

Copyright  
by  
Marlo Molinaro  
2020

HOW ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOL TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF  
SUPPORTIVE PRINCIPALS' BEHAVIORS IMPACT THE OVERALL T-TESS  
EVALUATION PROCESS

by

Marlo Molinaro, M.Ed.

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of  
The University of Houston-Clear Lake

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements

For the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

in Educational Leadership

THE UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON-CLEAR LAKE

May, 2021

HOW ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOL TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF  
SUPPORTIVE PRINCIPALS' BEHAVIORS IMPACT THE OVERALL T-TESS  
EVALUATION PROCESS

by

Marlo Molinaro

APPROVED BY

---

John M. Decman, Ed.D, Chair

---

Felix Simieou, Ph.D, Committee Member

---

Thomas Lynn Cothorn, Ed.D, Committee Member

---

Renee Lastrapes, Ph.D, Committee Member

RECEIVED/APPROVED BY THE COLLEGE OF <COLLEGE NAME>:

---

Felix Simieou III Ph.D, Interim Associate Dean

---

Joan Y. Pedro Ph.d, Interim Dean

## **Dedication**

In 2011, when I graduated with my master's degree, I hadn't even made it to the car when I was asked, "Mija, when are you going back to get your doctorate degree?" My response was, "oh Uncle, I don't know; that's a lot of work! I'll think about it but I'm not making any promises." In the summer of 2017, I went to New Mexico to visit my aunt and uncle and this time was asked by my Auntie, "Baby, when are you going back to school? You know you can do it. We would be so proud." Needless to say, I had already been through the courses, I was just struggling with my dissertation. I didn't want to say anything for fear of not completing and disappointing her and my uncle completely.

I knew the dissertation process would be grueling. One thing that kept me going was that I wanted to surprise my uncle who took the same academic path as myself, but unfortunately, never got the chance to finish. Uncle Henry, here is our Ed. D. I know that life happened when you were younger and you didn't get the opportunity to finish your dissertation; so I have completed it for the both of us. I hope that I have made you and Auntie very proud. I love you!

## **Acknowledgements**

I would first and foremost like to acknowledge my chair, Dr. John M. Decman. I am extremely appreciative of you taking me on as a student so late in the game. Thank you for making the dissertation process so easy. Your Dissertation for Dummies 101 was very helpful and you should sell it. I would also like to thank all the other members of my committee. I am grateful for all of your time and effort you put into helping me make my dissertation process a successful one.

To my sister Marni and cousin Lisa for keeping my secret. Yet another surprise to my mother and the entire family. Thank you to my other half, Sam. Without your support, love, and understanding, some semesters would have been sketchy!

A huge shout out to my study buddies Dr. Pamela Stewart and Dr. Jimmie Smith Jr. If it weren't for you guys, I would still be on the couch saying, "I'll meet you all tomorrow; I have something I need to take care of!" Thank you for keeping me focused, driven, and most of all laughing to keep from crying. We finally have our evenings and weekends back! Woohooo! What will we do with all our free time now? We can finally enjoy a football game and a good meal without a computer in front of us.

I would like to thank my fitness trainer, Sofia. Without her, this process would not have been a success. Thank you for keeping my mental and physical health strong so I could stay focused and energized. Without you, I would not have been able to vent through physical fitness. I would have turned to my favorite chocolate cake!

## ABSTRACT

# HOW ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOL TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF SUPPORTIVE PRINCIPALS' BEHAVIORS IMPACT THE OVERALL T-TESS EVALUATION PROCESS

Marlo Molinaro  
University of Houston-Clear Lake, 2021

Dissertation Chair: John M. Decman, Ed.D

The purpose of this explanatory sequential design was to (a) investigate teachers' perceptions of supportive principal behaviors, (b) investigate teachers' perceptions of the overall T-TESS evaluation process, and (c) find the correlation between the two perceptions. A convenience sample of 105 elementary and middle school teachers who work in a Title I urban district responded to a 47 question survey created by using portions of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ-RE) and the Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP), and individual interviews were conducted to collect qualitative data. The survey data analysis was used to determine teachers' perceptions of supportive principal behaviors as well as teachers' perceptions of the overall evaluation process. For the quantitative data, a Pearson's correlation was run to determine if there was a significance in the relationship between the two variables while coding and

concurrent triangulation was used to conclude the qualitative data. The quantitative results found that there was a significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of supportive principal behaviors and teachers' perceptions of the overall T-TESS evaluation process. The qualitative findings found there are six themes that revealed teachers' perceptions of supportive principal behaviors and how those behaviors affected their overall T-TESS evaluation process. The themes discovered were (a) trustworthiness, (b) building positive relationships, (c) active listening, (d) timely responses, (e) opportunities for growth, and (f) feedback. The qualitative data further strengthened the quantitative analysis and further suggested a significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of supportive principal behaviors and teachers' perceptions of the overall T-TESS evaluation process.

*Keywords:* evaluation, teacher evaluation, perceptions, teacher perceptions, supportive principal behaviors, overall evaluation process, Texas Teacher Evaluation and Support System, T-TESS, elementary school, middle school

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	4
Purpose of the Study.....	5
Research Questions.....	5
Definition of Key Terms.....	5
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE .....	7
Teacher Perceptions of Principal Behaviors.....	7
Direction Setting.....	7
Feedback.....	9
Professional Development.....	10
Interactions with Teachers.....	11
Evaluations.....	13
Texas Teacher Appraisal System.....	13
Professional Development and Appraisal System.....	15
Texas Teacher Evaluation and Support System.....	17
Comparison of the TTAS, PDAS, and T-TESS.....	19
Teacher Perceptions of Evaluations.....	20
National Educational Leadership Preparation Program Recognition Standards ..	23
Surveys.....	24
Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire .....	24
Teacher Evaluation Profile .....	25
Summary.....	26
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY .....	28
Overview of the Research Problem .....	28
Operationalization of Theoretical Constructs .....	28
Research Purpose and Questions .....	28
Research Design.....	29
Population .....	31
Sample.....	32
Participant Selection .....	33
Instrumentation .....	33
Data Collection Procedures.....	35
Data Analysis Procedures .....	36
Quantitative.....	36
Qualitative.....	37
Validity .....	38
Privacy and Ethical Considerations .....	38
Research Design Limitations .....	39

Conclusion .....	39
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS.....	41
Demographic Characteristics of the Participants .....	41
Quantitative Results .....	42
Research Question One.....	42
Research Question Two .....	43
Qualitative Results .....	48
Trustworthiness.....	48
Building Positive Relationships .....	49
Active Listening.....	52
Timely Responses .....	53
Opportunities for Growth.....	54
Feedback .....	55
Conclusion .....	62
CHAPTER V: SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	63
Summary .....	64
Research Question One.....	65
Implications.....	71
Recommendations for Future Research .....	73
Conclusion .....	73
REFERENCES .....	75
APPENDIX A: PERMISSION TO USE OCDQ-RE .....	83
APPENDIX B: PERMISSION TO USE THE TEP .....	84
APPENDIX C: SURVEY COVER LETTER.....	85
APPENDIX D: THE ORGANIZATIONAL DESCRIPTION CLIMATE QUESTIONNAIRE (OCDQ-RE) .....	86
APPENDIX E: TEACHER EVALUATION PROFILE (TEP).....	88
APPENDIX F: INTERVIEW CONSENT FORM .....	90
APPENDIX G: QUALITATIVE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS .....	92
APPENDIX H: RESUME.....	93

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1 Comparison of School Population Based on 2018-2019 TAPR.....31

Table 3.2 Student Demographics .....32

Table 4.1 Demographics of Participants .....42

Table 4.2 Survey Results for the OCDQ-RE .....44

Table 4.3 Survey Results for TEP Part B .....45

Table 4.4 Survey Results for TEP Part C: .....47

## CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

The schoolhouse, one of the most substantial organizations in our society, requires principals to provide hands-on leadership (Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2015). The role is critical; principals as school leaders establish the course and accomplishment of a school (Goolamally & Ahmad, 2014). Therefore, the capabilities and skill set of the school leader determines whether or not a campus is successful (Goolamally & Ahmad, 2014).

Given that a school is a complex organization with multiple stakeholders, the principal must manage multiple tasks to preserve the learning environment and satisfy stakeholders (Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2015). For example, community members desire principals who demonstrate care and support (Smylie & Murphy, 2016). Meanwhile, parents refer to a great principal as being frequently seen at the front doors; working assigned duties, such as walking the playground; and knowing the names of students and parents (Barr & Saltmarsh, 2014). In addition to these activities, Tschannen-Moran and Gareis (2015) suggest earning the trust of teachers is the primary responsibility of the principal. In vibrant and well performing schools, trust is essential because it reinforces the supportive behaviors necessary for nurturing high performance (Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2015). Hoy & Clover (1986) define a supportive principal as a person who has a basic concern for teachers, actively listens, and is open to teacher suggestions. Although most principals acknowledge the importance of trust in their work, these qualities often get squeezed out by accountability requirements (Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2015).

One way a principal can begin earning trust is through a collaborative evaluation process. Ritter and Barnett (2016) found that in a trusting environment educators

welcomed rigorous evaluations and shared responses. In the evaluation setting, teachers trust that meaningful feedback will be provided along with the opportunity for improvement prior to future evaluations (Ritter & Barnett, 2016). The Texas Teacher Evaluation and Support System (T-TESS) is a process that develops continuous improvement and focuses on providing on-going feedback so educators can develop their teaching practices (Texas Education Agency, 2019). In Chapter 150 of the Commissioner's Rules regarding evaluations, each teacher shall be appraised by using the T-TESS rubric or an alternative teacher appraisal system that follows the Texas Education Code (TEC) §21.352, and §150.1007 (Appraisal Laws & Rules, 2019). T-TESS has three components:

- goals setting and professional development plan
- the evaluation cycle, including pre-conference, observation, and post conference using a Likert scale type rubric ranging from distinguished to improvement needed
- student growth measurement (T-TESS, 2019).

Under each of the four domains, four to five dimensions are embedded and the seventeenth dimension, student learning objective (SLO), is rated outside of the four domains (T-TESS, 2019).

Within a school year, appraisers and teachers measure instructional performance using evidence-based feedback in four domains: planning, instruction, learning environment, and professional practices and responsibilities (T-TESS, 2019). Classroom observations are coupled with collaborative dialogue. From the gathered evidence and collaborative dialogues, the principal and teacher create a professional development plan (T-TESS, 2019).

Ultimately, the purpose of the T-TESS appraisal process is for the appraiser and teacher to collaborate in a systematic way that supports personalized professional growth and development (T-TESS, 2019). The teacher's role should be purposefully described as both learner and teacher (Templeton, Willis, & Hendricks, 2016). The teacher's role during the evaluation cycle is to reflect on his or her instructional and professional practices as the principal evaluates the teaching ability of the instructor (T-TESS, 2019). According to T-TESS (2019), principals should use a specific timeline for the evaluation process. During the first six weeks of school, the principal provides T-TESS orientation to review and or introduce the T-TESS evaluation and goal setting process with teachers (Evaluation Process, 2019). The goal setting process provides teachers and appraisers the first opportunity to work on an area of reinforcement (growth) as a focus throughout the year (T-TESS, 2019). Teacher participation in goal setting serves two purposes. First, it connects the gap between task perception and actual perception, and secondly it promotes workplace satisfaction and teacher motivation (Templeton, et al., 2016). In weeks seven through the last 15 days of instruction, the principal conducts informal/formal walkthroughs, a pre-conference, a 45-minute observation, and a post-conference (T-TESS, 2019). During this time, the appraiser provides additional evidence-based feedback to facilitate collaboration with the teacher regarding instructional practices and the teacher's area/s of refinement to improve first line instruction (T-TESS, 2019). To support teachers in identifying their annual goals, it is necessary for principals to provide regular feedback using check-points, small celebrations throughout the year, and additional time and resources to complete the goal (Templeton, et al., 2016). Prior to the last 15 days of the school year, the principal conducts an end-of-year conference (summative) to discuss all additional evidence the teacher has collected regarding the goals for the year and any improvements in domains one through four (T-TESS, 2019).

T-TESS evaluation protocols are designed to ensure both instructors and administrators collaborate often throughout the teacher evaluation process (T-TESS, 2019).

### **Statement of the Problem**

In 1997, the Professional Development Appraisal System (PDAS) began as the appraisal system for the state of Texas (T-TESS, 2019) to serve as a professional development system for educators, but became a check list of compliance instead (T-TESS, 2019). In 2013, a committee comprised of teachers, principals, higher education representatives, and educator organizations began working to update teacher standards (T-TESS, 2019). A rubric matching these standards was simultaneously developed, resulting in the creation of the T-TESS evaluation dimensions and domains (T-TESS, 2019). The purpose of T-TESS is to provide teachers with an open dialogue with their appraisers focused on collaborative support to improve instructional practices and professional development (T-TESS, 2019). Between 2014 and 2016, approximately 260 school districts piloted the T-TESS evaluation system; in 2017, it became the state suggested appraisal system (T-TESS, 2019). To improve teacher and administrator collaboration and first-line instruction through goal setting and targeted professional development, the Title I urban district located in Southeast Texas used in the research piloted the T-TESS evaluation process in 2016.

Effective execution of T-TESS centers on collaboration, commitment, and building capacity throughout the entire organization (T-TESS, 2019). To implement with fidelity, appraisers must demonstrate a collaborative stance towards the evaluation process (T-TESS, 2019). This may be measured by teacher perceptions of the principal's supportive behaviors and teacher perceptions of the overall evaluation process as a means of professional growth. As early as 2011, Powell's study identified a need for further research in this area. Specifically, Powell (2011) suggested investigation into teachers'

perceptions of supportive principal behaviors and teachers' perceptions of the overall evaluation experience.

### **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to investigate teachers' perceptions of supportive principal behaviors, teachers' perceptions of the overall T-TESS evaluation process, and the relationship between supportive principal behaviors and the overall T-TESS evaluation process at the elementary and middle school levels.

### **Research Questions**

1. What correlation exists between elementary and middle school teachers' perceptions of supportive principal behaviors and the teachers' perceptions of the overall evaluation process?
2. What is the effect of supportive principal behaviors on the overall evaluation process as measured by the OCDQ-RE and TEP?
3. What are the elementary and middle school teachers' perceptions of supportive principal behaviors and teachers' perceptions of the overall T-TESS evaluation process?

### **Definition of Key Terms**

*Evaluate*: "to collect, synthesize, and assign value to data to help diagnose problems, monitor progress, and make decisions about the extent to which a project/procedure meets identified goals/objectives or about the quality of performance and how it might be improved" (National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA, 2018).

*Perception*: "a belief or opinion, often held by many people and based on how things seem" Retrieved from: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org> (2019).

*Rubric*: "written and shared evaluative criteria for judging candidate performance that indicate the qualities by which levels of performance can be differentiated and that

anchor judgements about the degree of success on a candidate assessment” (NPBEA, 2019).

*Supportive Principal:* a principal who has a basic concern for teachers, actively listens, and is open to teacher suggestions. Principal provides praise regularly and sincerely and constructive criticism is handled positively (Hoy & Clover, 1986).

*Texas Teacher Evaluation and Support System (T-TESS) Evaluation:* “a process that develops habits of continuous improvement, and the process itself best lends itself to that outcome when appraisers and teachers focus on evidence-based feedback and professional development decisions based on that feedback through open dialogue and collaboration” (T-TESS, 2019).

## CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

To withstand organizational change, Fullan (2004) recommends the principal nurture building capacity and leadership in others through collaborative analysis. The principal's role must be transparent as one who supports a learner-centered campus (Fullan, 2004). Therefore, principals should have strong characteristics in building consistency on campus (Fullan, 2004). In this chapter, the researcher will discuss a review of literature associated with teachers' perceptions of principal behaviors (direction setting, feedback, professional development, and interactions with teachers), past and present evaluation systems in Texas, teachers' perceptions of the overall evaluation process, National Educational Leadership Preparation (NELP) Standards, and background on the surveys used to collect data for this research.

### **Teacher Perceptions of Principal Behaviors**

#### **Direction Setting**

Direction setting from the principal is vital for a campus to be effective. Successful school leaders set a path for educators, develop a strong vision, and have collective goals and expectations for high teacher performance (Kelchtermans & Piot, 2010; Sun & Leithwood, 2015). Quong and Walker (2010) conducted research on strategic leadership and found that leaders guarantee that each teacher's role, responsibilities, and accountabilities are clear, well-defined, understood, and established as well as maintaining consistent communication throughout the school. Price (2012) and Sun and Leithwood's (2015), studies reveal that direction setting can have significant advantages for teachers and the school such as improving teachers' career fulfillment, self-efficacy, loyalty, and empowerment. Direction setting also builds relationships between principals and teachers, enhances educators' perspectives of the principal's

effectiveness, builds teacher trust, and provides focused instruction (Price, 2012; Sun & Leithwood, 2015). Furthermore, direction setting provides an optimistic work environment, alignment of instructional goals, collective knowledge, and enthusiasm to make shared decisions (Price, 2012; Sun & Leithwood, 2015).

