THE IMPORTANCE OF THE PRINCIPAL

EVALUATION PROCESS ON STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

by

Marcia K. McMahon, MS

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of

The University of Houston-Clear Lake

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

THE UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON-CLEAR LAKE

MAY, 2016

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE PRINCIPAL

EVALUATION PROCESS ON STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

by

Marcia K. McMahon

APPROVED BY

_____

Gary Schumacher, PhD, Chair

_____

Kent Divoll, EdD, Committee Member

_____

Brenda Weiser, EdD, Committee Member

_____

Scott Harrell, EdD, Committee Member

RECEIVED BY THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION:

_____

Lawrence T. Kajs, EdD, Associate Dean

_____

Mark D. Shermis, PhD, Dean

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to thank Dr. Gary Schumacher, Dr. Michelle Peters, and Dr. Kent Divoll for their continued guidance throughout this endeavor. Not only did they see the value for this topic of this study, but also worked diligently to have this body of knowledge published for further review. In addition, I would like to recognize the contributions of Dr. Scott Harrell and Dr. Brenda Weiser for their input and encouragement in completing this research.

Additionally, I would like to acknowledge the faculty at the University of Houston-Clear Lake and peers of Cohort 7. Without their high expectations of student performance, coupled with peer encouragement and support, the completion of this dissertation would have been impossible.

This book is dedicated to my family and friends who have supported me in so many ways throughout this project. To my husband Andy, and sons Drew and Brian, I thank you for all the crazy moments that drove you to the edge, but still gave me the time and space to finish this challenge. To my YAYA's, I thank you for the encouragement, laughter, and putting me in my place when needed. Thank you to my grandparents who taught me the importance of work ethic and the necessity of educating future generations. To my father, mother, brother, and sister I could not have even dreamed of this achievement without your support. Finally, to my brother-in-law Frank, thank you for your hours of revisions and edits. My passive voice has paid you well!

ABSTRACT

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE PRINCIPAL

EVALUATION PROCESS ON STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Marcia K. McMahon
University of Houston-Clear Lake, 2016

Dissertation Chair: Gary Schumacher, PhD

Over the last 30 years, research has examined the role principals play in shaping

school improvement and developing a foundation for student learning. This mixed

methods study examined the relationship between school districts' principal evaluation

processes and potential impact on student achievement in reading and mathematics. This

study, conducted within 27 Texas school districts, surveyed principals and teachers from

41 campuses, as well as district office representatives.

This study was conducted in three parts. First, principals were administered the

Principal Evaluation Attributes, Feedback and Perception survey to measure their

perceptions concerning the evaluation process in the areas of accountability, increased

student achievement, professional growth, incentives for improvement, adherence to

policy, and fostering school climate. Next, district evaluation instruments were analyzed

with student performance in reading and mathematics on the 2011 Texas Assessment of

Knowledge and Skill assessment to determine if a relationship between the quality of

district developed instruments and student performance existed. Findings indicated that there was no correlation between principal evaluation instruments and student achievement. Survey results indicated that evaluation processes within districts are perceived as merely a checklist for complying with district policy and have little impact on principal professional growth or student achievement.

The second component of the study included semi-structured interviews with school district level officials who were responsible for conducting the principal evaluation process. The findings suggest principal supervisors concurred with the use of district developed checklists as a means to evaluate campus principals, but had a different perception in relationship to principal performance, use for professional development, and impact on student achievement.

Finally, new to this body of research, was the capturing of teacher perceptions regarding specific principal behaviors that impact student achievement in relation to the principal evaluation process. On on-line survey of teachers from the 41 campuses from this study was conducted in the spring of 2015. Teachers in this study indicate that professional growth opportunities for the campus principal should focus on school wide improvements, not necessarily personal principal development. Teachers found effective principals implement classroom-coaching strategies to improve instruction, outline expectations, and mandate needed professional growth individualized for optimal teacher performance. Thus, effective principals align professional development identified through the analysis of multiple sources of data and relate those findings to specific areas

of teacher professional growth. Critical in this process is the amount of time principals

spend observing classroom instruction and providing effective feedback to classroom

teachers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

RÉSUMÉ

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Public demand for continuous improvement has flooded American schools for decades. As campus leaders and those ultimately responsible for student achievement, principals have become the target of school improvement efforts. Researchers agreed that effective principal leadership is critical for the development and maintenance of effective schools (Edmunds, 1980; Elmore, 2000; Ginsberg & Thompson, 1992; Lezotte, 1992; Mace-Matluck, 1987). Assuming a positive correlation between principal leadership and student achievement and, by extension school success, the principal evaluation process represents an integral part of contemporary education reform. To increase principal effectiveness, states or individual school districts must develop evaluation instruments and processes that measure principals' leadership skills and their potential effect on student performance. This chapter presents current information regarding problems related to principal evaluation and to the potential positive effect on student achievement, as well as the significance of the study, research purpose and questions, and definitions of key terms.

