed from the teacher evaluation system.

Principals also want better videos and sound for initial test takers and for their calibration exams, and they want the state to require fewer mandatory training hours before taking the exams. They also express a desire for more training from the state department of education for their teachers and themselves on how to use the new evaluation instrument. Both the Kentucky department of education and state universities and colleges need to step up training on the system for aspiring principals.

In sum, it is quite evident from the research that Kentucky principals wanted to voice their concerns about the evaluation system, the proficiency exam and the subsequent calibration exams. A few respondents even emailed the researcher after taking the survey and thanked the researcher for the opportunity to take such a survey.

As discussed, over half of the respondents were elementary principals and the remaining respondents were nearly equally either middle/junior high or high schools principals. Over half of the respondents also were principals in rural school settings. These schools tend to have smaller enrollments and, therefore, most only have one administrator who must conduct all of the teacher observations and evaluations. This may account for much of the stress being expressed. It also points to one limitation of the study: the views of principals in middle/junior high and high schools and those in urban or suburban schools were represented less than those in elementary and rural schools. It may be that principals who did not respond to this survey felt no need to do so because they were satisfied with the teacher evaluation systems they use. Alternatively, perhaps the rural, elementary school principals simply had more time available to respond

to this survey. Lack of knowledge regarding non-respondents is a common limitation of survey research; extensions of the current study should incorporate additional methods in an attempt to address this issue.

Research such as this, which was conducted near the end of the first full year of required implementation of TPGES in Kentucky public schools, is vital in order to gauge the perceptions that Kentucky principals have about their new teacher evaluation system. This study makes clear that administrators are choosing to leave the profession partly because of the implementation of TPGES. State officials must improve the new teacher evaluation system by making it easier for principals to implement. Hopefully, this research will catch the attention of state department officials, who can improve the system

Will current teachers and principals stick around long enough to see this new evaluation system bear fruit? Will legislators and state decision-makers take to heart principal's perceptions and modify the system? Time will tell. This research offers an essential first step in ensuring that the voices of those using TPGES are heard. Hopefully, the ultimate result will be higher-quality education in Kentucky. In addition, Kentucky administrator experiences should be used to inform decisions in other states, and vice versa. Studies similar to this one should be conducted in other states where either Danielson's Framework for Teaching or another new evaluation system is being adopted.

References

- Bailey, M. (2012, October 11). Teacher evaluations in New Haven ease out teachers in second year. *New Haven Independent*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/10/11/teacher-evaluations-in-ne_n_1956355.html

- Bowie, L. (2014, June 4). Baltimore County teachers resigning in greater numbers this year. *The Baltimore Sun*. Retrieved from http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2014-06-04/news/bs-md-teacher-retirements-20140604_1_baltimore-county-cheryl-bost-teachers
- Bush, M. (2015, May 21). APS teachers burn their evaluations in protest. *Albuquerque Journal*. Retrieved from <http://www.abqjournal.com/587949/news/aps-teachers-burn-their-evals.html>
- The Danielson Group. (2013). Retrieved from <http://danielsongroup.org/charlotte-danielson/>
- Illinois Education Association. (2012). Teacher, principal evaluator training hard but rewarding work. By IEA Communications. Growth Through Learning; Illinois Performance Evaluation. Retrieved from <http://www.ieanea.org/2012/08/18/teacher-principal-evaluator-training-hard-but-rewarding-work>
- Johnson, S. (2014, August 18). Retiring teachers adding to CCSD teacher-shortage problem. Anchor/Reporter. Channel 8 CONNECT. Retrieved from: <http://www.8newsnow.com/story/26561788/retiring-teachers-adding-to-ccsd-teacher-shortage-problem>
- Kentucky Department of Education. (2013). District professional growth and effectiveness plan. Model district certified evaluation plan version 2.0. Observer certification. Retrieved from http://education.ky.gov/CommOfEd/fri/Documents/Model_District_Certified_Evaluation_Plan_Version_2_0_1-6-14.docx
- Kentucky Department of Education. (2014). District professional growth and effectiveness plan. TPGES student growth. Retrieved from <http://education.ky.gov/teachers/PGES/TPGES/Pages/TPGES-Student-Growth-Page.aspx>

- Milliard, T. (2013, August 13). Confusion, fear greet school system. *Las Vegas Review-Journal*. Retrieved from <http://www.reviewjournal.com/news/confusion-fear-greet-school-system>
- National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. (2012). Database on state teacher evaluation policies. Retrieved from <http://resource.tqsource.org/stateevaldb/UserGuides/ExecutiveSummary.pdf>
- Nielson, K. (2013). Teachers fleeing New Mexico districts. *The Chalk Face*. Retrieved from <http://atthechalkface.com/2013/12/12/teachers-fleeing-new-mexico-districts/>
- Nevada Department of Education. (2014). Nevada educators performance framework Sstatewide evaluation system. Retrieved from [file:///C:/Users/rdodson1/Downloads/TLC-12-1.14.12-Workshop-Materials.v3part1-copy%20\(1\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/rdodson1/Downloads/TLC-12-1.14.12-Workshop-Materials.v3part1-copy%20(1).pdf)
- New Mexico Public Education Department. (2015). Evaluation plan. Retrieved from http://www.ped.state.nm.us/ped/NMTeach_EvaluationPlan.html
- PeoplePulse. (2013). Quintessential marketing consulting Pty Ltd. Retrieved from <http://www.peoplepulse.com.au/Survey-Response-Rates.htm>
- Ruffini, S., Makkonen, R., Tejwani, J., & Diaz, M. (2014). IES National center for education, evaluation and regional assistance: Institute of education sciences. Principal and teacher perceptions of implementation of multiple-measure teacher evaluation systems in Arizona. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED548539.pdf>
- SurveyGizmo. (2010) *Best Practices*. Retrieved from <http://www.surveygizmo.com/survey-blog/survey-response-rates>
- Teachscape. (2011). Charlotte Danielson's framework for teaching sees record growth as states and districts

redefine teacher evaluation. Retrieved from <http://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/charlotte-danielsons-framework-for-teaching-sees-record-growth-as-states-and-districts-redefine-teacher-evaluation-124646653.html>

Waller, M. (2012, June 5). 15 Jefferson Parish public school principals ousted under academic performance policy. *The Times-Picayune*. Retrieved from: http://www.nola.co/education/index.ssf/2012/06/sixteen_jefferson_parish_publi.html