An imperative first step in improving overall teacher performance is outlining the school's mission, goals, and performance expectations (Aguinis, Joo, & Gottfredson, 2011). Van den Ouweland, Vanhoof, and Van den Bossche (2018) found conveying and defining performance expectations to teachers can have significant benefits for schools. Teachers benefit from principals who communicate a clear vision, mission, and expectations. When a principal sets defined campus goals and expectations, this transforms into teachers creating clear goals and professional development plans (Aguinis, et al., 2011). Defined expectations and goals become groundwork for additional administration practices to happen, such as feedback, instructional coaching, teacher evaluations, and motivate individual and organizational growth (Aguinis, et al., 2011).

With clear expectations, vision, and mission, school leaders can focus on instructional leadership with teachers. According to Osakwe (2010), school leaders offer support to educators through leadership and, thus, campus objectives are accomplished with effective teaching and learning. In addition, through their practices, effective principals are capable of driving teachers further (Heaton, 2016). Therefore, to achieve effective and efficient teaching, school principals need strong instructional and managerial practices (Wildman, 2015). Heaton (2016) states principals assist teachers in improving their skills for better instruction. In Finnigan's (2011) study on transformational leadership, he found principals required strong instructional leadership skills, which participants defined these skills as a having a clear vision, pronounced

expectations, and an understanding of protocols and procedures, as well as providing stability in taxing and doubtful circumstances. Outcomes were that educators became aggravated when the principal's vision was nonexistent or the teachers had insufficient understanding of instruction, while reliable principals with high standards inspire educators to follow suit (Finnigan, 2011). When principals used direction setting and teachers had a clear understanding of the principal's reasoning behind the school vision, teachers supported the campus initiatives (Lambersky, 2016).

### **Feedback**

The purpose of teacher evaluations is to improve teaching and encourage learning in schools (Gordon, McGill, Sands, Kalinich, Pelligrino, & Chatterji, 2014). Instructional feedback is an approach for observing teachers' lessons and how the students respond to that learning as well as for providing strategies on how to correct the instruction (Oakes, Lane, Menzies, & Buckman, 2018). Therefore, effective principals support and monitor teachers using feedback to guide teachers towards improving instructional practices (Yousaf, Usman, & Islam, 2018; Zepeda, 2014).

According to Drago-Severson (2011), receiving feedback is a vital part of learning. Stone and Heen (2014) stated that when feedback is provided, the receiver may not take it well and when we receive feedback, others do not do a good job of delivering it. Providing and receiving feedback and how it is accepted is crucial to the progression of school principals (Bell, 2020). When school leaders conduct conversations with teachers around a common understanding of good teaching, such conversations offer an opportunity for progression (Danielson, 2011). Bell (2020) suggests that when providing feedback to teachers, the person providing the feedback should validate what the teacher is doing well first and then pinpoint where the teacher needs to make minor changes.

Hozebin's (2018) research regarding feedback through the use of the subjective objective assessment plan (SOAP) discovered participants' capabilities and readiness to take part in traditional post-observation discussions was positive. Participants concurred that beneficial feedback during traditional post-observation dialogues makes it easier to be self-reflective and improve teaching practices (Hozebin, 2018). Therefore, principals' effective supervision will increase and motivate teachers' output and effectiveness (Yousaf, et al., 2018). Principals, who have vast knowledge and skills regarding instructional practices, are considered legitimate leaders in the teachers' eyes (Finnigan, 2011). Horng and Loeb (2010) believe that administrators who are effective leaders are hands-on and collaborate with teachers in school progressions.

### **Professional Development**

Eraut (2006) defined professional development as "the natural process of professional growth in which a teacher steadily acquires self-assurance and confidence, gains new perspectives, acquires more expertise, discovers new techniques and takes on new roles." Obi (2004) found that strong leadership practices such as providing professional development can enhance teacher performance. Robinson, Lloyd, and Rowe (2008) state that the support principals offer in addition to their involvement in professional learning of teachers impacts the learning achievement of students. Yousaf, et al. (2018) found principals play a significant role in teachers' work performance and progress when teachers' professional development is monitored and expanded. Principals can arrange, provide, or inform teachers of pertinent opportunities for staff development to teachers to reach the overall goals of the school (Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008; Yousaf, et al., 2018). Effective professional development allows teachers to increase the knowledge and skill set needed to concentrate on areas of improvement to support student learning (Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008). Zepeda (2014) states

professional development aids in teacher training and makes teaching more of a learning experience. Drago-Severson's (2011) research on Learning Forward's new learning design found three standards of adult learning. The third strand of the learning design articulates the significance of providing adults choice in their learning and the opportunities to collaborate with others. Genuine professional learning, in which adults are learning, growing, and experiencing as they contribute makes a remarkable difference for all stakeholders in the school systems. Educators appreciate professional learning that feels meaningful (Drago-Severson, 2011). Quong and Walker's (2010) research found that strategic leaders create a collaborative learning culture where staff learn from and inspire each other to grow, guarantee the variety, quality, and use of all accessible resources, and create and sustain effective strategies and procedures for professional development.

### **Interactions with Teachers**

Principals' connections with their teachers affect their fulfillment, cohesion, and commitment levels (Price, 2012). Teachers believed that they could be more effective and efficient educators when principals exhibited behaviors such as "showing professional respect, encouraging and acknowledging teacher effort and results, providing appropriate protection, being seen, allowing teacher voice, and communicating principal vision" (Lambersky, 2016, p. 395). Lambersky (2016) found principals who gave professional respect by allowing teachers to voice their opinion, valuing the teachers' instructional skill set, and providing encouragement felt less micromanaged. Educators who received positive reinforcement such as "a kind word, small note, or a brief thank you" felt emotional fulfillment in the workplace, therefore obtaining upcoming commitments from the teachers (Lambersky, 2016, p. 396). Quong and Walker (2010) also found that strategic leaders inspire collective leadership by

identifying the role of teachers as equivalent leaders and recognize and acknowledge their skill set, expertise, and accomplishments as well as remaining humble and respectful.

Lambersky (2016) states that visibility is a subtle way to support teacher emotion and principals who are regularly seen during the day are more likely to increase principal and teacher authority with students, and, as a result, are “agents of order and safety” (p. 399). Balyer’s (2012) research regarding transformational leadership behaviors of school principals found that principals are visible in both classrooms and hallways, respect different points of view, and are aware of the teachers’ needs. Finally, teachers are looking for principals who allow them to have a voice in decision making. Principals who are effective managers tend to trust and value teachers’ knowledge, skills, and experiences (Finnigan, 2011). Hui, Jenatabadi, Ismail, Jasimahbt, and Radzi (2013) found educators whose principals share information and inspire collaborative decision making are more fulfilled with their day-to-day work than teachers who miss out on these opportunities. Teacher commitment becomes greater when principals collaborate with teachers on school decisions as it increases the number of connections between principal and teacher and therefore enhances the relationship (Price, 2012; Lambersky, 2016).

The relationship between teacher and principal is key to build trust and school improvement. Price (2012) states the principal-teacher relationship is a great example of how relational trust progresses from emotional bonds. Scudder (2018) found it is imperative for principals not to overlook the emotional piece of leadership, and to take the opportunity to listen to teachers concerns by responding appropriately to show they care. Bryk and Schneider (2002) found that “relational trust,” conceptualized as the interplay among respect, competence, personal regard, and integrity, reduces uncertainty and vulnerability in contexts involving external pressures and demands” (p. 8). Calahan (2013) stated that “tools such as transparency, well-defined expectations, compassion,

and flexibility are required to grow or sustain teacher trust” (p. 4). Finnigan’s (2011) research discovered two types of trust: “effective management and respect” (p. 8). Effective management represents the everyday tasks of the school and can be a link between teachers and principals (Byrk & Schneider, 2002, Finnigan, 2011). Another characteristic teachers find meaningful for principals is a respectful demeanor, meaning principals do not scold in front of others, have a sense of empathy, and appreciate the ongoing effort teachers put forth daily (Finnigan, 2011). Trust helped schools keep teachers and link the gap of change (Calahan, 2013). Balyer’s (2012) research regarding transformational leadership behaviors of school principals found four characteristics of a transformational leader. Characteristic number one “idealized influence behavior” states principals are understanding of their teachers’ professional needs, teachers trust their principal, and teachers believe in their principals efforts to progress the school forward.

Principals are in a significant position to increase teacher performance by cultivating enthusiasm to bring about school transformation (Finnigan, 2011). According to MacNeil, Prater, and Busch (2009), building a quality school atmosphere is essential in leadership. Through a positive influence on school climate and supportive behaviors, a principal can affect successful instruction and learning as well as teacher collaboration (Tlusciak-Deliowska & Dernowska, 2015). Together, principals and teachers can create an environment of professionalism (Tlusciak-Deliowska & Dernowska, 2015).

## **Evaluations**

### **Texas Teacher Appraisal System**

House Bill 72 was passed by the Texas Legislature in 1984 (Davis-Frost, 2000). Based on the bill, the state board of education was mandated to implement an evaluation system to appraise classroom teachers (Texas Teachers Appraisal System Appraisal Manual [TTASAM], 1989). The TTAS was implemented during the 1986-1987 school

year statewide (TTASAM, 1989). Although the TTASS was intended to be a comprehensive and generic system used to enhance classroom instruction, the evaluation proposed shared actions of effective instruction which became the domains of the appraisal (TTASAM, 1989). Per the Texas Administrative Code 149.42 Teacher Appraisal, “the appraisal of teacher performance for career ladder assignments for staff development, performance shall be appraised with the following criteria subsumed under five major areas called domains” (TEA, 1991, p. 85). According to TEA (1991), the domain descriptors and criterion consisted of the following:

“Domain I: Instructional Strategies:

Criterion 1: Provide opportunities for students to participate actively and successfully,

Criterion 2: Evaluate and provide feedback on student progress during instruction.

Domain II: Classroom Management and Organization:

Criterion 3: Organizes materials and students

Criterion 4: Maximizes amount of time available for instruction

Criterion 5: Manages Student Behaviors.

Domain III: Presentation of Subject Matter

Criterion 6: Teaches for cognitive, affective and/or psychomotor learning

Criterion 7: Uses effective communication skills

Domain IV: Learning Environment

Criterion 8: Uses strategies to motivate students for learning

Criterion 9: Maintains supportive environment

Domain V: Professional Growth and Responsibilities

Criterion 10: Plans for and engages in professional development

Criterion 11: Interacts and communicates effectively with parents

Criterion 12: Complies with policies, operating procedures, and requirements

Criterion 13: Promotes and evaluates student growth (p. 87-88).”

According to TEA (1991) the TTAS was scored according to the following rubric: clearly outstanding (160-184), exceeds expectations (136-159.9), meets expectations (104-135.9), below expectations (80-103.9), and unsatisfactory (below 79.9). Each teacher was required to fill out the Teacher Assessment of Instructional Goals and Outcomes (TAIGO) Part I prior to the end of the second six weeks of school, and Part II of the TAIGO was to be completed prior to the end-of-year summative conference (TEA, 1991). Another purpose of the TTAS was to rank teachers according to performance scores as part of the norm-referenced career ladder (Setliff, 1989). A career ladder suggested teachers would compete with one another for stipends based on their evaluations (Setliff, 1989).

### **Professional Development and Appraisal System**

In 1995, Senate Bill 1 mandated the Commissioner of Education craft an evaluation system for educators in Texas that included input from both teachers and other education professionals (Professional Development and Appraisal System [PDAS] Training Manual, 2007). The Texas Education Code (TEC) 21.351 dictated the new criteria for the appraisal system was comprised of implementation of classroom management and student performance (PDAS Training Manual, 2007). Hence, in 1995, the PDAS was created per the TEC and all teachers were required to be appraised annually and score, at minimum, as proficient on each of the PDAS domains to be eligible for less-than-annual evaluations allowed through HB 1440 (PDAS Training

Manual, 2007). Any teacher who did not meet the criteria in all the PDAS domains could be placed back on an annual 45-minute evaluation despite agreement of being on a less-than-annual basis (PDAS Training Manual, 2007). Per legislation, appraisers were allowed to conduct informal and formal observations for all teachers regardless of whether they were on a PDAS evaluation or a less than annual (PDAS Training Manual, 2007).

The PDAS was comprised of 51 appraisal criteria under eight domains. The eight domains were the following:

- Active, Successful Student Participation in the Learning Process
- Learner-Centered Instruction
- Evaluation and Feedback on Student Progress
- Management of Student Discipline, Instructional Strategies, Time, and Materials
- Professional Communication
- Professional Development
- Compliance with Policies, Operating Procedures, and Requirements
- Improvement of Academic Performance of All Students on the Campus (PDAS Training Manual, 2007).

Domain eight had 10 criteria connected to student performance. Out of the 10, five reflected on the efforts of teacher planning, analyzing, and delivering instruction. One related to monitoring student attendance and three focused on how well the teacher identified at-risk students (PDAS Training Manual, 2007).

In addition to the observation portion of the PDAS, teachers were also responsible for the Teacher Self-Report (TSR). The TSR was an opportunity for teachers to show evidence in the sixth and eighth domains regarding how they used their professional development to improve student achievement (PDAS Training Manual, 2007).

PDAS used a 4-point Likert scale for scoring: *exceeds expectations, proficient, below expectations, and unsatisfactory* (PDAS Training Manual, 2007). Ratings in each PDAS domain was scored individually so there were no collective scores (PDAS Training Manual, 2007).

The PDAS evaluation system required a principal to conduct at minimum one 45-minute observation along with two additional walkthrough observations (PDAS Training Manual, 2007). If the district chose, teacher observations did not have to be scheduled, and, if agreed upon, teachers had the option to split the 45-minute observation into two separate evaluations (PDAS Training Manual, 2007). If teachers had concerns or did not agree with the original observation provided, they had the option to request a second evaluation completed by a different appraiser (PDAS Training Manual, 2007). Teachers who scored less than proficient in more than one domain would be placed on an intervention plan to provide them additional opportunities for professional development in the areas of need (PDAS Training Manual, 2007). Summative conferences were opportunities for teacher and principal to discuss any concerns regarding the appraisal. All teachers were offered the opportunity to have a summative conference with the appraiser at the end of the year unless the teacher opted out of the summative conference requirement (PDAS Training Manual, 2007).

### **Texas Teacher Evaluation and Support System**

The state of Texas revamped the educator appraisal system in response to the new directives given from the United States Department of Education (Templeton, Willis, & Hendricks, 2016). School principals should consider the T-TESS appraisal processes as a chance to truly become instructional leaders or coaches for the campus (Templeton, et al., 2016). Principals who used targeted leadership coaching nurtured a stronger institution and built capacity in staff (Bolman & Deal, 2011). The overall goal of the T-TESS

evaluation process is for the evaluator and the teacher to work together in an effective and efficient way that supports individualized professional growth (T-TESS, 2019).

T-TESS was piloted by Texas school districts beginning in 2014. By 2016, T-TESS became the official evaluation instrument used by all Texas school districts (T-TESS, 2019). If school districts did not want to use the T-TESS instrument, they had to supply an instrument that was equivalent in nature. In Chapter 150 of the Commissioner's Rules, every highly qualified teacher must be evaluated by the T-TESS scoring rubric or another instrument that is similar to the Texas Education Code (TEC) §21.352, and §150.1007 (Appraisals Laws and Rules, 2019).

Throughout the school year, evaluators and teachers gauge instructional performance using feedback and dialogue based on observational evidence in four domains: planning, instruction, learning environment, and professional practices and responsibilities. Each domain has three to five dimensions to score teachers. Domain one has four dimensions with a focus on planning. The dimensions are 1.1 (Standards and Alignment), 1.2 (Data and Assessment), 1.3 (Knowledge of Students) and 1.4 (Activities) (Rubric, 2019c). Domain two has five dimensions under the instruction umbrella. These dimensions are 2.1 (Achieving Expectations), 2.2 (Content Knowledge and Expertise), 2.3 (Communication), 2.4 (Differentiation), and 2.5 (Monitor and Adjust) (Rubric, 2019c). Domain three has three dimensions that focus on the teacher's learning environment. These dimensions are 3.1 (Classroom Environment, Routines, and Procedures), 3.2 (Managing Student Behavior), and 3.3 (Classroom Culture) (Rubric, 2019c). Domain four has four dimensions that have a focus on professional practices and responsibilities. The four dimensions are 4.1 (Professional Demeanor and Ethics), 4.2 (Goal Setting), 4.3 (Professional Development), and 4.4 (School Community Involvement) (Rubric, 2019). All 16 dimensions are scored on a scale ranging from the

lowest score of improvement needed (teacher-center actions) to the highest score of distinguished (student-centered actions) (Rubric, 2019). The 17<sup>th</sup> dimension is based on a student learning objective (SLO) and is scored based on student growth separately from the other 16 dimensions (T-TESS, 2019).