Research Problem

"No great accomplishment ever happened without great leadership, and transforming public education is no exception" (New Leaders, 2013, para.1). Over the last 30 years, research has shown that the school principal accounts for nearly 25% of the total effect on student achievement by leading school improvement and fostering a

foundation for student learning (Clifford & Ross, 2012; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005). Clifford, Behrstock-Sherratt, and Fetters (2012a) argued ensuring effective principals lead the nation's schools requires that states and school districts implement measures in evaluating principal performance that positively affects student achievement. Even though educators and policy makers agree the principal plays a crucial role in the school's success, principal evaluation—unlike teacher evaluation—has attracted little interest. Indifference regarding instruments measuring principal effectiveness helps to explain the limited availability of empirical research (Hart, 1993; Lashway, 2003).

Critics of principal evaluation systems cite a lack of clear performance standards and rigor in both the design and the attention to implementation (Clifford & Ross, 2012). Reeves (2004) describes principal evaluation as "infrequent, late, unhelpful, and mostly a source of administrative bother" (p. 20). Additionally, few widely available principal evaluation instruments indicate psychometric rigor or publish results regarding validity and reliability (Goldring, Porter, Murphy, Elliot, & Cravens, 2009b; Heck & Marcoulides, 1996). Lashway (2003) reviewed the findings of a 1998 study conducted by the *National Association of Elementary School Principals*. The study found 76% of the principals surveyed reported an annual evaluation; 13% indicated an evaluation every two or three years; and 10% indicated they rarely or never received a performance evaluation.

In a complimentary national survey, Reeves (2004) concluded principals generally viewed their current evaluation processes as positive (89%), accurate (79%), and aligned to job responsibilities (76%). However, fewer than half of the principals

surveyed stated the process improved motivation or provided specifics to identify needed changes in leadership behaviors. These findings are not surprising given the difficulty in designing a principal evaluation process aligned to the complex, ambiguous, and contextual responsibilities principals must perform. More serious criticisms of the current state for principal evaluations derive from poorly implemented measures such as the lack of untrained evaluators, absence of useful feedback, or a commitment to the process in order to promote substantial, sustainable changes in both school improvement and student achievement (Leithwood, Begley, & Cousins, 1994; Reeves, 2004).

While most states mandate districts conduct annual principal evaluations, compliance does not always guarantee quality (Goldring et al., 2009b). Texas school districts in 2010 reported to the Texas Education Agency (TEA) the assessment instruments that were used to evaluate principal effectiveness. At present, the TEA does not require all school districts to use a standard instrument to evaluate principals and thus allows individual school districts to customize evaluation procedures. The findings concluded 1,236 districts and charter schools employ over 1,000 independent evaluation instruments to measure principal performance (TEA, 2010). While districts complied with the reporting process, no data set provided findings to indicate whether evaluation methods aligned to state standards or affected student achievement. The Texas Education Agency also requires all public school principals undergo an annual evaluation on nine performance domains, including effective management of teachers and consideration of student achievement. However, the Texas Administrative Code does not specify the weight student performance should receive among the nine performance domains. Unsurprisingly, a TEA survey of school district evaluation instruments reported only

30% of school districts indicated the evaluation system included a student achievement component (TEA, 2011a).