### **Comparison of the TTAS, PDAS, and T-TESS**

Since 1984, the state board of education has required an evaluation system to appraise teachers. With each appraisal system, the domains and criteria have ranged from a minimum of four domains with 17 criteria to eight domains with 51 criteria. The three evaluations each have different rating systems that range from distinguished to improvement needed, clearly outstanding to below expectations, or exceeds expectations to unsatisfactory. The TTASS and PDAS each required the teacher to complete a teacher self-report, whereas the T-TESS requires self-reflective goal setting. The TTAS allowed teachers to be ranked and earn monetary stipends but the PDAS and T-TESS evaluations do not allow this. The TTAS and PDAS evaluations required a “growth plan” for teachers who scored below expectations in two or more domains or unsatisfactory in one domain. T-TESS does not have an exact growth plan. The growth plan is ongoing based on goal setting and determining if the teacher is on track to meet that goal. The T-TESS evaluation is goal and collaboration driven whereas the TTAS and PDAS were checklist-based criteria and had no focus on teacher growth with goal setting.

Similarities of the TTASS, PDAS, and T-TESS are that each evaluation has domains in instructional strategies, classroom management, professional development, and meeting policies and district requirements. Each of the evaluations also requires a summative conference at the end of the school year. A major difference between PDAS and T-TESS is the necessity for evidence-based data to support the evaluation ratings (Templeton, et al., 2016). Using direct statements and reflection from the data to spark

conversation, the evaluation becomes less of a power struggle and more collaborative between appraiser and educator (Templeton, et al., 2016). With PDAS, the teacher only had to bring evidence for domains six and eight (PDAS Training Manual, 2007) to show professional development and student improvement. All three appraisal systems came into play per the TAC and state mandated laws for teacher improvement.

### **Teacher Perceptions of Evaluations**

Teacher appraisals that evaluate teacher observation in conjunction with student success have become quite common in education (Neumerski, Grissom, Goldring, Drake, Rubin, Canata & Schuermann, 2018). Many teacher evaluations include formative and summative evaluations (Sheppard, 2013). A formative evaluation is meant to help and support teachers in their professional growth and a summative evaluation is used to see if a teacher met the minimum requirement (Sheppard, 2013). In Chicago, Jiang, Spote, and Luppescu (2015) conducted research on teacher perceptions of the new evaluation system (Recognizing Educators Advancing Chicago Students REACH) being implemented in schools. Educators were not in favor of student growth being a part of the appraisal process, particularly teachers of primary grades (Jiang, et al., 2015). Chicago teachers voiced apprehension regarding the progress measurement piece added to the evaluation because they deemed it unfair in schools that are more challenging than others because parent support is unlikely in these areas (Jiang, et al., 2015).

In Israel, Ungar (2018) conducted qualitative research to determine teachers' perceptions of the evaluation process based on their experiences and discovered four themes concerning teachers' outlook towards evaluations. Theme one, "how educators perceive teacher appraisals," had two subthemes: "judgement and professional growth" (Ungar, 2018, p. 515). Teacher participants defined the appraisal process as judgmental by comparing it to being under a microscope or having to take a look in the mirror at

oneself (Ungar, 2018). Vekeman, Devos, and Tuytens (2015) found Belgian teachers did not want the appraisal system to be used as a punishment for their deficiencies in the classroom or as a way for administrators to take control over instructional practices. In contrast, teachers felt the evaluation process included teacher growth (Ungar, 2018). Vekeman, et al (2015), found that other teachers in the research expected a positive outcome of teacher development in instructional practices. The second theme, “teachers’ perceptions of how the evaluation process should proceed,” had two subthemes: “the pre-evaluation process and the desirable junctures for undertaking the evaluation” (Ungar, 2018, p. 516). During the pre-appraisal process, teachers wanted principals to establish guidelines and expectations as well as define criteria to be successful on the evaluation (Ungar, 2018). Teachers in the study agreed that the evaluations should be spaced out over the duration of the school year (Ungar, 2018). The third theme examines the pros and cons of the evaluation process (Ungar, 2018). Participants revealed when teachers’ evaluations are completed, together teacher and principal can develop new instructional strategies, exclude less effective methods of teaching, and encourage personal growth (Ungar, 2018). Jiang, et al. (2015) found the majority of their participants believed the evaluator was reasonable and measured the observation correctly. Educators liked the fact that evaluators must be evidenced-based in their findings and provide specific feedback well enough to provide support with their teaching practices (Jiang, et al., 2015). Principal-teacher trust was related to teachers’ perceptions of evaluation feedback (Jiang, et al., 2015). One negative aspect of having an appraisal is the evaluator may not complete the evaluations in a timely manner due to time restrictions and may not stay long enough to get sound evidence from the observation (Ungar, 2018). A second negative aspect to the evaluation process is the evaluation can be subjective and

undesirable feedback from the principal can cause a decrease in confidence and motivation for continued efforts for the teachers (Ungar, 2018).

The final theme found nine ways to increase effectiveness of teacher evaluation (Ungar, 2018).

- Evaluations need to take place throughout the school year.
- Appraisers must be knowledgeable and considered a resource for professional development.
- Evaluators should play the role mentor
- Feedback should be delivered positively
- Evaluators must monitor consistently after feedback is provided.
- Guidelines for evaluation success need to be provided.
- Principal and teacher should work as partners.
- Peer evaluations should be used.
- Observations need to be conducted across multiple subject areas (Ungar, 2018).

Rindler's (1994) study regarding the evaluation systems of teachers in intensive English programs found several factors that influence teachers' professional development such as effectiveness of ideas, integrity and trustworthiness of the appraiser, evaluators' capability to model strategies, quantity of feedback provided, time spent on the evaluation, and expectations were clear and supported by the teacher. Sutton (2008) collected qualitative data in the mid-Atlantic region and inquired about teachers' comprehension of the evaluation system. Teachers reported that building relationships, having clear communication, providing professional development, and knowing the evaluation process can be taxing are important factors to the evaluation process (Sutton, 2008). Doherty (2009) studied teachers in Massachusetts using the TEP and found that

teachers felt the existing evaluation system had a positive effect on their progress professionally and the appraisal positively impacted school improvement.

### **National Educational Leadership Preparation Program Recognition Standards**

Not only do teachers have national standards they must uphold but administrators do as well. In 2015, the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA) replaced the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards that had defined educational leadership since 1996 (Smylie & Murphy, 2016). The NPBEA, the Council for Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), and the Wallace Foundation (financial supporter) collaborated to revamp the nationwide standards that monitors the groundwork and practice for academic leaders (NPBEA, 2018). Supported with research, the National Educational Leadership Preparation (NELP) Program Standards offered an outline for consideration on methods to train, assist, and appraise educational leaders (NPBEA, 2018). In 1996, the CCSSO circulated its first version of national standards for educational leaders followed by revisions in 2008 backed by continued research (NPBEA, 2018). For at least two decades, the two versions of standards continued to offer a framework for educational leadership policy at the state level (NPBEA, 2018). Changes to the standards are needed as education moves towards the twenty-first century workplace with technology advancements along with changes in educational leadership continuing to be a priority (NPBEA, 2018). With these changes, it is evident that updated standards are needed to guide educational leaders in their practice to be productive (NPBEA, 2018).

Standard 7.3 states a skilled educational leader should independently involve educators in “professional learning designed to promote reflection and school improvement” (NPBEA, 2018, p. 28). Principals should “plan for opportunities for

professional growth that promotes reflection and evaluate professional staff capacity needs and management practices” (NPBEA, 2018, p. 29)

Standard 7.4 states campus leaders’ skill set should competently “evaluate, develop, implement, and support to promote school improvement” (NPBEA, 2018, p. 29). Specifically, principals need to be able to “provide teaching staff with actionable feedback to support improvement and develop a system for monitoring whether supervision and evaluation strategies promote improvement” (NPBEA, 2018, p. 29).

### **Surveys**

#### **Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire**

In 1962, Halpin and Croft established a survey instrument entitled the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) (Hoy & Clover, 1986). The OCDQ survey initially listed eight organizational climates but was condensed to six after further research (Hoy & Clover, 1986). Out of the six climates, three related to principals’ behaviors, “supportive, directive, or restrictive,” and the other three bands referenced teachers’ behaviors: “collegial, intimate, or disengaged” (Hoy & Clover, 1986, p. 100). In 1986, an updated version of the OCDQ contained four grouping types of open/closed school climate based on principals and teachers, open focuses on supportive and collegial/intimate teachers, engaged has a focus on restrictive and/or directive principals but has collegial/intimate teachers, disengaged with a focus on supportive principals with disengaged teachers, and closed which has restrictive principals and disengaged teachers (Hoy & Clover, 1986). The OCDQ is composed of 42 items survey with six sub-tests. The instrument uses a 4-point Likert scale of *rarely occurs, sometimes occurs, often occurs, and very frequently occurs*.

## **Teacher Evaluation Profile**

According to Stiggins and Nickel (1989), the school setting must have defined norms in order for teachers to develop instructionally. To support educator growth, the school environment needs to be suitable for learning, teachers need to be open to their own growth, and over time, resources and activities need to be provided for teachers. One way to contribute to the growth of educators is through the appraisal process (Stiggins & Nickel, 1989). During the appraisal process, evidence collected can be used to inspire collaborative discourse between the teacher and appraiser. Such dialogue can be used to suggest needed instructional improvements, goal setting, resources, and possible professional development the teacher can attend to enhance instructional strategies (Stiggins & Nickel, 1989).

Research from Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin and Bernstein (1984), and Stiggins and Bridgeford (1985) uncovered that classroom educators never developed a professional development plan during the appraisal process. Based on this research, Stiggins and Duke (1988) began the creation of the Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP) to determine why this was the case. Stiggins and Duke (1988) piloted their first study on teacher evaluation systems to disclose hindrances to teacher growth through the appraisal process. The second study Stiggins and Duke (1988) conducted examined classroom teachers' perceptions of having a positive experience in instructional growth as a result of a positive evaluation (Stiggins & Nickel, 1989). The final study conducted by Stiggins and Duke (1988) revealed successful appraisals were connected to different teacher growth experiences. Based on the survey provided in the third study, the questionnaire was revised into the TEP (Stiggins & Nickel, 1989). The TEP survey opens with questions that refer to the overall quality and influence of a teacher's most current appraisal experience (Stiggins & Nickel, 1989). Originally the TEP consisted of 55

questions; however, Stiggins and Duke's pilot study determined that only 44 key attributes described the overall teacher evaluation experience. The survey uses a Likert-type scale that ranges from not credible to very credible to infrequent to frequent (Stiggins & Duke, 1988, p. 155).

### **Summary**

In this chapter, the researcher discussed literature connected with teachers' perceptions of principal behaviors, past and present evaluation systems in Texas, teachers' perceptions of the overall evaluation process, National Educational Leadership Preparation (NELP) Standards, and background on the OCDQ-RE and TEP surveys. The literature revealed teachers appreciated principals who provided direction setting by delivering a clear vision, mission, and expectations which improved teacher work environment, self-efficacy, trust, and overall job performance. Principals who provided feedback to teachers guided them toward increased motivation and better instructional strategies. Teachers also found professional development opportunities to be important in the evaluation process since providing teachers new learning opportunities can enhance teacher performance (Obi, 2004). Lambersky (2016) found that positive interactions between principals and teachers such as giving a mutual respect, recognizing teacher efforts, allowing teachers to have a voice in campus decision making, providing appropriate protection, being visible in classrooms, and not micromanaging teachers provided an increase in teacher commitment to the vision and mission of the campus. The researcher used portions of the OCDQ-RE to help collect data on participants' perceptions of supportive principal behaviors.

Since the early 1980's, teacher evaluations have been a topic of discussion for the Texas Legislature. Texas has had three evaluation systems since 1984: the TTASS, PDAS, and T-TESS. Although the TTASS and PDAS were intended to enhance teacher

instruction, they both became more compliance-based than instructional. The TTASS and PDAS asked for minimal evidence and self-reflection to be provided to the appraiser either through the teacher-self-report or for PDAS in domains six (professional development) and eight (student improvement). The T-TESS, however, asks for teachers to be reflective throughout the entire process. It asks for teachers to set goals, have a pre-conference and post-conference with principals, change goals as needed, comprise student learning objectives (SLO), collect evidence for goals, discuss areas of refinement and reinforcement, and allows several opportunities for the principal to provide feedback to the teachers to make improvements along the way.

To help collect this data, the researcher used portions of the OCDQ-RE and the TEP surveys to help find participants' perceptions of supportive principal behaviors and the overall T-TESS evaluation process. For the purpose of this study, standards 7.3 and 7.4 of the NELP standards relate to the research. In 2015, the NPBEA replaced the ISLLC standards. The standards began to become more aligned on ways to train, assist, and appraise teachers. As changes were needed to keep up with 21st century technology, it was evident that the standards also needed to guide educators as well to be productive in their practice (NPBEA, 2018).

## CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

### **Overview of the Research Problem**

T-TESS is the evaluation system used in the Title I urban district in Southeast Texas and began implementation in 2016. The evaluation system intends to improve teachers' instructional practices through principal and teacher collaboration. Since the T-TESS evaluation is fairly new in the state of Texas, there is a gap in the research correlating supportive principal behaviors to the overall T-TESS evaluation process. The purpose of this study was to investigate teachers' perceptions of supportive principal behaviors, teachers' perceptions of the T-TESS evaluation process, and the relationship between the two. The outcomes of this research will help school principals by providing actionable results to enhance leadership practices. Findings may be used to identify specific behaviors of principals that produce more effective professional development plans and improve teachers' instructional practices to support student learning.

### **Operationalization of Theoretical Constructs**

The quantitative portion of the study contained two constructs: perceptions of supportive principal behaviors and the overall evaluation process. The perceptions of supportive principal behaviors were measured with the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ-RE) (revised elementary version). The perceptions of the overall evaluation process were measured using the Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP). Both constructs were measured on a Likert scale to determine the degree to which participants agreed with the questions posed.

### **Research Purpose and Questions**

The purpose of this study was to investigate teachers' perceptions of supportive principal behaviors, the perceptions of the overall T-TESS evaluation process, and the

relationship between teachers' perceptions of principal behaviors and teachers' perceptions of the teacher evaluation process at the elementary and middle school levels.

The following research questions were studied:

1. What correlation exists between elementary and middle school teachers' perceptions of supportive principal behaviors and the perceptions of teachers' overall T-TESS evaluation process?
2. What is the effect of supportive principal behaviors on the overall T-TESS evaluation process as measured by the OCDQ-RE and the TEP?
3. What are elementary and middle school teachers' perceptions of supportive principal behaviors and teachers' perceptions of the overall T-TESS evaluation process?

### **Research Design**

For this study, the researcher used an explanatory sequential design. The researcher began with gathering quantitative data followed by a compilation of qualitative data to further support the quantitative findings. An explanatory design is "one in which results or questions arising from quantitative data are explored qualitatively, producing data that are used to complement or clarify the original findings" (Shifferdecker & Reed, 2009, p.639).

This study addressed the relationship between teachers' perceptions of supportive principal behaviors and teachers' perceptions of the overall T-TESS evaluation process. An explanatory sequential design mixed methods design was used and involved collecting quantitative results first and then explaining the quantitative results with in-depth qualitative data. In the first, quantitative phase of the study, the OCDQ-RE and TEP data were collected from elementary and middle school teachers from local elementary/middle schools in the Title I urban district to test elementary and middle

school teachers' perceptions of supportive principal behaviors. The second, qualitative phase was conducted as a follow-up to the quantitative results to help explain the quantitative results. In this exploratory follow-up, the plan was to explore teachers' perceptions of supportive principals' behaviors and teachers' perceptions of the overall T-TESS evaluation process with elementary and middle school teachers from local schools in the Title I urban district.

Secondly, the study addressed teachers' perceptions of the overall T-TESS evaluation process and the teachers' perceptions of principals' behaviors. The purpose of this exploratory sequential design was to first qualitatively explore with a small sample and then to determine if the qualitative findings generalize to a large sample. The first phase of the study was the qualitative exploration of teachers' perceptions of principals' behaviors and teachers' perceptions of the overall T-TESS evaluation in which survey and individual interview data were collected from elementary/middle school teachers in the Title I urban district. From this initial exploration, the qualitative findings were used to develop measures that could be administered to a large sample. In the planned quantitative phase, OCDQ-RE and TEP were collected from elementary/middle school teachers in an Title I urban district.

Qualitative research suggests the understanding of "why" individuals participate in particular actions or behaviors (Rosenthal, 2016). The research interview is one of the most critical qualitative data collecting methods and if the qualitative interviews are done correctly, they can provide a rich set of data (Qu & Dumay, 2011). In-depth interviews involve asking open-ended questions and obtaining a comprehensive understanding of participants' experiences, views, beliefs, feelings, and knowledge (Rosenthal, 2016). In the qualitative phase, the researcher asked seven open-ended interview questions to elementary and middle school teachers that focused on supportive principal behaviors

and the overall T-TESS evaluation process. The researcher asked these specific questions to gain a more personalized understanding of the teachers’ perceptions of the two variables.

### **Population**

This mid-sized urban school district located in the southeast region of Texas services 45,423 students (TEA, 2020). Although the Title I urban district is considered to be average in size, there are a variety of campuses and diverse student populations. Additionally, the district employs 3,260 highly qualified teachers. The composition of schools is displayed in Table 3.1, and student demographics are outlined in Table 3.2.

Table 3.1

*Comparison of School Population Based on 2018-2019 TAPR*

---

School	Grades Served	Number of Campuses
Elementary	PK-4	21
	PK-5	3
Intermediate	5-6	6
Middle	7-8	6
Ninth Grade Center	9	2
High School	10-12	2
High School	9-12	1
Magnet	9-12	1
Early	9-12	1
Technical	9-12	1

---

Table 3.2

*Student Demographics*

	Frequency ( <i>n</i> )	Percentage (%)
<b>Ethnicity</b>		
African American	13,123	28.9%
American Indian	319	0.7%
Asian	5,318	11.7%
Caucasian	1,708	3.8%
Hispanic	24,637	54.2%
Pacific Islander	73	0.2%
Two or More Races	245	0.5%
<b>Socio-Economic Status</b>		
Economically Disadvantaged	38,336	84.4%
Non-economically Disadvantaged	7,087	15.6%
English Language Learners	19,837	43.7%
At-Risk	36,078	79.4%

**Sample**

The researcher used a convenience sample to gather quantitative data from teachers. The sample included 279.6 highly qualified elementary teachers who teach Pre-Kindergarten (PK) through 5th grade and 162.8 highly qualified middle school teachers who teach 7th and 8th grade and have one or more years of experience. A purposeful sample was used to collect qualitative data. The participants were asked on the survey if they would be willing to be interviewed so the researcher could collect further data. The researcher individually interviewed eight teachers who volunteered. Since the district

adopted T-TESS in 2016, all participants had experienced the T-TESS evaluation process at least one or more times.

### **Participant Selection**

For the quantitative data collection, the researcher collaborated with the district IRB representative on when and how the collective survey would be distributed to staff members. Due to COVID-19, the district IRB representative stated the survey could not go out to all elementary and middle school campuses at one time. The surveys could only be sent to principals who agreed with sending out the survey to their staff members. To start, the researcher contacted four elementary schools and two middle schools for permission to send out the surveys. Once permission was granted from the principals, the survey was sent to staff members from the corresponding schools.

For the qualitative participant selection, the researcher added a question at the end of the survey to ask for volunteers willing to be interviewed. Once teachers were identified, the researcher contacted participants via email (if provided), phone call, or text message to request personal email addresses for those who did not provide that information. After the email information was provided, the researcher emailed the consent form for the participant to sign. When the researcher received the signed consent form, the researcher set up individual video conference meetings via Zoom.

### **Instrumentation**

Supportive principal behaviors were measured using of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire OCDQ-RE (revised elementary version) to collect data (Hoy & Clover, 1986). Permission to use this questionnaire was obtained prior to collecting data (see Appendix A). The OCDQ-RE is a 42-item survey with six sub-tests. The instrument uses a four-point Likert scale of rarely occurs, sometimes occurs, often occurs, and very frequently occurs. Reliability related to the sub-test's alpha coefficients

regarding supportive principals was (S) (.95) (Hoy & Clover, 1986). In Hoy & Clover's 1986 study, six hypothetical measurements of school climate were created. The relationships between the measurements steadily held up as theoretically projected (Hoy & Clover, 1986). Therefore, the item (variable) quantifying each element was systematically correlated to each other as anticipated in the test of the OCDQ-RE (Hoy & Clover, 1986). For the basis of this research, the researcher used only the statements from the OCDQ-RE that were related to principal behaviors (see Appendix D).

The second survey the researcher used to collect data was the Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP) (see Appendix E). The questionnaire requests teachers to describe their most recent evaluation under five categories: attributes of the teacher, evaluator, data collection on teacher performance, feedback, and evaluation context (Stiggins & Duke, 1988). Originally the TEP consisted of 55 questions; however, Stiggins and Duke's pilot study determined only 44 key attributes described the overall teacher evaluation experience. The survey was used in over 27 districts in Connecticut, Montana, Ohio, Oregon, and Washington and was answered by more than 4,500 teachers. Depending on the type of question, the survey uses a Likert type scale that ranges from *not credible to very credible, infrequent to frequent, none to a great deal*, etc (Stiggins & Nickel, 1988, p. 155). The revised TEP has met validity as it "offers data on attributes of a teacher evaluation environment and is related to growth and development" and is reliable as it "produces internally consistent data on those attributes" (Stiggins & Nickel, 1988, p. 162). Permission to use this survey was obtained from Education Northwest prior to collecting data (see Appendix B). For the basis of this research, the researcher used two out of five subsets to collect the data focused on the overall evaluation experience.

One interview protocol was developed to conference with both elementary and middle school teachers (See Appendix G). The interview questions were based on the

review of the literature, related questions from the OCDQ-RE and TEP surveys, and the research questions. Pseudonyms were used to protect the identity of the participants.

### **Data Collection Procedures**

The researcher gathered both quantitative and qualitative data sets. Data were combined and findings were analyzed to understand the research problem (Creswell, 2008). To collect the quantitative data, the researcher used the survey program Qualtrics to create the questionnaire ([uhcl.qualtrics.com/](http://uhcl.qualtrics.com/)). Once the survey was created, the researcher composed an email to the IRB district representative with the corresponding link to be used to complete the survey. The email was sent to specific principals and the principal sent the email to participants. In the email, the participants were directed to “click on the link below” to be sent directly to the Qualtrics survey. The researcher continued to contact schools for permission until a significant number (n=100) of participants were obtained.

To begin collecting the qualitative data, the researcher contacted the eight volunteers from the survey to confirm their participation in the interview. Once permission from interview participants was obtained, the researcher emailed each individual participant the consent form. When participants returned the signed consent form the researcher, individual video conferences were sent using Zoom. The platform allows for the “host” to audio record and save each individual interview. During the interview, each participant was asked seven questions regarding supportive principal behaviors and the overall T-TESS evaluation process. At each meeting, the researcher reviewed the purpose of the study, interview questions, and reminded participants that the interview was strictly voluntary, participants could opt out at any time, and that a pseudonym would be used.

## Data Analysis Procedures

### Quantitative

For the quantitative data, the responses from the survey were examined. To analyze the quantitative data, the researcher used the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) program to find the mean, standard deviations, and the correlation between the teachers' perceptions of supportive principal behaviors and teachers' perceptions of the overall T-TESS process. A Pearson's correlation coefficient was used to analyze the relationship between supportive principal behaviors and the overall evaluation process.

To collect the data regarding which grade level the participants taught, the researcher asked for the participants to choose either elementary or middle school. SPSS then assigned a code for elementary (12) and middle school (13). The researcher then asked, "What campus are you currently at?" The participants typed in the name of their campus therefore, no coding was needed for this question as the information was provided when exported from SPSS. To determine the number of years of experience for each teacher, the survey question was set for participants to enter a two digit number. This number was exported from SPSS and was easy to separate into categories; therefore no coding was needed for this particular question. For the remaining survey questions that were scored on a Likert Scale, the participants chose an answer ranging from *rarely occurs to very frequently occurs, credible to not credible, unfamiliar to familiar*, etc, and the scores were converted to a number from ranging from one to five when exported from SPSS.

Due to COVID-19, the district sent out a number of surveys to all staff members inquiring about employees thoughts regarding virtual learning versus in person learning, how safe the safe members felt to return to work, information regarding who is willing to

return and who is not, etc. to collect data. Due to the number of surveys sent from the district regarding COVID concerns, the researcher had to reduce the number of total survey questions. The OCDQ-RE has 42 questions that pertain to teacher and principal behaviors. The researcher focused on the nine survey questions that referred to supportive principal behaviors. The TEP consisted of five parts that focused on teacher attributes, perceptions of the evaluator, information gathered on teacher's performance, feedback received, and the attributes of the evaluation context. To uphold the validity of the survey, the researcher chose two parts that focused on the teachers' perceptions of the evaluation process (Part B) and the teacher evaluation process (Part C). The researcher did not chose parts A, D, or E of the survey since not all questions in these sections were pertinent to the research and could not be separated from the other questions in the section.

### **Qualitative**

Concurrent triangulation is described as “the type of data collected at the same time using two or more methods to cross validate data findings happening at the same time. Its purpose is for both the quantitative and qualitative methods to be used to overcome a weakness in using one method with the strength of the other” (Rani, Jithin, Phurailatpam, & Radhika, & Clement, 2019, p. 3-4). Therefore, the researcher used the findings of the qualitative interview data to strengthen the data of the quantitative findings. Coding is a method where the researcher reads and compares ideas from the transcripts to pinpoint repeated concepts (Rosenthal, 2016). The researcher used open coding to find common themes and axial coding to determine a more in depth finding of common themes until data were saturated. Then, the researcher combined themes that were alike from the participant interviews. Triangulation was used to merge the survey

data and the interview data collected to determine if the results supported or contradicted the research questions.

### **Validity**

Rosenthal (2016) suggests researchers cross check the transcription to the audio recording to confirm accuracy. The researcher strengthened the validity of this study by audio recording the interviews and transcribing each interview. Therefore, the researcher had an accurate account of exactly what each participant stated. The researcher used the audio recordings and transcriptions to cross reference data to ensure information reported was authentic to the participant. Using this method, the researcher confirmed responses have been transcribed accurately.

### **Privacy and Ethical Considerations**

The researcher received permission to conduct the study from the University of Houston-Clear Lake (UHCL) Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects (CPHS) and the school district's Institutional Review Board (IRB) before collecting data. Once permission was granted from both parties, the researcher collected the quantitative and qualitative data.

Participants in the study were not subject to any harm. Risks to the participants were minimal as participation was voluntary and participants could opt out of the research study at any time without penalty. All data were kept confidential with only the researcher having access to the information. All responses were kept on the researcher's computer hard drive and flash drive. Pseudonyms were used to keep the confidentiality of participants' names. Research will be kept for a minimum of five years after the study was completed and then will be eliminated properly.

### **Research Design Limitations**

There were multiple factors that were limitations to the study. One limitation was that the researcher only gathered and analyzed data from participants in one urban school district. The researcher was also limited to the number of schools to send the survey out to due to COVID-19. The district IRB representative requested that mass surveys not be sent out to the entire district. Another limitation to the research was that the survey data collected were only a snapshot of a smaller sample. In the survey collection, not all participants answered all of the questions, therefore leaving  $n < 100$ . Additionally, the researcher was limited to volunteers for individual interviews. Since the researcher was limited on the number of schools the survey could be sent to, this limited the number of interview volunteers. Lastly, the researcher wanted to use all portions of the TEP for data collection regarding the overall evaluation process. However, the IRB district representative highly encouraged the researcher to lower the number of research questions because she felt that with the pandemic situation taking place and an abundance of surveys already having been sent from the district, the researcher would not receive the responses needed if the survey was too long. Therefore, the researcher only used two sections of the TEP and only focused on principal behaviors from the OCDQ-RE.

### **Conclusion**

Overall, the ultimate goal of the T-TESS evaluation is for administrator and educator to work collectively to build capacity in the classroom teacher. Lambersky (2016) states educators are looking for principals to have certain supportive behaviors such as being respectful, encouraging, acknowledging teacher efforts, etc. to help teachers become more effective and efficient instructionally. In the literature review, researchers found teachers had both positive and negative reactions to their evaluation process. In this study, the researcher gained insight on whether or not the Title I urban

district's principals are meeting the needs of the teachers and if principals are willing to be active participants in teachers' professional growth. Through this study, finding a relationship between the principals' supportive behaviors and the teachers' overall T-TESS experience could help build capacity not only administratively but instructionally for teachers.

## CHAPTER IV:

### RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to investigate teacher perceptions of supportive principal behaviors and the overall T-TESS evaluation process as well as the relationship between supportive principal behaviors, and the overall evaluation process at the elementary and middle school levels in an urban school district. The quantitative data were collected using portions of the two surveys that relate to the research: the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ-RE) (supportive principal behaviors) and the Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP) (teacher evaluation process). The qualitative data were collected through individual interviews with teachers on both the elementary and middle school levels (see Appendix G).

#### **Demographic Characteristics of the Participants**

Sections of the OCDQ-RE and the TEP surveys were combined into one survey for the participants. Due to COVID-19 and the abundance of surveys being sent out from the district, the survey was only sent to teachers at particular elementary and middle schools in the Title I urban district. For the quantitative portion of the study, there were 51 (49%) elementary participants and 54 (51%) middle school participants, N=105 (100%). For the qualitative portion of the study, eight teachers (five elementary school teachers and three middle school teachers) were individually interviewed to further discuss teachers' perceptions of supportive principal behaviors and the overall evaluation experience. Participants' years of experience ranged from one to 30 years. The researcher collected years of experience of teaching using the following ranges, zero to five (30 participants), six to 10 (20 participants), 11 to 15 (25 participants), 16-20 (16 participants), and 21 or more years (14 participants). Table 4.1 details information regarding participants.

Table 4.1

*Demographics of Participants*

	N	%
<b>Grade Level</b>		
Elementary	51	49
Middle	54	51
<b>Years of Experience</b>		
0-5 years	30	28.57
6-10 years	20	19.04
11-15 years	25	23.81
16-20 years	16	15.24
21 or more years	14	13.33

**Quantitative Results**

**Research Question One**

In exploring research question one, “What correlation exists between elementary and middle school teachers’ perceptions of supportive principal behaviors and the perceptions of teachers’ overall evaluation process” quantitatively, the researcher ran a Pearson’s correlation coefficient to calculate and determine if there was a relationship between teachers’ perceptions of supportive principal behaviors and teachers’ perceptions of the overall T-TESS evaluation process. The Pearson’s correlation determined there was a relationship between the two variables. According to the Pearson’s correlations, supportive principal behaviors (SPB) showed a significant positive relationship with the teacher evaluation process,  $r(91)=.692, p<0.01$ . This implies that a significant relationship exists between teachers’ perceptions of supportive principal behaviors and teachers’ perceptions of the overall evaluation process.

## **Research Question Two**

In order to explore research question two, “What is the effect of supportive principal behaviors on the overall T-TESS evaluation process as measured by the OCDQ-RE and the TEP?” one portion of the OCDQ-RE survey was used to find teachers’ perceptions of supportive principals’ behaviors and two sections of the TEP were used to find teachers’ perceptions of the overall evaluation process. Survey questions were ranked on a Likert-type scale of one to five based on the type of question posed to the participants. The OCDQ-RE survey questions asked participants’ interpretations on how the principal ensures the following:

- provides corrective criticism
- is helpful
- listens/accepts teacher suggestions
- asks about personal welfare of teachers
- treats teachers as equals
- is complimentary
- is easy to understand
- shows teacher appreciation
- explains criticism

Table 4.2 details the OCDQ-RE questions on supportive principal behaviors.

Table 4.2

*Survey Results for the OCDQ-RE*

Supportive Principal Behaviors: The principal	N	M	SD
goes out of his/her way to help	93	2.52	.653
uses corrective criticism	93	2.53	.582
explains his/her reasons for criticism	87	2.43	.658
looks out for personal welfare	92	2.62	.571
treats teachers as equals	91	2.45	.654
compliments teachers	92	2.66	.498
easy to understand	93	2.61	.572
shows appreciation	91	2.52	.603
listens/accepts teacher suggestions	90	2.33	.618

As identified in Table 4.2, each of the nine questions had a mean of 2.33 or higher which showed at least 77.67% of the teachers believed their principal exhibited supportive behaviors. Therefore, more than 50% of the teachers have positive perceptions of supportive principal behaviors regarding the overall T-TESS evaluation process.

The TEP, the second part of the survey was used to find teachers' perceptions of the overall evaluation process. The 25 questions asked focused on the perceptions of the

person who evaluates teachers' performance and described the attributes of the information gathered during teachers' most recent evaluation.