Research demonstrates the role principals play in shaping school improvement, developing a foundation for student learning, and increasing student achievement (Clifford & Ross, 2012). Conclusions from *How Leadership Influences Student Learning*, (Leithwood, Seashore Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004) support: (a) principals influence student achievement, and (b) principals exert their greatest influence in schools exhibiting the greatest need. Assuming these givens, districts that desire to improve public perception through increased student performance may have to assign principals capable of affecting student achievement in the nation's most struggling schools (Leithwood, et al., 2004). Clifford et al. (2012a) defined an effective principal as "the intended or expected effects of the principal's work" (p. 1). While vague in nature, education organizations and researchers have attempted to develop more implicit definitions of effective principal behaviors for evaluation purposes. The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO, 2008) suggested:

> Effective school principals are strong educators, anchoring work on the central issues of learning and teaching and school improvement. Serving as moral agents that advocate the schools and communities they serve; principals make connections with other people by valuing and caring for others as individuals and members of the educational community. (p. 5)

Additional studies focused on identifying principals' behaviors with the greatest effect on school climate and student achievement (Marzano et al., 2005; Stronge, Richard, & Catano, 2008). Behaviors include the following:

- Create and sustain a commonly-accepted vision and mission for organizational performance,

- Engage teachers and apply data towards analyzing student performance and quality of instruction,

- Efficiently manage campus and instructional resources such as personnel, instructional time, and funding,

- Create a physically, emotionally, and cognitively safe learning environment for students and staff,

- Develop relationships with parents, communities, and businesses supporting education, and

- Act in a professional and ethical manner.

In 2011, the United States (U.S.) Department of Education (DOE) created the first measurable definition of an effective principal by focusing on student achievement as a determinant. Accordingly, the U.S. DOE (2011) defined a highly effective principal based upon students achieving high rates of growth described as an increase of one and one-half grade levels in an academic year.

To address the implementation of *Common Core Standards* currently employed across much of the nation, the State Consortium of Educator Effectiveness (2014) underscored the importance of the campus principal's ability to provide instructional leadership. Because teacher preparation programs have failed to address the Common Core standards in training, principals must adopt a different way to organize curriculum and instruction within and across schools. Recent shifts in principal accountability for instructional support includes engaging teachers in curriculum and instructional

alignments, involving teachers in specifically aligned professional development, and promoting the application of appropriately analyzed data. Therefore, previously developed evaluation systems do not meet the needs of assessing instructional leadership knowledge and skills to coordinate the change needed in today's schools.

Well-designed evaluation instruments can promote the development of effective principals and ultimately increase school performance and student achievement (Thomas, Holdaway, & Ward, 2000). To transform principal evaluations into a tool for growth requires a shift from an evaluation conducted as an annual event to a more cyclical approach that meets the needs of the campus principal. Leithwood et al. (1994) suggested a three-step process to implement an evaluation program. The first step began with preparing the principal for the evaluation process by articulating procedures, policies, and purpose. The next step included the use of multiple sources of data collected to provide evidence and identification of personal strengths and areas for growth. The final step incorporated useful feedback to identify needed professional development and plans for individual growth. To enhance the process, Reeves (2004) advised the development of rubrics that explicitly described the criteria to determine levels of proficiency. The most common levels progressed from unacceptable to acceptable and proficient to exemplary (Kimball, Milanowski, & McKinney, 2009).

Traditionally, principal evaluation instruments have taken the form of home-grown checklists evaluators used to review the principal's organization skills and assess personal character. However, federal government mandates associated with legislation such as *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB), *American Recovery and Reinvestment* (ARRA) and *Race to the Top* competition have led districts and organizations to utilize a

standards-based approach to the evaluation process as a practical guide (Clifford, Hansen, & Wraight, 2012b). Policymakers and practitioners have turned to state and national standards such as the Interstate School Leadership Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) or the Texas Learner-Centered Leadership standards to define effective principal behaviors. These types of standards may provide a foundation for principal evaluation because they reflect a professional consensus of essential leadership skills.

Significance of the Study

According to Wise and Verstegen (2000), "Education is fundamental, and those who are unable to obtain a quality education may be doomed to a substandard life" (p. 587). In order to keep pace with the needs of 21st century learners and the nation's ever-rising expectations of educators, states and school boards must invest in a system that supports and develops a principal's leadership skills (Clifford et al., 2012a). Examining current evaluation systems and principals' perceptions of an instrument's capability to support the development of personal leadership effectiveness and student achievement may improve the design of future evaluation methods.

To ensure effective principals lead schools, states and school districts must implement improved measures to evaluate principal performance. While professional standards define what a principal should know and do, determining how to measure principal performance in reasonable, systematic, and useful ways has remained an ongoing challenge (Clifford, Menon, Gangi, Condon, & Hornung, 2012c). Portin, Feldman, and Knapp (2006) characterized principal performance evaluations as having limited value for feedback, professional development, or responsibility to school improvement. In addition, principals reported evaluation processes as an inconsistent

measurement of leadership skills due primarily to inconsistencies in the administration of assessment instruments (Thomas et al., 2000).