Table 4.3

*Survey Results for TEP Part B*

Describe Your Perceptions of Person Who Evaluated Your Performance (Most Recently)	N	M	SD
Credibility as a source of feedback	92	4.39	.838
Working relationship with you	91	4.35	.848
Level of Trust	92	4.26	.850
Interpersonal Manner	92	4.40	.878
Temperament	91	4.26	1.009
Flexibility	91	4.13	1.046
Knowledge of technical aspects of teaching	90	4.39	.831
Capacity to demonstrate or model needed improvements	91	3.96	1.095
Familiarity with your classroom in general	89	4.06	1.026
Experience in classrooms in general	87	4.24	.889
Usefulness of suggestions for improvements	89	4.15	.995
Persuasiveness of rationale for suggestions	92	4.03	.845

For parts B and C of the TEP, 23 questions were ranked on scale from one to five. The data showed the lowest mean was 2.69, indicating 54% of teachers were satisfied with their overall evaluation process. Tables 4.3 and 4.4 describe the results found in the TEP portions of the survey regarding the evaluation process.

Table 4.4

*Survey Results for TEP Part C:*

Describe these attributes of the information gathered on your performance during your most recent evaluation	N	M	SD
Were the standards communicated to you	90	4.29	.864
Were the standards clear to you	90	4.37	.785
Were the standards endorsed by you as appropriate for your classroom	88	4.26	.890
What was the form of the standards	89	2.63	.713
Were the standards the same for all or unique to you	90	3.62	1.329
Observation of your classroom performance	90	4.16	1.027
Examination of classroom or school records (lesson plans)	89	3.91	1.062
Examination of student achievement	88	3.91	1.110
Number of formal observations per year	87	3.08	1.014
Appropriate frequency of informal observations	87	2.72	1.008
Average length of formal observation	88	3.82	.929
Average length of informal observation	89	2.69	.961
Number of different people observing and evaluating you during the year	89	1.83	1.110

For part C, one question asked, “What was the form of the standards: goals to be attained, personal and/or professional traits to possess, or both?” and was ranked on a scale of one to three. The mean for this question was 2.63, which meant 87.7% of the teachers felt standards were to obtain a goal, possess personal/professional traits, or both. An additional TEP survey question was ranked on a scale from one to four. This survey question inquired the number of people observing and evaluating the teacher. The responses ranged from supervisor only to supervisor plus three more people. The mean for this question was 1.83. Although the mean is low, the responses match the number of observers who are certified to complete the T-TESS evaluation.

### **Qualitative Results**

To further support research question three, “What are the elementary and middle school teachers’ perceptions of supportive principal behaviors and teachers’ perceptions of the overall T-TESS evaluation process?” the researcher interviewed eight participants and the following supportive principal behavior themes emerged during the qualitative data process: trustworthiness, building positive relationships, active listening, timely responses, opportunities for growth, and feedback.

#### **Trustworthiness**

In the interviews with the elementary and middle school teachers, trust between teacher and principal was a common theme. With a positive working relationship, teachers trust that administrators will do the following in regard to their evaluation:

- Score the evaluation fairly
- Guide them through the entire evaluation process
- Provide advice/suggestions for areas of growth
- Provide evidence the principal is “not out to get” the teacher during the evaluation process

Kristen and Marc expressed that “I don’t feel like they are trying to trap me, get rid of me, or hurt me in any way.” Tracy commented “I trust they are going to help guide me through the T-TESS process. I feel by the way they interact with me, that I can trust them.” Finally, Molly explained, “I feel that I can trust my principal. If something went wrong, I can ask for advice.” Teachers who have trust in their principal feel confident the overall evaluation process will be positive and fair.

### **Building Positive Relationships**

Building positive relationships was another emerging theme found during the interviews. The participants believed principals build positive relationships with teachers in the following ways:

- Sending positive notes and emails
- Maintaining an open-door policy
- Being understanding and empathetic
- Recognizing different personality types of each staff member
- Asking about teachers’ personal lives
- Listening without judgment
- Acting in a professional manner
- Making teachers feel comfortable with administrators
- Being visible throughout the school
- Providing advice to teachers in professional and personal situations

Amber stated that her principal builds a positive relationship by “knowing the staffs’ personalities, being friendly and professional, making you feel comfortable, building you up as a professional, tries to get you to become better than you already are, helpful in any situation, takes time to get to know others, and makes you feel good when you are around her.” Molly shared that her principal builds positive relationships by “being open

minded/understanding of situations, providing solutions to problems, and I am comfortable talking with her.”

Tracy felt that building positive relationships took form in ways such as “asking about me personally, having conversations with me, and providing positive feedback on the good things that are happening in my classroom.” Kristen felt “the principal has a way of getting to know the teachers’ personalities, has an open door policy, provides opportunities for you to speak and be heard in both positive and negative situations, and provides the teachers resources they need to get results.” Natalie explained her principal allows staff members to do different team building activities, which is important as well.

Maggie shared, “The principal allows me be myself without judgement or consequences. I do not feel like I have to minimize what I can contribute to my team or the staff. ” Marc stated,

I like to think that I start the building relationship process. I go out of my way to meet the principals because they spend most of their time dealing with problems and putting out fires. They don't have a chance to build positive relationships as much as they would like to. And so, I start off by trying to work something out with them ahead of time. For example, my assistant principal and I got to know each other through football. Along with my efforts, my expectation is that in return the principal can't be standoffish. They must have some sort of response to my overture.

Another question the researcher asked was “How has that relationship impacted your T-TESS process?” Kristen shared she wondered if her positive relationship with her administrator skewed her evaluation scores. She stated,

When certain mistakes are made by the teacher during an observation and the principal has observed you multiple times throughout the school year, they really

do know who you are and can make a judgement, such as, maybe they accidentally did this, but all the other times the administrator has walked in the teacher has done it. Or, the vice versa of it, if the relationship is not positive do administrators use all those other reasons such as every time the administrator walks in they don't see certain criteria so this time they are only doing it for the observation.

Kevin had the same response. He stated, "I don't really have a positive relationship with my principal. My relationships are really with the assistant principals. Since my evaluator has changed from principal to assistant principal, my scores have been for the better." Marc had a similar opinion as Kristen. He felt his relationship with the assistant principals shows him the administrators are trying to be fair. The assistant principal can have the opinion of "yes you did or no you did not" because of the subjectivity of the evaluation. Natalie felt the relationship she has with the principal and how it impacts her perceptions of the T-TESS process were not related at all.

Tracy's perceptions were clearly stated: "I trust they are going to help me through the T-TESS process. Administrators are going to support and guide me to be successful. They are not setting me up for failure." Molly stated her relationship with her principal made her feel confident in her instructional practices. She feels that when her principal comes into her classroom she is not "out to get her." Molly further commented her principal provides a positive interaction with her in sharing her strengths and weaknesses as a teacher. Amber explained,

My principal provides such a great environment that the pressure of the T-TESS is removed because the relationship has already been established and I know ahead of time what is expected. The principal has already guided and shown you

what it needed to improve so you feel confident when they are in the room observing.

Amber continued to say that having this type of relationship with your principal really helps T-TESS productivity. Maggie felt the same way as Amber. She shared having a positive relationship with her principal made the T-TESS process easier. It allowed Maggie to facilitate her classroom as she would on any given day because she is aware of the expectations of her evaluation. As one can see, positive relationships between the teacher and the principal are crucial. Teachers who have this relationship feel confident, positive, and willing to grow in their instructional practices.

### **Active Listening**

Elementary and middle school teachers found that active listening is a critical behavior which supportive principals must display. The participants shared active listening from the principal makes the evaluation process easier. Participants appreciate the chance to explain their perspective of the lesson and the opportunity to share evidence prior to the final scoring of the evaluation. The conversation between the principal and teacher allows for an open dialogue of collaboration and opportunities for compromise on both parts. Kristen shared that she appreciated when her principal listened to her explanation of how the lesson went. She enjoyed how together they could dialogue about why the principal may have seen the lesson go in a particular way.

Participants shared the perspective that principals who listened without judgement allowed the teacher to be more at ease during the evaluation process. Interviewees felt being able to speak freely with the principal without judgment or punishment was important. Tracy shared, “My principal listens to feedback and doesn’t take things personally.” Maggie stated her principal is “open to new instructional ideas and guides you through those ideas so you are successful.” She felt she was able to take more risks

in the classroom because her principal listened to her ideas and encouraged risk taking. When a principal enters the classroom, the teacher can be themselves during instruction without feeling ridiculed. Kevin and Marc agreed that principals who listen with the intent to help is refreshing because often the principal is tied up with school business. For teachers, listening to understand instead of listening to respond is crucial for a successful evaluation. Without collaborative dialogue, principals and teachers do not get the full benefit of the evaluation process.

### **Timely Responses**

Participants were appreciative of principals responding in a timely fashion not only to the evaluations performed but to other concerns as well. Teachers mentioned that principals' feedback regarding evaluations happens just a few days after the original observation. Natalie stated that she expects the principal to do the appropriate number of observations necessary for the year and to provide prompt feedback with those observations. Participants shared principals try to respond quickly to teachers' needs regarding instructional practices during a collaborative debrief conversation timely after the observation. Interviewees further commented that principals follow the T-TESS process time frame from setting goals, pre-conferences, observations, post-conferences, and end-of-year summary.

Although timely responses to other teacher concerns is not directly related to the overall T-TESS evaluation process, it is indirectly related because teachers felt a sense of importance from the principal because they could trust a solution to the problem would be provided. This allowed for the positive relationship to continue to build and, therefore, when principals provided corrective criticism, teachers were open to hear it. Marc shared,

My assistant principal listens to me directly and tries to act upon what I say or request in a very timely manner. The assistant principal solves the issue in the moment or will say, I'll get back to you by the end of the day and mean it. If problems are not solved, then the teacher and principal try to figure out why and address the situation at that time, we find out why, and try to address it.

### **Opportunities for Growth**

Teachers found the evaluation process to be an opportunity for growth. Some teachers stated that principals allowed teachers to build capacity with each other based on the teachers' strengths as an additional way to learn. Maggie explained her principal allows teachers to be risk takers and has coaching conversations on how the "risk" could be executed. One teacher's main expectation from the principal during the T-TESS process is to make her aware of the instructional deficits in her lesson delivery. Molly shared, "My main expectation is for my principal to tell me how I performed in my class and how I can modify to make the lesson better." Amber appreciated how her principal is an active participant in professional learning communities, planning times, and mini professional developments during staff meetings for all teachers to learn new material.

Teachers also referred to the goal setting process as an opportunity for growth. The goals provide a focus and allow for both teacher and student growth. Tracy and Amber both agreed that when principals help teachers set achievable goals, they are set up for success. Participants also appreciated the instant resources principals provide to them. For instance, Kristen stated,

My principal is a resource herself. She goes the extra mile to get you everything you need. If a principal thinks you need something, they will either send someone into your classroom to help support you, supply resources for the teacher, or follow up by saying "I thought you might need \_\_\_\_\_ to do \_\_\_\_\_." These

actions really show how a principal will go above and beyond for a teacher to help them improve.

### **Feedback**

Qualitative data revealed that feedback was another common theme among the participants. Three out of eight participants expected the principal to follow the cycle of the T-TESS process and provide feedback after each walkthrough and 45-minute observation while the other participants shared how they expected to receive feedback. Molly shared that her main expectation from principals was to provide feedback regarding her instructional practices. Natalie commented that she expected principals to provide feedback after each observation. Kevin and Marc shared they expect the principal to provide feedback of their performances along the way, but, unfortunately, they only received feedback at the end of the year.

Maggie mentioned she received feedback within two days of an observation, and she is allowed to meet with her evaluator to discuss the results. Kevin and Marc said the feedback they received at the end of the year summary is minimal. Kristen, Maggie, Tracy, and Amber felt the feedback received from their principals was positive and constructive, timely from the original observation, provided opportunities for dialogue to discuss areas of strengths and weaknesses, provided suggestions on ways to improve, and suggested opportunities that enhanced their instructional practices before the next walkthrough or 45- minute observation. For the participants, feedback is a crucial part of the T-TESS process, and teachers have high expectations about receiving the constructive criticism. Participants expressed their willingness to develop their instructional practices through the process.

At the end of the quantitative survey, participants were asked if they would like to volunteer to be interviewed further so the researcher could collect additional qualitative

data. In collecting qualitative data, eight teachers (five elementary school and three middle school) were individually interviewed to discuss teachers' perceptions of supportive principal behaviors and the overall T-TESS evaluation experiences. The participants were asked seven open-ended questions regarding supportive principal behaviors and how those behaviors impacted their evaluation process. Each participant was provided a pseudonym to keep identities confidential.

Qualitatively the researcher continued to examine elementary and middle school teachers' perceptions of supportive principal behaviors and teachers' perceptions regarding the overall evaluation process by asking the participants seven questions. The qualitative data gathered from participants discovered supportive principal behaviors influenced a positive T-TESS evaluation process. In the upcoming paragraphs, the questions and responses of the participants provide clear support of the research question.

The first qualitative question the researcher asked was "What expectations do you have of your principal during the T-TESS process?" Participants' expectations of their principal during the T-TESS process varied. Kristen expected her principal to ask clarifying questions during her pre-and post- conferences. She stated this dialog allowed her to give reasons why she may have had to change a lesson or why she had to go back and scaffold the learning depending on the demographics of her class. Amber shared she expects her principal to be very specific and provide examples of what the principal is looking for in the observation. Amber continued to say she wanted her principal to assist and guide her through the T-TESS goal setting process. She felt the collaboration helps keep goals manageable and obtainable for herself and for students. Tracy was of the same opinion. Her expectation was for the principal to guide her and help her "tweak" the goal she has set for herself to be set up for success for the year.

Molly's main expectation was for her principal to inform her regarding her instructional practices in the classroom. Molly stated, "We assume things are going well, but it is different on the other side." She explained that principals have a different perspective of the lesson delivery than teachers do. Natalie expected her principal to provide her with all the evaluations she is required for the year. She explained that for her, this isn't always the case:

If I am to receive two 15-minute walkthroughs and one 45-minute observation, then my principal should conduct those observations timely along with providing feedback on each of them rather than waiting until the end of the year.

Kevin expected principals to know and understand the T-TESS material, but discovered "Principals didn't really know the material before they deployed it to us." Maggie commented she believes her principal should "provide opportunities for growth. The T-TESS shouldn't make me feel inferior or that I can't grow." Marc did not have any specific expectations from his principal. Although the participants had different expectations, the expectations are obviously indicative of each individual teacher's needs. Therefore, principals have to be knowledgeable of their teachers' needs in order to help them be successful during the T-TESS evaluation process.

The second qualitative question the researcher asked regarding supportive principal behaviors was "What characteristics would you consider a supportive principal to have and what do those characteristics look like and sound like to you?" Kevin believes that a supportive principal is an active listener, someone who "thinks before they talk, and of course someone who looks for ways that can actually help you as the teacher rather than hinder." Marc stated, "Overall, a supportive principal would try to help me as the teacher and take care of any problem I have, whether it is a disruptive student, lack of

materials, or arrange for training.” Marc shared that this looks and sounds like this for him:

If I have a disruptive student, they remove them from my class. If I don't have the materials I need, they secure the materials for me. I don't need anybody telling how bad a job I'm doing without having a solution.

Natalie commented that a supportive principal should provide feedback in a considerate way. To her, “supportive” sounds like “I noticed you did this in your lesson and it was successful with your students; however, when you did this, the children were confused and maybe here’s how you could improve that.” Molly felt that her principal was supportive when she received advice regarding parent and student issues. “The principal provides advice when the teacher feels that she has done everything they can to solve the problem.”

Tracy stated that her principal communicates effectively and provides ample time to complete things. The principal does not ask for last-minute tasks to be completed.

Supportive characteristics look and sound like to me someone who is hands-on, is available, answers emails and phone calls in a timely manner, says ‘How can I help? What do you need? Tell me what I can do? You’ll get through this.’ My principal knows that I tend to overthink and worry so they know when I need to breathe.

Amber mentioned several characteristics she felt a supportive principal should exhibit, including a principal who “communicates well, has an eye for details, sets high expectations, and gets to know the teachers.” For Amber, those characteristics look and sound like someone who is visible in her classroom and provides her feedback. Kristen prefers principals who are inquisitive and do not make assumptions: “Principals who want to understand, ask questions without judgment on their face or a tone in their

voice.” Principals provide resources or are the resource for teachers. “If a principal thinks you need something, they either send someone to support the teacher in a certain area or get the resources for the teacher; going above and beyond.” Kristen further stated, “I feel a principal sounds and looks supportive when they ask questions, keep tone and body language calm, give teachers what they need, and provide suggestions for instructional ideas.” Overall, teachers are looking for principals who provide resources, communicate well, listen, provide advice, and give feedback.

The third question the researcher asked inquiring about supportive principal behaviors was “What supportive characteristics does your principal exhibit?” Marc shared that his assistant principal listens to him directly. “He hears my needs and then gets back to me in a timely fashion with the answers or a possible solution to the problem.” Natalie felt that her principal offers the opportunities to voice her perspective first before a negative assumption is made. Maggie shared that her principal allows her to “shine” in her areas of strength and permits her to help build capacity with the teachers on campus. Molly, Tracy, and Kristen all expressed their principal listens to the staff. Kristen went on to say her “principal is calm, does not demean others, and asks questions.” Amber commented her principal exhibits the following characteristics: is visible, talks with students and teachers, leads staff meetings and mini professional developments, is vocal during planning sessions and professional learning communities, and is always there when we need her. It is clear, teachers’ definitions of supportive behaviors vary and the expectations for those behaviors are high.

The final question the researcher asked about supportive principal behaviors was “How has your administrator built a positive relationship with you?” All but one of the participants felt that their principal builds positive relationships with them as a teachers. For the participants, relationship building looked different. Two of the participants

mentioned that their principal allows them to “be themselves” and “speak freely without judgement.” Kristen went on to say that she felt “this speaks volumes because the principal just wants what is best for students and in return she expects the teachers to do what is best for kids.” Other participants felt that their principal built relationships with them by being available when needed, providing advice, and actively listening. Unfortunately, one participant felt that their principal did not take the time to build a relationship with him. He did feel, however, that the assistant principals worked hard at building a relationship with him.

The first question the researcher asked regarding teachers’ perceptions of the overall T-TESS process was “How has the T-TESS evaluation process impacted you as a teacher?” Marc found that the process has allowed him to be more reflective, organized, and able to provide his principal proof of what he has accomplished. Maggie shared that her T-TESS evaluation process has been positive and her principal provides trainings for new teachers on campus to learn about what the ratings and objectives mean. Kevin commented that “anytime you have to have to question yourself is a good thing. You should never think that you are too good to learn new things. The T-TESS is just asking you to be the best teacher you can be.”

Natalie believed that the T-TESS allows her to know what other people see while she is teaching. “It doesn’t necessarily make me feel that my practices are effective, but if done effectively, it can let me know where I need to improve.” Molly shared that the T-TESS evaluation has helped her improve areas of weakness and reflect on what she doesn’t know how to do so she can seek the advice of others. Tracy enjoys the goal setting process. “The goals help me stay focused and help me grow. The goals are not something I can table; I have to keep up with the goals.” Amber commented that the T-

TESS process is intense, knowing you have to be evaluated in so many domains. She also agreed with Tracy, stating that

The T-TESS process is a good one because you get to set goals to help you focus. When the principal does the pre-conference or a walkthrough, she provides you feedback so you can make corrections. The feedback during the debriefing really helps you become a better instructor.

Kristen explained the T-TESS process has helped her become a better teacher as a whole. “The T-TESS is more specific compared to the PDAS, so you are really able to break down certain criteria you want to improve on.”

Another qualitative question the researcher inquired about the overall T-TESS process was “In your opinion, how has your administrator collaborated with you in providing feedback during the T-TESS process?” Kristen and Amber both commented their principals follow the rules and process of the T-TESS. Both principals provide the pre-conference/post-conference and ask clarifying questions regarding students and the demographics of the class. These questions provide the principal with insight on why a lesson may look completely different in each class. Participants shared that their principal does one of two things: provides feedback frequently along with suggestions and resources on how to improve along the way or waits until the end of the year during the summative conference to provide feedback to the teacher.

The final question the researcher asked participants regarding the overall evaluation process was “How does that relationship impact your perceptions of the overall T-TESS process?” Participants felt that having a relationship with the principal made the evaluation process easier and more effective. Interviewees were aware of the evaluation expectations, felt comfortable asking questions regarding their evaluation, and

were receptive to feedback. Participants felt that the principal provided guidance throughout the evaluation process and the goal setting process.

### **Conclusion**

In conclusion, this research was conducted to examine teachers' perceptions of supportive principal behaviors and the overall evaluation experience in addition to the relationship between the two variables. In this study, the quantitative findings show a significant relationship between the two variables. The qualitative data further strengthen the quantitative results. Overall, teachers felt they had experienced a positive T-TESS evaluation process and have supportive principals in their corner. The common themes that emerged during the study were trustworthiness, positivity, active listening, timely responses, opportunities for growth, and feedback. The researcher found principals with the above supportive behaviors provide positive evaluation experiences for their teachers.

## CHAPTER V: SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter discusses the summary, implications, and recommendations of the findings. The purpose of this study was to investigate teachers' perceptions of supportive principal behaviors, their perceptions of the overall evaluation process, and the relationship between teachers' perceptions of supportive principal behaviors and the overall evaluation process at the elementary and middle school levels. This study was conducted in a Title I urban district in Southeast Texas.

To address research question one, the researcher used portions of the OCDQ-RE and the TEP and combined them into one survey. For the quantitative portion of the study, there were 51 (49%) elementary participants and 54 (51%) middle school participants, N=105 (100%). In analyzing the data, N equaled anywhere from 87 to 93 for the specific survey questions. A Pearson's correlation determined there was a significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of supportive principal behaviors and their perceptions of the overall evaluation process.

To address research question two, the researcher used the survey data to find the mean and the standard deviation for each survey question. Based on the means of each question, the researcher then determined if there was a relationship between supportive principal behaviors and the overall T-TESS evaluation process. There was in fact a relationship between teachers' perceptions of supportive principal behaviors and the perceptions of the overall T-TESS evaluation process as teachers' responses led to average or above average mean scores throughout the survey. The higher the mean for teacher perceptions of supportive principal behaviors, the higher the mean for teacher perceptions of the overall T-TESS process.

To address research question three, the researcher used the survey to ask participants if they would like to be interviewed to gather further qualitative data. The researcher interviewed eight individual teachers to find common themes regarding supportive principal behaviors and the evaluation process. The researcher individually interviewed five elementary and three middle school teachers who held different grade level positions (elementary) and specific content areas positions (middle school). The participants felt that overall their principal exhibit supportive principal behaviors and because of those behaviors, teachers had a positive T-TESS evaluation experience.

### **Summary**

Research questions explored whether or not there was a correlation between teachers' perceptions of supportive principal behaviors and teachers' perceptions of the overall evaluation process and what those specific perceptions were:

1. What correlation exists between elementary and middle school teachers' perceptions of supportive principal behaviors and the perceptions of teachers' overall evaluation process?
2. What is the effect of supportive principal behaviors on the overall evaluation process as measured by the OCDQ-RE and the TEP?
3. What are the elementary and middle school teachers' perceptions of supportive principal behaviors and teachers' perceptions of the overall evaluation process?

The quantitative data showed average to above average means based on the survey questions along with a significant relationship between the two variables. There were also common themes that emerged with the individual interviews.

### **Research Question One**

The researcher ran a Pearson's correlation to determine if there was a relationship between teachers' perceptions of supportive principal behaviors and teachers' perceptions of the overall evaluation process. The results of the research showed that the Pearson's correlation did in fact determine a significant positive relationship exists between the two variables.

### **Research Question Two**

The outcomes suggest that principals who deliver supportive behaviors based on the results of the OCDQ-RE have a collaborative and positive relationship with the teacher. In turn, the teacher has a positive evaluation experience from beginning to end. Supportive behaviors a principal should exhibit include the following: provides corrective criticism, is helpful, listens/accepts teacher suggestions, asks about personal welfare of teachers, treats teachers as equals, is complimentary, is easy to understand, shows teacher appreciation, and explains the corrective criticism provided to the teacher. According to table 4.2, the nine survey questions all had average to above average means. More than 50% of the teachers had positive perceptions of supportive principal behaviors regarding the overall T-TESS evaluation process. Supportive principal behaviors such as direction setting provides work satisfaction by building trust, self-efficacy, perspective of the principals' effectiveness, focused instruction, collective knowledge, and shared decision making (Price, 2012; Sun & Leithwood, 2015). Tables 4.3 and 4.4 also showed average to above average means based on the TEP survey questions. More than 54% of the teachers were satisfied with their overall evaluation process. Therefore, the quantitative data shows that principals who exhibit supportive principal behaviors impact a positive evaluation experience. Through a positive influence on school climate and supportive

behaviors, a principal can affect successful instruction and learning as well as teacher collaboration (Tlusciak-Deliowska & Dernowska, 2015).

### **Research Question Three**

The findings for the research found common themes in connection to the qualitative interview responses. The common themes that emerged from the individual interviews were trustworthiness, building positive relationships, active listening, timely responses, opportunities for growth, and feedback. Researchers such as Bell (2020) and Hozebin (2018) conducted studies on the effects of feedback to teachers. Ungar (2018), Danielson (2011), Jiang, et al. (2015), Sheppard (2013), Doherty (2009), Sutton (2008), and Rindler (1994) all studied teacher perceptions of evaluations, the effects of teacher evaluation, or purposeful evaluations. Yousef, et.al.(2018), Lambersky (2016), Finnigan (2011), Bryk & Schneider (2002), conducted research on principal behaviors.

Trustworthiness was the first theme to emerge. Teachers shared that having a meaningful relationship with their administrators provided principals the opportunity to respond to teachers in the following manner: score the evaluation fairly, guide teachers through the complete evaluation process, provide advice/suggestions for areas that need improvement, and provide evidence that the principal is not “out to get them.” Kristen and Marc both expressed that they felt their principal was not out to get, trap, or harm them in any way. Overall, participants felt that their principal would guide them through the evaluation process and provide suggestions for improvement for anything that went wrong in the observation. Tracy stated she felt that the principal would guide her through the evaluation process to be successful. Finnigan’s (2011) and Byrk & Schneider (2002) research discovered that effective management and respect are a positive link between teacher and principal. With teachers being able to trust their principal, dialogue between principal and teacher becomes more collaborative. Trust is one way that teacher and

principal can build positive relationships. Bryk and Schneider (2002) found that “relational trust,” theorized as the interactions between respect, competence, personal regard, and integrity reduces doubt and vulnerability. Tracy and Molly both commented that they could trust their principal based on the interactions they have their principal and feel as if they could ask for advice if things go wrong.

Building positive relationships was the second theme found in the data. Participants felt that principals built positive relationships with staff members in a variety of ways; such ways include writing positive notes, being available for teachers throughout the day, having an understanding demeanor, being aware of the different personalities of the staff, inquiring about the teachers’ lives outside of work, actively listening, being non-judgmental, being professional, making teachers feel comfortable being around the administrator, being visible, and being a problem solver. Amber and Molly both agreed that their principal built positive relationships by being open minded and understanding, providing solutions, making the teacher feel comfortable, being friendly, knowing teachers’ personalities, and making the teacher feel good when you are around them. Finnigan’s (2011) research found that principals who have a respectful demeanor, do not scold in front of others, have a sense of empathy, and appreciate teachers’ ongoing efforts are meaningful characteristics to have as a principal to continue to build successful relationships with teachers. Participants believed that the positive relationship between a principal and the teacher is crucial for a successful evaluation. Teachers felt that with a positive relationship with their principal and an inviting work environment, teachers are more at ease during the evaluation process and therefore are more productive in the classroom. Amber stated that her principal provides such a great work environment that the pressure of the T-TESS is removed because of the relationship that has already been established. According to MacNeil, Prater, and Busch (2009),

building a quality school atmosphere is essential in leadership. With this relationship, teachers have a more positive outlook on personal growth and self-reflection. Maggie felt that her principal allows her to be herself without judgement, and she didn't feel as if she has to minimize what she can contribute to her colleagues. Molly stated that her principal discusses the strengths and weaknesses of the lessons and provides suggestions on how she can improve as a teacher.

Along with building positive relationships, teachers felt active listening was an important part of the evaluation process because they felt that with active listening came less judgement on the principal's part. Participants shared how they appreciated when principals heard their perspective of how the lesson went, suggestions from the teachers themselves on self-improvement, and reasons why the lesson delivery was a certain way. Lambersky (2016) found that principals who gave professional respect by allowing teachers to voice their opinions, valued the teachers' knowledge, skills and experiences felt less micromanaged. Teacher commitment becomes greater when principals permit teachers to share their views in campus decisions (Lambersky 2016). Participants believed that being able to speak freely without negative consequences with their principal provided a more productive evaluation process as well. The discussion between the teacher and principal enables collaboration and compromise. Tracy shared her principal is open to feedback and does not take things personally. Kevin and Marc agreed that principals who listen with the intent to help is refreshing because often the principal is tied up with school business. Together, principals and teachers can create an environment of professionalism (Tlusciak-Deliowska & Dernowska, 2015). Participants also found that principals who responded timely was important to their effectiveness as a teacher. Teachers are eager to get their evaluation feedback in a timely manner so corrections can be made immediately versus waiting too long. Participants

Maggie and Amber both mentioned that their principals provided timely responses to the observation within a few days. In Ungar's (2018) research, participants shared that when teachers' evaluations are done in their entirety, the principal and teacher can collaborate to develop new instructional strategies, tweak the current instructional strategies, and encourage personal growth. Teachers also felt it is crucial for the correct number of observations to be completed. Natalie for example stated,

If a teacher is to have two 15-minute walkthroughs and one 45-minute observation, the principal should follow that timeline and complete the observations timely throughout the year instead of waiting until the last minute to complete them or not doing them at all.

Timely responses allowed for the positive relationship between the principal and teacher to strengthen; therefore, corrective criticism was easier to provide and teachers were more open to hearing it.

With that came opportunities for growth as a common theme. As the evaluation process is set out to be a learning experience, teachers stated they do use this time as an opportunity for growth. Tracy and Amber both felt that their principal helps them set obtainable goals to set them up for success. From the goal setting process, walkthroughs, debriefs, 45-minute observation, and the summative (end-of-year conference), teachers used this time to discuss ways to grow instructionally and improve instantly versus long term. For example, Molly's expectation of her principals was for them to tell her exactly how she is performing in her classroom and how she can improve her lesson. Danielson (2011) found when school principals have dialogue with teachers with a common understanding of good teaching, such conversations offer an opportunity for growth. Participants also appreciated the principal's active participation in professional learning communities and/or providing professional development to the staff. Amber stated she

appreciates how her principal is an active part of professional developments and/or professional learning committees. Obi (2004) found that strong leadership practices such as providing professional development can enhance teacher performance. Participants found their principals to be valid resources for the teachers. Either the principal provided suggestions on how to make changes, provided someone to go in and model for them, or provided physical resources to help them be more successful. Kristen mentioned that her principal is a resource herself and goes out of her try to get “you” the things you need to be successful. Principals can arrange, provide, or inform teachers of pertinent opportunities for staff development to teachers to reach goals of the school (Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008, & Yousaf, et. Al., 2018).

Feedback, as a theme, aligns with the research of Yousaf et, al. (2018) who indicated effective principals support and monitor teachers using feedback to guide teachers toward improving instructional practices. Bell (2020) suggested that when providing feedback, principals should first validate the teacher with information of what the teacher did well and then provide where minor adjustments need to be made. Feedback was an expectation for principals from all participants. It was mentioned that feedback was provided as soon as just a few days after the observation or only at the end of year summative meeting. Hozebin (2018) discovered teachers who received beneficial feedback during post-observation dialogue made it easier for teachers to be self-reflective and improve instructionally. Six out of the eight participants stated they received feedback from their principals after each walkthrough or 45-minute observation just a few days after their evaluation and used this collaboration to improve between walkthroughs and/or the 45-minute observation. They found that their principals provided this time for improvement so they could score better the next time. Unfortunately, the other two participants only received feedback regarding their

observations at summative meeting leaving them little to no time to apply the suggestions provided.

### **Implications**

The outcomes from this research have implications for all campus principals, anyone who evaluates teachers, and those who desire to be campus principals or assistant principals. The portions of the OCDQ-RE and the TEP that were used in the survey were developed for leaders to discover teachers' perceptions of supportive principal behaviors and the teachers' perceptions of their overall evaluation process. The results of this study revealed there is a significant relationship between the two variables. Powell (2011) suggested investigation in teachers' perceptions of supportive principal behaviors and teachers' perceptions of the overall evaluation experience and the gap in literature revealed that studies had not been conducted regarding supportive principal behaviors and teacher perceptions to the overall T-TESS evaluation process. Since the T-TESS evaluation was implemented in 2016, there is limited research that involves the T-TESS evaluation instrument.