This study was significant for several reasons. First, the study provided data to determine whether an alignment exists between evaluation instruments and state leadership standards for campus principals. Second, findings should heighten the discussion of principal evaluation processes in the areas of effective evaluation instrument design, data collection, and evaluation processes, as well as various methods employed within the evaluation system. Finally, states and local districts could utilize findings from this study to develop principal evaluation systems to increase principal effectiveness and improve student achievement.

Research Purpose and Questions

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between school districts' principal evaluation instruments and processes, and potential impact on student achievement in the areas of reading and mathematics. This study sought to answer the following research questions:

1. Is there a relationship between principal evaluation instruments and school-level performance on state assessments in reading and mathematics?

   H_a: There is a relationship between principal evaluation instruments and school performance on state assessments in reading and mathematics.

2. What, if any, are commonly employed processes (objectives, methods, frequency of feedback) districts utilize for principal evaluations?

3. How do campus principals perceive the principal evaluation process and potential effect on student achievement?

4. How do district principal evaluators perceive the principal evaluation process and potential effect on student achievement?

5. What, if any, are the principal behaviors teachers perceive as having a positive impact on student achievement?

Definitions of Key Terms

The following definitions provided an understanding and context of key terms used in this study:

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, 2009: Education funds provided through the *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act* (*ARRA*) provide an opportunity to prompt reform and improvement efforts while saving and creating jobs to stimulate the economy. Resources align to increased student achievement, sustainable gains in school and school system capacity, and improved efficiency and effectiveness (U. S. Legal Definitions, 2014a).

ISLLC Standards: A set of national standards for principal professional performance developed by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium founded in best practice (CCSSO, 2008).

No Child Left Behind: No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) is federal legislation that enacts the theories of standards-based education reform. NCLB guarantees all children a just, equal, and substantial opportunity, resulting in a high-quality education and ability to reach proficiency on state academic standards and assessments (U.S. Legal Definitions, 2014b).

Principal: The term principal refers to the multifaceted role of the lead building administrator in today's schools (CCSSO, 2008).

Principal Evaluation: The process by which school principals appraisals provide information regarding the performance of job-related responsibilities and professional obligations (Marzano et al., 2005).

Principal Evaluation, Attributes, Feedback, and Perception (PEAFP) Survey: The PEAFP survey consisted of 33 items broken into four subscales: (a) the extent of various methods used to evaluate the performance level of campus principals; (b) the frequency of principal evaluation; (c) the perception of the campus principal related to the evaluation process in the areas of accountability, increased student achievement, professional growth, incentives for improvement, adherence to policy, and fostering school climate; and (d) demographics (Condon, 2009).

Race to the Top: The ARRA provides $4.35 billion for the Race to the Top Fund, a competitive grant program designed to encourage and reward states that create the conditions for education innovation and reform and achieve significant improvement in student outcomes. Desired outcomes include gains in student achievement, closing achievement gaps, improving graduation rates, and preparation for success in college and careers (U.S. Department of Education, 2009).

Student Achievement: A student's score on the State's assessments (U.S. Department of Education, 2014).

Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS): The Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) assessments are designed to measure the extent to which the student has learned and can apply the defined knowledge and skills at each tested grade level (TEA, 2015, para. 1).

Summary

Due to high-stakes testing, rigorous federal and state accountability programs, and the current education political climate, the call for accountability among school principals has never been greater. Because effective teachers and principals are two critical factors contributing to what students learn, the creation of improved evaluation instruments and processes have set the foundation for recent education reform initiatives (National Conference of State Legislators, 2013). Today's principals must function as instructional leaders focused on increasing student achievement and developing and supporting teachers. Thus, effective principal evaluation systems must focus on improving principal practices, enhancing capacity, and increasing accountability for producing effective teachers and student achievement (Clifford & Ross, 2012).