Being trustworthy, building positive relationships, actively listening, providing timely responses, offering opportunities for growth, and giving feedback are all behaviors principals should exhibit with all teachers to enrich the evaluation process. Although some principals have a natural ability to show these behaviors, other principals may need to learn them. Districts could use this research to develop professional development sessions for principals and assistant principals to become more familiar with how these behaviors look, feel, and affect those evaluated. Often, districts only provide professional development for teachers, and new learning for administrators is scarce unless they attend large conferences out of the city or state. Due to funding, this is often not feasible for many.

Districts can also use the outcome of the research to determine how to support principals who have climate survey data that is not up to par and have difficulties with building climate and culture. Districts could provide professional developments that show principals how to appropriately use an improvement cycle to identify a problem, plan a solution to the problem, implement the strategies, and when to review or assess progress. A follow up session for principals could determine their next step/s if they have or have not met the overall goal. This process is similar to the teacher evaluation process we ask principals to follow and, therefore, would build capacity in principals just as we want to build capacity in teachers.

Districts can use this research to show the importance of the evaluation process. It is important for all teachers to receive the appropriate number of observations required throughout the year, for principals to provide timely feedback on each observation, and for them to provide the resources teachers will need to be successful from one observation to the next. With this process, principals will be able to build teacher capacity and, so, teachers can be used more as a resource on the campus level to meet the needs of the students.

The purpose of the study was to add value to the current literature by clarifying Texas teachers' perceptions of supportive principal behaviors and teachers' perceptions of the overall evaluation process and the significant relationship between the two. Principals who want to improve teachers' evaluation scores and their teaching effectiveness should consider self-reflection on what supportive principal behaviors they exhibit and how those behaviors affect teacher evaluations and ultimately student achievement.

### **Recommendations for Future Research**

There are four recommendations for future research based on the findings. First, by increasing the sample size of the survey to all elementary, middle, and high school levels and conducting a larger number of interviews, the school district will get a more accurate account of teachers' perceptions of supportive principal behaviors and their perception of the overall evaluation process. Secondly, research could be conducted in more than one Title I district. This comparison could provide valuable data to determine how districts can further support their principals. Next, the research could be conducted in Title I districts compared to non-Title I districts to see if there are any differences in perceptions in behaviors and in the evaluation process. The researcher could conduct a case study that focuses on one school principal and the assistant principal/s and how their supportive behaviors (if any) affect the overall evaluation process. Finally, a study could be conducted to determine if there is a relationship between the evaluation process and student achievement.

### **Conclusion**

This exploratory sequential design strengthened previous studies conducted by quantitatively finding that the Pearson's correlation ( $r$ ) between teachers' perceptions of supportive principal behaviors (OCDQ-RE) and teachers' perceptions of the overall T-TESS evaluation process (TEP) was significant. The survey data collected also indicated average to above average means for both supportive principal behaviors (OCDQ-RE) and the overall T-TESS evaluation process (TEP) which strongly suggests an additional relationship between the two variables. The qualitative data found in the individual participant interviews strengthened the quantitative data. Participants expressed that without supportive principal behaviors, a positive relationship with their principals, and collaborative dialogue a successful evaluation would be harder to obtain. In fact, teachers

would not have the self-efficacy, open mind, and/or willingness to be self-reflective to achieve professional growth and enhance their instructional practices.

Principals' behaviors can affect both positively and negatively affect a teacher's evaluation experience. Hoy & Clover (1986) define a supportive principal as someone who has a basic concern for teachers, actively listens, and is open to teacher suggestions. Without an ongoing positive relationship between both principal and teacher, the evaluation process can be less effective and have an impact on teachers' instructional practices in the classroom. The T-TESS process is designed for teacher and principal to work collaboratively so both teacher and principal can grow both personally and professionally in their craft. Teachers are looking for principals who are supportive of what is happening in their classrooms and who actively listening, providing feedback, responding timely, building positive relationships, providing opportunities for growth, and being trustworthy. Although these themes may look and sound differently to each participant, the expectations were still the same and very evident in the interviews and how the principal behaviors impacted their overall T-TESS evaluation process.

## REFERENCES

- Aguinis, H., Joo, H., & Gottfredson, R.K. (2011). Why we hate performance management and why we should love it. *Business Horizons*, 54(6), 503-507.
- Appraisal Laws and Rules (2019). Retrieved from: <https://tea.texas.gov/texas-educators/educator-evaluation-and-support-system/appraisal-laws-and-rules>
- Balyer, A. (2012). Transformational leadership behaviors of school principals: A qualitative research based on teachers' perceptions. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 4(3) 581-591.
- Barr, J. & Saltmarsh, S. (2014). It all comes down to the leadership: The role of the school principal in fostering parent-school engagement. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 42(4), 491-505.
- Bell, S. (2020). A principal's playbook for two-way feedback. *Education Update*, 62(2), 1-4.
- Bolman, L.G., & Deal, T.E. (2011). Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice and leadership. San Francisco, CA.: John Wiley & Sons
- Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2002). Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement. New York, NY: Russell Sage.
- Calahan, L. S. (2014). Trust me, I'm your principal. *The Education Digest*, 80(1), 4.
- Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational Research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Danielson, C. (2011). Evaluations that help teachers learn. *Educational leadership*, 68(4), 35-39.

- Davis-Frost, D. (2000). *The professional development and appraisal system in Texas: Intentions and implementation*. (doctoral dissertation). University of North Texas, Ann Arbor, MI: ProQuest LLC.
- Doherty, J.F. (2009). Perceptions of teachers and administrators in a Massachusetts suburban school district regarding the implementation of standards-based teacher evaluation system (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Seton Hall University, South Orange, New Jersey.
- Drago-Severson, E. (2011). How adults learn forms the foundation of the learning designs standard. *The Learning Professional*, 32(5), 10-12.
- Eraut, M. (2006). 'Strategies for promoting teacher development'. *Journal of in-service education*, 4(1-2), 10-12.
- Evaluation Process (2019): Retrieved from: <https://teachfortexas.org/Views/Appraiser>
- Finnigan, K.S. (2011). Principal Leadership in low-performing schools: A closer look through the eyes of teachers. *Education and Urban Society*, 20(10), 1-20.
- Fullan, M. (2004). *Leading in a culture of change: Personal action guide and workbook*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Goolamally, N. & Ahmad, J. (2014). Attributes of school leaders towards achieving sustainable leadership: A factor analysis. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 3(1), 122-133.
- Gordan, E.W., McGill, M.V., Sands, D.I., Kalinich, K.M., Pelligrino, J.W., & Chatterji, M. (2014). Bringing formative classroom assessment to schools and making it count. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 22(4), 339-352.
- Heaton, T.L. (2016). Handbook of instructional leadership. Retrieved from [http://digitalcommons.cedarville.edu/education\\_presentations/280](http://digitalcommons.cedarville.edu/education_presentations/280).

- Horng, E., & Loeb, S. (2010). New thinking about instructional leadership. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 92(3), 66-69.
- Hoy, W.K., & Clover, S.I.R. (1986). Elementary school climate: A revision of OCQD. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 22(1), 93-110.
- Hozebin, C. C. (2018). Structured post-observation conversations and their influence on teachers' self-reflection and practice. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, 85(1).
- Hui, H., Jenatabadi H.S., Ismail, N.A., Jasimahbt C.W., & Radzi W.M. (2013). Principal's leadership style and teacher job satisfaction: A case study in China. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 5(4), 175-184.
- Jiang, J.Y., Sporte, S.E., & Luppescu, S. (2015). Teacher perspectives on evaluation reform: Chicago's REACH students. *Educational Researcher*, 44(2), 105-116.
- Kelchtermans, G., & Piot, L. (2010). *School leadership raised and mapped out*. Leuven: Acco.
- Lambersky, J. (2016). Understanding the human side of school leadership: Principals' impact on teachers' morale, self-efficacy, stress, and commitment. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 15(4), 379-405.
- MacNeil, A.J., Prater, D.L., & Busch, S. (2009). The effects of school culture and climate on student achievement. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 12(1), 73-84.
- National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (2018). National educational leadership preparation (NELP) program recognition standards. Retrieved from <http://npbea.org>
- Neumerski, C.M., Grissom, J.A., Goldring, E., Drake, T.A., Rubin, M., Cannata, M., & Schuermann, P. (2018). Restructuring instructional leadership. *The Elementary School Journal*, 119(2), 270-297.

- Oakes, W. P., Lane, K. L., Menzies, H. M., & Buckman, M. M. (2018). Instructional feedback: An effective, efficient, low-intensity strategy to support student success. *Beyond Behavior*, 27(3), 168-174.
- Obi, E. (2004). *Law and education management*. Enugu, Nigeria: Empathy International
- Osakwe, N.R. (2010). Relationships between principals' supervisory strategies and teachers' instructional performance in Delta North Senatorial District, Nigeria. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(6), 437-440.
- “Perception”, *Cambridge Dictionary* (2019): Cambridge University Press: Retrieved from: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/perception>
- Price, H. (2012). Principal-teacher interactions: How affective relationships shape principal and teacher attitudes. *Educational Administrator Quarterly*, 48(1), 39-85).
- Powell, E.D. (2011). The relationship between elementary school climate and teacher perceptions about evaluation (Doctoral dissertation), The University of Houston Clear Lake) Ann Arbor, MI: ProQuest LLC.
- Qu, S. Q., & Dumay, J. (2011). The qualitative research interview. *Qualitative research in accounting & management*, 8(3), 238-264.
- Quong, T., & Walker, A. (2010). Seven principles of strategic leadership. *International Studies in Educational Administration (Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration & Management (CCEAM))*, 38(1), 22-34.
- Rindler, B. (1994). The attributes of teacher evaluation systems that promote teacher growth as perceived by teachers of intensive English programs. (unpublished doctoral dissertation). Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts

- Rani, M. E., Jithin, M. G., Phurailatpam, M. J. S., Radhika, K., & Clement, I. (2019). Mixed Research Design. *Journal of Nursing Science Practice, Research and Advancements* (1)2, 1-6.
- Ritter, G. W., Barnett, J.H. (2016). Learning on the job: Teacher evaluation can foster real growth. *Phi Delta Kappan* 97(7), 48-52.
- Robinson, V. M., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational administration quarterly*, 44(5), 635-674.
- Rosenthal, M. (2016). Qualitative research methods: Why, when, and how to conduct interviews and focus groups in pharmacy research. *Currents in pharmacy teaching and learning*, 8(4), 509-516.
- Rubric. (2019). Retrieved from [https://teachfortexas.org/Resource\\_Files/Guides/T-TESS\\_Rubric.pdf](https://teachfortexas.org/Resource_Files/Guides/T-TESS_Rubric.pdf)
- Setliff, B. F. (1989). The effects of the Texas teacher appraisal system on the climate of six small school systems (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas.
- Schifferdecker, K. E., & Reed, V. A. (2009). Using mixed methods research in medical education: Basic guidelines for researchers. *Medical education*, 43(7), 637-644.
- Scudder, J. (2018). School leadership: Keeping it simple: Avoid drowning in complexity by first admitting it exists. *Principal Leadership (Middle Level Ed.)*, 18(9), 52-55.
- Sheppard, J.D. (2013). Perceptions of teachers and administrators regarding the teacher evaluation process (doctoral dissertation). Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, Georgia.

- Smylie, M.A. & Murphy, J.F. (2016). The call for caring school leaders: New professional standards serve as a guiding light for all aspects of educational leadership. *Principal*, 95(5), 16-19.
- Stiggins, R.J., & Bridgeford, N.J. (1985). Performance assessment for teacher development. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 7(1), 85-97.
- Stiggins, R.J., & Duke, D.L. (1988). *The case for a commitment to teacher growth: Research on teacher evaluation*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Stiggins, R.J. & Nickel, P. (1989). The teacher evaluation profile: A technical analysis. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 2(2), 151-165.
- Stone, D. & Heen, S. (2014). *Thanks for the feedback: The science and art of receiving feedback well*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- Sun, J., & Leithwood, K. (2015). Direction-setting school leadership practices: A meta-analytical review of evidence about their influence. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 26(4), 499-523.
- Sutton, S.R. (2008). Teachers' and administrators' perceptions of teacher evaluation (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Wilmington University, New Castle, Delaware.
- Templeton, N. R., Willis, K., & Hendricks, L. (2016). The coaching principal: Building teacher capacity through the Texas Teacher Evaluation and Support System. *The International Journal of Organizational Innovation*, 8(4), 140-145.
- Texas Education Agency (2007). *Professional Development and Appraisal System Training Manual (PDAS)*, Austin, Texas: TEA.
- Texas Education Agency (1991). *Texas teacher appraisal system: Evaluation study*, Austin, Texas: TEA.

- Texas Education Agency (1989). *Texas teacher appraisal system: Appraiser's manual*. Austin, Texas: TEA.
- Texas Education Agency (2019). Data and Reports. Retrieved from <https://tea.texas.gov/reports-and-data>
- Texas Education Agency (2019). T-TESS. Retrieved from <https://tea.texas.gov/texas-educators/educator-evaluation-and-support-system/texas-teacher-evaluation-and-support-system>
- Texas Teacher Evaluation and Support System (T-TESS) (2019). Retrieved from <https://teachfortexas.org/>
- Plusciak-Deliowska, A., Dernowska, U. (2015). The principal's behaviors and job satisfaction among middle school teachers. *The New Educational Review*, 39(1), 215-225.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. & Gareis, C. R. (2015). Principals, trust, and cultivating vibrant schools. *Societies*, 5(2), 256-276.
- Ungar, O.A. (2018). Teacher evaluation following reform: The Israeli perspective. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 26(4), 511-527.
- Van den Ouweland, L., Vanhoof, J., & Van den Bossche, P. (2018). Principals' and teachers' views on performance expectations for teachers. An exploratory study in Flemish secondary education. *Pedagogische Studien*, 95(4), 272-292.
- Vekeman, E., Devos, G., Tuytens, M. (2015). The influence of teachers' expectations on principals' implementation of a new teacher evaluation policy in Flemish secondary education. *Educational Assessment Evaluation and Accountability* 27(2), 129-151.

- Wildman, R. H. (2015). *A phenomenological study of high school teachers' motivation as related to teacher performance management* (doctoral dissertation). Walden University, Ann Arbor, MI: ProQuest LLC.
- Wise, A.E., Darling-Hammond, L., McLaughlin, M.W., & Bernstein, H. T. (1984). *Case Studies for teacher evaluation: A study of effective practices*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.
- Yousaf, S. U., Usman, B., & Islam, T. (2018). Effects of supervision practices of principals on work performance and growth of primary school teachers. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, 40(1). 285-298.
- Zepeda, S. J. (2014). *The principal as instructional leader: A handbook for supervisors* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: Routledge.

APPENDIX A:  
PERMISSION TO USE OCDQ-RE

Copyright © 1991 by Sage Publications, Inc.

All rights reserved. The publisher extends the right to the purchaser to photocopy Tables 7.2, 7.6, 7.10, and 7.14. No other part of this book may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

*Distributed by Corwin Press, Inc., A Sage Publications Company.*

Address inquiries and orders to:

Corwin Press, Inc.  
P.O. Box 2526  
Newbury Park, CA 91319

SAGE Publications Ltd.  
6 Bonhill Street  
London EC2A 4PU  
United Kingdom

SAGE Publications India Pvt. Ltd.  
M-32 Market  
Greater Kailash I  
New Delhi 110 048 India

Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Hoy, Wayne K.

Open schools/healthy schools: measuring organizational climate / Wayne K. Hoy, C. John Tarter, Robert B. Kottkamp.  
p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.  
ISBN 0-8039-3784-9

1. School management and organization—Evaluation.  
2. School environment—Evaluation. 3. Educational surveys.  
I. Tarter, Clemens John. II. Kottkamp, Robert B. III. Title.  
LB2823.H69 1991  
379.1'54—dc20

90-20086  
CIP

FIRST PRINTING, 1991

Sage Production Editor: Michelle R. Starika



APPENDIX B:  
PERMISSION TO USE THE TEP

**From:** Jeff Jones <Jeff.Jones@educationnorthwest.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 20, 2020 12:40 PM  
**To:** Molinaro, Marlo  
**Subject:** Re: Permission to use the TEP

You are welcome to use the TEP for your study as long as you credit Education Northwest.

--

Jeff Jones  
Web Developer  
Education Northwest

**From:** Molinaro, Marlo <MolinaroM1821@UHCL.edu>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 19, 2020 6:03 PM  
**Subject:** Re CONTACT FOR SEEKING PERMISSION to use the TEP

Hello,

I am currently a doctoral candidate in the Ed.D program at the University of Houston Clear Lake. My dissertation is titled, "How elementary and middle school teachers' perceptions of supportive principals' behaviors impact the overall TTESS process. I am interested in using the Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP) as one of my instruments in my study. Do you have the name of the individual in your organization I would need to write to for approval?

Thank you for your help and consideration,

Marlo Molinaro  
**From:** Molinaro, Marlo  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 17, 2019 3:41 PM  
**To:** Caridan.Craig@educationnorthwest.org  
**Subject:** PERMISSION to use the TEP

Hello,

I am currently a doctoral student at the University of Houston Clear Lake. My dissertation is titled,

HOW ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOL TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF SUPPORTIVE PRINCIPALS' BEHAVIORS IMPACT THE OVERALL T-TESS EVALUATION PROCESS

I am interested in using the Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP) as one of my instruments for my research.

I greatly appreciate your help and consideration.

Marlo Molinaro

APPENDIX C:  
SURVEY COVER LETTER

April 2020

Dear Educator,

My name is Marlo Molinaro and I am a doctoral candidate at the University of Houston Clear Lake. I would like to ask for your participation in completing the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire and the Teacher Evaluation Profile surveys. The purpose of these surveys is to assess supportive principal behaviors and teachers' perceptions of the T-TESS evaluation process.

Participation in the survey is voluntary, but answering all of the questions in their entirety will be useful to the data collection process. The survey will take approximately 10 minutes to complete and all responses are anonymous. No risks will be endured during this process and you can withdraw your participation at any time.

Your permission to participate is implied once you have clicked on the active link below. Thank you for your time, thoughtful responses, and completion of the survey. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at [REDACTED].

Please click on the link below in the email to begin the survey.

Sincerely,

Marlo Molinaro  
Doctoral Candidate, UHCL



**Table 7.2 (continued)**


---

22. The principal looks out for the personal welfare of teachers.....	RO	SO	O	VFO
23. The principal treats teachers as equals.....	RO	SO	O	VFO
24. The principal corrects teachers' mistakes.....	RO	SO	O	VFO
25. Administrative paperwork is burdensome at this school.....	RO	SO	O	VFO
26. Teachers are proud of their school.....	RO	SO	O	VFO
27. Teachers have parties for each other.....	RO	SO	O	VFO
28. The principal compliments teachers.....	RO	SO	O	VFO
29. The principal is easy to understand.....	RO	SO	O	VFO
30. The principal closely checks classroom (teacher) activities.....	RO	SO	O	VFO
31. Clerical support reduces teachers' paperwork.....	RO	SO	O	VFO
32. New teachers are readily accepted by colleagues.....	RO	SO	O	VFO
33. Teachers socialize with each other on a regular basis.....	RO	SO	O	VFO
34. The principal supervises teachers closely.....	RO	SO	O	VFO
35. The principal checks lesson plans.....	RO	SO	O	VFO
36. Teachers are burdened with busy work.....	RO	SO	O	VFO
37. Teachers socialize together in small, select groups.....	RO	SO	O	VFO
38. Teachers provide strong social support for colleagues.....	RO	SO	O	VFO
39. The principal is autocratic.....	RO	SO	O	VFO
40. Teachers respect the professional competence of their colleagues.....	RO	SO	O	VFO
41. The principal monitors everything teachers do.....	RO	SO	O	VFO
42. The principal goes out of his/her way to show appreciation to teachers.....	RO	SO	O	VFO

---

## APPENDIX E:

### TEACHER EVALUATION PROFILE (TEP)

Thank you Education Northwest for granting permission to use the TEP.

#### 146 *The Case for Commitment to Teacher Growth*

10. Knowledge of subject matter      I know a little    A B C D E    I know a great deal
- Describe your teaching experience:
11. At current grade      A: 0 to 1 year  
B: 2 to 3 years  
C: 4 to 5 years  
D: 6 to 10 years  
E: 11 or more years
12. With current content (if secondary teacher)      A: 0 to 1 year  
B: 2 to 3 years  
C: 4 to 5 years  
D: 6 to 10 years  
E: 11 or more years
13. Experience with teacher evaluation prior to most recent experience      Waste of time    A B C D E    Helpful

#### *B. Describe Your Perceptions of Person Who Evaluated Your Performance (Most Recently)*

14. Credibility as a source of feedback      Not credible    A B C D E    Very credible
15. Working relationship with you      Adversary    A B C D E    Helper
16. Level of trust      Not trustworthy    A B C D E    Trustworthy
17. Interpersonal manner      Threatening    A B C D E    threatening
18. Temperament      Impatient    A B C D E    Patient
19. Flexibility      Rigid    A B C D E    Flexible
20. Knowledge of technical aspects of teaching      Not knowledgeable    A B C D E    Knowledgeable
21. Capacity to demonstrate or model needed improvements      Low    A B C D E    High
22. Familiarity with your particular classroom      Unfamiliar    A B C D E    Very familiar
23. Experience in classrooms in general      Little    A B C D E    A great deal
24. Usefulness of suggestions for improvements      Useless    A B C D E    Useful
25. Persuasiveness of rationale for suggestions      Not persuasive    A B C D E    Very persuasive

#### Appendix A

147

#### *C. Describe These Attributes of the Information Gathered on Your Performance During Your Most Recent Evaluation*

- How were the dimensions of your teaching (standards) to be evaluated/addressed?
26. Were standards communicated to you?      Not at all    A B C D E    In great detail
27. Were standards clear to you?      Vague    A B C D E    Clear
28. Were standards endorsed by you as appropriate for your classroom?      Not endorsed    A B C D E    Endorsed
29. What was the form of the standards?      A: Goals to be attained  
B: Personal and/or professional traits to possess  
C: Both
30. Were the standards      The same for all teachers?    A B C D E    Unique to you?
- To what extent were the following sources of performance information tapped as part of the evaluation?
31. Observation of your classroom performance      Not considered    A B C D E    Used extensively
32. Examination of classroom or school records (lesson plans, etc.)      Not considered    A B C D E    Used extensively
33. Examination of student achievement      Not considered    A B C D E    Used extensively
- To what extent were there observations in your classroom?  
(Note: In these items, *formal* refers to observations that were preannounced and were preceded and followed by a conference with the evaluator; *informal* refers to unannounced drop-in visits)
34. Number of formal observations per year (most recent experience)      A: 0  
B: 1  
C: 2  
D: 3  
E: 4 or more
35. Approximate frequency of informal observations (most recent experience)      A: None  
B: Less than 1 per month  
C: Once per month  
D: Once per week  
E: Daily
- What was the average length of observation (most recent experience)?
36. Formal      Brief (few minutes)    A B C D E    Extended (40 minutes or more)

37. Informal \_\_\_\_\_  
 Brief (few minutes) A B C D E Extended (40 minutes or more)
38. Number of different people observing and evaluating you during the year  
 A: Supervisor only  
 B: Supervisor & 1 other person  
 C: Supervisor & 2 other persons  
 D: Supervisor & 3 or more  
 E: Other

If others besides your supervisor evaluated you, who were they (titles only)? \_\_\_\_\_

*D. Describe These Attributes of the Feedback You Received*

39. Amount of information received  
 None A B C D E Great deal
40. Frequency of formal feedback  
 Infrequent A B C D E Frequent
41. Frequency of informal feedback  
 Infrequent A B C D E Frequent
42. Depth of information provided  
 Shallow A B C D E In-depth
43. Quality of the ideas and suggestions contained in the feedback  
 Low A B C D E High
44. Specificity of information provided  
 General A B C D E Specific
45. Nature of information provided  
 Judgmental A B C D E Descriptive
46. Timing of the feedback  
 Delayed A B C D E Immediate
47. Feedback focused on district teaching standards  
 Ignored them A B C D E Reflected them

*E. Describe These Attributes of the Evaluation Context*

48. Amount of time spent on the evaluation process, including your time and that of all other participants  
 None A B C D E Great deal
- What resources are available for professional development?
49. Time allotted during the teaching day for professional development  
 None A B C D E Great deal
50. Available training programs and models  
 None A B C D E Many
- How were district values and policies expressed in evaluation?
51. Clarity of policy statements regarding purpose for evaluation  
 Vague A B C D E Clear

52. Intended role of evaluation  
 Teacher accountability A B C D E Teacher growth
53. Recent history of labor relations in district  
 Turbulent A B C D E Tranquil
54. Impact of collective bargaining agreement on evaluation process  
 None A B C D E Great deal
55. Impact of state law on evaluation process  
 None A B C D E Great deal

*F. Are there other dimensions of you as a teacher, the nature of the performance data collected, the nature of the feedback, the evaluation context, or other factors that you think are related to the success (or lack of success) of your past teacher evaluation experiences that should be included in the above list? If so, please specify.*

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX F:  
INTERVIEW CONSENT FORM

**INFORMED CONSENT: ADULT RESEARCH PARTICIPANT**

You are being asked to participate in the research project described below. Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary and you may refuse to participate, or you may decide to stop your participation at any time. Should you refuse to participate in the study or should you withdraw your consent and stop participation in the study, your decision will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you may otherwise be entitled. You are being asked to read the information below carefully and ask questions about anything you don't understand before deciding whether or not to participate.

**Title:** How Elementary and middle school teachers' perceptions of supportive principals' behaviors impact the overall T-TESS evaluation process

**Principal Investigator(s):** [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

**Student Investigator(s):** Marlo Molinaro

**Faculty Sponsor:** Dr. John Decman

**Purpose of the Study:** The purpose of this study is to investigate teacher perceptions of supportive principal behaviors and the relationship between teacher perceptions of principal behaviors and teacher perceptions of the teacher evaluation process at the elementary and middle school levels.

**Procedures:** If you choose to take part in this study, you will participate in an interview via Zoom and will be audio recorded. The interview will be scheduled on a day and time convenient for you. I will ask you questions regarding supportive principal behaviors and the overall evaluation process.

**Expected Duration:** Interviews are anticipated to last 20-30 minutes each.

**Risks of Participation:** There are no anticipated risks if you chose to participate in this study.

**Benefits to the Subject**

There is no direct benefit received from your participation in this study, but your participation will help the investigator(s) to better understand the relationship between supportive principal behaviors and the overall evaluation process.

**Confidentiality of Records**

Every effort will be made to maintain the confidentiality of your study records. The data collected from the study will be used for educational and publication purposes, however, you will not be identified by name. For federal audit purposes, the participant's documentation for this research project will be maintained and safeguarded by the Principal Investigator or Faculty Sponsor for a minimum of three years after completion of the study. After that time, the participant's documentation may be destroyed.

## **Compensation**

There is no financial compensation to be offered for participation in the study.

## **Investigator's Right to Withdraw Participant**

The investigator has the right to withdraw you from this study at any time.

## **Contact Information for Questions or Problems**

The investigator has offered to answer all of your questions. If you have additional questions during the course of this study about the research or any related problem, you may contact the Student Researcher, Marlo Molinaro, by phone at [REDACTED] or the Faculty Sponsor, Dr. John Decman, may be contacted by email at [REDACTED]

## **Signatures**

Your signature below acknowledges your voluntary participation in this research project. Such participation does not release the investigator(s), institution(s), sponsor(s) or granting agency(ies) from their professional and ethical responsibility to you. By signing the form, you are not waiving any of your legal rights.

The purpose of this study, procedures to be followed, and explanation of risks or benefits have been explained to you. You have been allowed to ask questions and your questions have been answered to your satisfaction. You have been told who to contact if you have additional questions. You have read this consent form and voluntarily agree to participate as a subject in this study. You are free to withdraw your consent at any time by contacting the Principle Investigator or Student Researcher/Faculty Sponsor. You will be given a copy of the consent form you have signed.

**Subject's printed name:**

**Signature of Subject:**

**Date:**

Using language that is understandable and appropriate, I have discussed this project and the items listed above with the subject.

**Printed name and title:**

**Signature of Person Obtaining Consent:**

**Date:**

THE UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON-CLEAR LAKE (UHCL) COMMITTEE FOR PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS HAS REVIEWED AND APPROVED THIS PROJECT. ANY QUESTIONS REGARDING YOUR RIGHTS AS A RESEARCH SUBJECT MAY BE ADDRESSED TO THE UHCL COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS (281.283.3015). ALL RESEARCH PROJECTS THAT ARE CARRIED OUT BY INVESTIGATORS AT UHCL ARE GOVERNED BY REQUIREMENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

(FEDERALWIDE ASSURANCE #FWA00004068)

APPENDIX G:  
QUALITATIVE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

- 1) What expectations do you have of your principal during the T-TESS process?
  
- 2) How has the T-TESS evaluation process impacted you as a teacher?
  
- 3) What characteristics would you consider a supportive principal to have? What do those characteristics look like and sound like to you?
  
- 4) What supportive characteristics does your principal exhibit?
  
- 5) How has your administrator built a positive relationship with you?
  
- 6) How does that relationship impact your perceptions of the overall T-TESS process?
  
- 7) In your opinion, how has your administrator collaborated with you in providing feedback during the T-TESS process?

APPENDIX H:

RESUME

**Marlo Molinaro**

**Objective:** Seeking a position as a campus principal on the elementary or intermediate level where effective communication and leadership skills will create and execute the campus mission, vision, meaningful work, and meaningful relationships.

**Administrative Experience**

- | <b>2014-Present</b>  | <b>M.K.Elementary</b> | <b>Assistant Principal</b> |
|--|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Participate in piloting the Effective Schools Framework (focus group, TEA visit, improvement plan)</li><li>○ Facilitate Administrative Interns</li><li>○ Participate in Aspiring Leadership Cohort 1 (Kennedy Elementary)</li><li>○ Participate in developing strategies for TAIS improvement plan</li><li>○ Facilitate data meetings with grade level teachers</li><li>○ Execute professional development sessions for parents</li><li>○ Create weekly staff newsletter</li><li>○ Implement student of the week, employee of the week, and honor roll celebrations</li><li>○ Interview candidates for all open positions and Alief ISD Job Fair</li><li>○ Collaborate with ABC and SDC facilitators for campus improvements</li><li>○ Facilitate new teacher meetings</li><li>○ Implement self-climate survey to staff</li><li>○ Build climate and culture with monthly team builders and monthly positive notes to staff members and employee of the week</li><li>○ Facilitate goal setting, pre and post conferences, and walkthrough debriefs with staff members</li><li>○ Collaborate with attendance clerk for truancy and attendance plans</li><li>○ Supervise Boys Club (ACE), Girls Club (GAP), Student Council</li></ul> |                       |                            |

**Professional Experience:**

- | <b>2010-2014</b>  | <b>D.H.Elementary</b> | <b>Math Specialist</b> |
|---|-----------------------|------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Administrative Intern-discipline, ARDs, parent conferences and walkthroughs</li><li>○ Interpret Data for grades PK-4</li><li>○ Create re-teach plans with teachers for grades 2-4</li><li>○ Facilitate PLC, planning, and long term planning sessions</li></ul> |                       |                        |

- Model first line instruction and taught in classrooms for those on medical leave
- Provide professional developments sessions for campus
- Deliver small group interventions for grades K-3
- Create intervention schedules
- Establish step team club using INOVA data

**2001-2010            H.H. Elementary            2<sup>nd</sup>/3<sup>rd</sup> Grade Teacher**

- Provide effective 1<sup>st</sup> line instruction in all content areas
- Share in PLCs
- Contribute in team planning
- Analyze classroom data-reteach plans/small group plans/whole group instruction
- Conduct parent Conferences
- Member of ABC committee

**Professional Development**

- Safe and Civil Schools Instructional Coaching and Positive Behavior for School Excellence
- Aspiring Principals Workshop (TAASP)
- First 90 Days by Michael D. Watkins (book study)
- Becoming a Person of Influence by John Maxwell (book study)
- Leadership Fusion: Region 4
- Restorative Discipline for Administrators
- AIE Conference San Antonio
- Rigor, Relevance, and Relationships
- Aspiring Principal Cohort I and II
- Communication: Say What You Need To Say So Others Will Listen
- What Great Educators Do Differently by Todd Whitaker (book study)
- T-TESS Training Region 4
- Leadership Fusion
- University of Houston Clear Lake Doctoral Courses
- University of Houston Clear Lake Superintendent Internship

**Certifications**

Principal Certification K-12  
 TEXAS Teacher Evaluation and Support System (T-Tess)  
 Instructional Leadership Development (ILD certification)  
 Elementary Self-Contained 1-8  
 Elementary English 1-8

English as a Second Language  
Gifted and Talented

**Education**

- |      |   |                |
|------|---|----------------|
| 2013 | University of Houston Clear Lake  | Clear Lake, TX |
|      | Pursuing Doctoral Degree in Educational Leadership<br>Superintendent Specialization |                |
| 2011 | University of Houston Clear Lake  | Clear Lake, TX |
|      | Masters of Science in Educational Management  |                |
| 2000 | University of Houston Downtown  | Houston, TX    |
|      | BA in Interdisciplinary Studies specialization in English                           |                |