Current evaluation measures tend to consist of locally developed instruments used primarily as contract-driven processes to document promotion or non-renewal of contracts (New Leaders, 2013). To influence the school improvement process, principal evaluation systems must serve multiple purposes. Statewide evaluation systems promote formal expectations for the profession. At the district level, evaluations guide continuous improvement practices, as well as inform personnel decisions. Therefore, all stakeholders in public education should view principal evaluation as a continuous multi-purpose process necessary to improve the quality of principals, of teaching, and of learning (Clifford & Ross, 2012).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between school districts' principal evaluation instruments and processes and their influence on student achievement. To address potential relationships, this literature review will focus on: (a) principal evaluation and student achievement; (b) the purpose for principal evaluations; (c) principal evaluation instruments, implementation, and policies; (d) current issues related to principal evaluation; (e) key stakeholder perceptions of the evaluation process; and (f) theoretical framework.

Principal Evaluation and Student Achievement

Literature related to school principals' depth of influence on student achievement varies, although current research indicates a larger influence than findings concluded from earlier studies. For example, an early study conducted by Glassman (1992) indicates the potential effect the principal may have on student achievement varies within the context of a given school. These findings correlate to the level of involvement of the campus principal in relation to school improvement. The study concludes that principals in high performing schools (as measured by test scores) tend to collaboratively collect larger amounts of data, such as student performance on both formative and summative assessments, attendance of students and teachers, types and frequency of discipline referrals, as well as results from climate surveys. The study also found principals in lower performing schools report little involvement in a collaborative approach to data analysis as a means to increase student achievement.

In their study of causal relationships among principal behaviors and outcomes relating to school context, Snyder and Ebmeier (1992) concluded that principal behaviors have a significant effect on teacher outcomes; however, these behaviors have little effect on student achievement. The researchers attribute these findings to the unique role that teachers and principals play in the context of a school. While teachers control the direct delivery of instruction; principals have minimal control over learning at the individual student level (Snyder & Ebmeier, 1992). Notably, findings from early research relating to the potential influence that principals may have on student achievement stem from a period where the principals primarily functioned as the manager of school organizations. School managers focus on the day-to-day operations of the campus such as facilities, budget, pupil control, and extra-curricular activities (Martin & Willower, 1981). Contemporary researchers, who view the principal as an instructional leader, draw dissimilar conclusions regarding the potential relationship between principal behaviors and student achievement.

Marzano's et al. (2005) meta-analysis covering 30 years of research which found a positive correlation of 0.25 regarding the relationship between effective principal behaviors and student achievement. The researchers argued, "Given the perceived importance of leadership, it is no wonder that an effective principal is thought to be a necessary precondition for an effective school" (p. 5). In a similar study, Leithwood, Patten, and Jantzi (2009) analyzed 1,445 teacher responses to an online survey measuring principal behaviors in their schools. The survey contained four sections of effective principal behaviors (Rational Path, Emotions Path, Organizational Path, and Family Path) with each section containing multiple variables regarding the potential influence on

student achievement. The Rational Path focuses on behaviors related to the principal's knowledge regarding curriculum, teaching, and learning. The Emotions Path surveys the feelings and dispositions of staff members, both individually and collectively regarding school climate issues such as job satisfaction, morale, and stress/burnout. The Organizational Path includes school structures, cultures, policies, and standard operating procedures, while the Family Path emphasizes family-related factors such as parent education and income that influence student achievement. Utilizing annual test results in Canada's grade three and grade six math and reading data, the study indicates a positive correlation exists between principal behaviors and student achievement. These finding are logical given elementary and middle school principals perceive their role as an instructional leader is to improve teaching and learning by providing professional development to teachers, as well as nurture their own professional growth (Grigsby, Schumacher, Decman, & Simieou III, 2010).

In a complementary study consisting of 185 principals in Wisconsin, Dean (2012) used a model of achievement to estimate how principal behaviors affected student achievement. The sample for this study originated from Wisconsin school staffing data from 1994–2011, along with Wisconsin achievement data based upon scores on the Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examination (WKCE). Over 1,500 principals participated in the study. A model of achievement that controlled for student demographics, school staff characteristics, and test idiosyncrasies allowed the researcher to estimate principal effectiveness related to student achievement. The study found that principals in the top and bottom 10% of the effectiveness continuum have the greatest effect, either positive or negative, on reading and math achievement. The effective

difference between a principal at the 10th percentile and the 90th percentile corresponded to a half-standard deviation relative to student achievement statewide. This difference suggests that switching a 10th percentile principal for one at the 90th percentile would positively influence student achievement by an average of 22 percentile points. The results further suggest that while the teacher continues to have the greatest effect on student performance, a single principal—empowered to influence a larger number of students—can affect student achievement at a rate more than four times that of the highly effective teacher.

Lacking in the literature is research relating principal evaluations to student achievement. Principals indirectly influence student achievement through commitment toward best practices and a participative leadership style that supports the implementation of those practices (Hallinger & Heck, 1998). Given that recent research has supported the indirect relationship the campus principal has on student achievement, school districts must evaluate the performance of campus principals through a process that measures best leadership practices.

According to Snyder and Ebmeier (1992), a link exists between principal evaluations, teacher quality, and instructional practices. However, documenting a direct link to student performance is difficult. The researchers argue that school districts could hold principals accountable for the achievement, provided they had more control over variables such as teacher selection and school budgets. In order for principals to influence student achievement, school districts must implement effective evaluation instruments and procedures. However, Hart (1993) found common evaluation processes focus on principal processes such as student behaviors and communication. Because the principal

is also responsible for monitoring instruction and learning via classroom observations,

teacher evaluations, and interactions with key stakeholders, evaluation procedures should

emphasize these areas to support student achievement (Sergiovanni, 1995).

The Purpose of Principal Evaluations

Principal evaluation has emerged in education reform, due mainly to federal

programs such as *NCLB* legislation and *Race to the Top* funding, to highlight the roles

and responsibilities for campus principals in leadership, professional development, and

other processes. Stufflebeam and Nevo (1993) argue the necessity for the systematic

evaluation of school principals for three reasons: (a) to determine the principal's aptitude

and competency in effectively leading schools; (b) to determine whether the principal's

particular skills suit the needs of the campus; and (c) to determine whether principals

meet the school districts' predetermined expectations. Amsterdam, Johnson, Monrad,

and Tonnsen (2005) concurred with these reasons, as described in their "three-phase

process" for principal evaluations to: (a) determine the competencies a principal should

demonstrate; (b) describe performance in terms of required skills; and (c) assess ratings

based on demonstrated proficiency.

Thirty years of research indicates that the campus principal is critical to school

improvement and student achievement (Branch, Hanushek, & Rivkin, 2013; Leithwood

et al., 2004; Marzano et al., 2005). Similar to teacher evaluation, principal evaluation

systems increasingly focus on linking student achievement to principal performance

(Kimball et al., 2009). As a result, the focus of principal evaluations has shifted, from an

appraisal of managerial skills to the evaluation of the principal's leadership skills

(Milanowski, Kimball, & Pautsch, 2008). Reeves (2004) asserts "Leadership matters,

even when other variables, including resources and personnel are held constant, a single leader has an enormous impact on the entire organization" (p. xi.). Therefore, the focus of principal evaluation processes must center on appraising the leadership skills of the campus principal.

Researchers have described aspects of principal leadership in a variety of ways: (a) instructional leadership, (b) facilitative leadership, (c) transformational leadership, (d) visionary leadership, (e) leadership for school culture, (f) curriculum leadership, and (g) learner-centered leadership (Blasé & Blasé, 1998; Catano & Stronge, 2006; Checkley, 2000; Drury, 1993; Sun & Youngs, 2009). Evaluation systems centered on instruments that identify leadership behaviors articulate these various dimensions for school leadership assessment. These instruments represent the extent to which the principal ensures the school exhibits high expectations for student learning, rigorous and relevant curriculum, high levels of instruction to meet the rigor of the content, a culture of learning, and professional behavior to meet performance accountability standards (Goldring, Cravens, Murphy, Porter, Elliot & Carson, 2009a).

The process of evaluating principals provides the opportunity to improve individual practice, build human capacity, and promote accountability for teacher performance and student growth to ensure all principals positively affect student performance. Therefore, principal evaluation represents a key strategy for improving schools, closing the achievement gap, and ultimately increasing student achievement. For principal evaluation to achieve these ends, school districts must design evaluation instruments, implementation procedures, and policies evaluators find easy to administer, capture the essence of the role of the school principal, and provide valid and reliable data

to enhance professional development and performance evaluation (Goldring et al., 2009a).

Principal Evaluation Instruments, Implementation, and Policies

Federal and state accountability requirements have placed tremendous pressure on schools to improve student performance. Principal evaluation systems play a major role in the way districts observe, support, and increase principal effectiveness. In order to review proprietary evaluation systems, or develop local systems, district personnel should understand the available literature regarding the alignment of evaluation instruments, implementation, and policies to meet the needs and goals for a given school district.

Evaluation Instruments

A key feature in the evaluation process is the development of well-defined criteria for assessing acceptable principal performance. A school district must communicate expectations that align with the district's goals and beliefs (Catano & Stronge, 2006). Research, though narrow in empirical evidence, indicates methods and tools used to evaluate principals vary widely (Amsterdam et al., 2005; Contano & Stronge, 2006; Derrington & Sharratt, 2008; Goldring et al., 2009a; Kimball et al., 2009; Tschannen-Moran & Garcia, 2004). Unfortunately, little discussion is available regarding methods for developing principal evaluation instruments that lead to fair and valid decisions, especially for locally developed instruments (Amsterdam et al., 2005; Tschannen-Moran & Garcia, 2004).

Just as in teacher evaluation systems, the most common method to measure principal performance includes an approach to the evaluation process based upon a prescribed set of standards. Studies conclude effective standards-based evaluation

instruments contain an in-depth analysis of instructional leadership behaviors and emphasize continued leadership development (Kimball et al., 2009; Reeves, 2004; Stufflebeam & Nevo, 1993). Furthermore, researchers agree effective principal evaluation instruments should include clear principal leadership expectations and incorporate objective performance benchmarks (Ginsberg & Berry, 1990; Goldring et al., 2009b; Rinehart & Russo, 1995; Stufflebeam & Nevo, 1993; Thomas et al., 2000).

One of the earliest reviews of standards-based evaluation instruments emerged from a Glassman and Martens (1993) study in California. The purpose of the study was to determine how effective school districts incorporate standards developed for personnel evaluations by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educator Evaluation (2008). These standards contain 21 principles merged into four categories:

1. Propriety standards (legal and ethical considerations),

2. Utility standards (informative, influential, and timely comment),

3. Feasibility standards (efficiency and ease of use), and

4. Accuracy standards (database outcomes).

The study found the utility standard the most commonly identified category to employ constructive evaluation practices, including developing practical procedures and building relationships with evaluators. The least commonly used standard focuses on monitoring principal performance to establish reliable measures of outcomes. Researchers also concluded, from a practical perspective, that school districts would find incorporating all of the standards presented by the Joint Committee challenging due to time, personnel, and monetary limitations. In addition, school district policy regarding

evaluations and the role of the principal may not align to some of the standards

(Glassmen & Martens, 1993).

The most popular set of standards used for principal preparation and licensing are those developed by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) with 43 states reporting the use of these standards for principal licensing (Derrington & Sharratt, 2008). When applied to school leadership, standards-based evaluations should:

1. Target leadership abilities or methods that increase teachers' ability to affect student achievement;

2. Include specific behaviors and detailed rubrics that define numerous levels of performance, usually ranging from unsatisfactory through basic and proficient to exemplary;

3. Employ rubrics with enough detail to clarify the behaviors or competencies required of a good performer; and

4. Include the use of multiple sources of data and training of evaluators to recognize evidence and to apply the rating scale or rubric (Kimball et al., 2009).

Catano and Stronge (2006) studied the relationship between evaluation practices, accreditation standards, and ISLLC standards. The researchers found to facilitate clear communication regarding principal expectations and job performance, evaluation instruments must align with both state and professional standards. In a related study, Derrington and Sharratt (2008) indicate the use of standards-based instruments provided consistency and support a common language for principals and evaluators to clarify evaluation criteria. Superintendents involved in the study reported the ISLLC standards

contained indicators of principal expectations and promoted specificity to develop

instruments aligned with district reform efforts, goals, and objectives. Kimball, et al.

(2009) found standards-based principal evaluation systems have a positive effect on

principal performance resulting from greater clarity in performance expectations,

increased quality of feedback, and opportunity to rank order priorities of the multifaceted

job requirements of today's campus leaders. Campus principals in the study reported the

standards-based evaluation approach as a more favorable process than previously used

systems because it provided specificity of the principal's role as instructional leaders in

order to affect student achievement

Goldring et al. (2009a) identified three major elements for assessing principal

behaviors: (a) alignment to professional standards, (b) emphasis on leadership

development, and (c) consideration of organizational context. A study of 68 urban

districts in 43 states found 50% of district evaluation instruments (most developed

locally) lack an alignment to any professional standards. In addition, most of the

documents used in the evaluation process included a rating scale, as opposed to a rubric-

based assessment, self-assessment, or the use of portfolios. Researchers found the local

development of evaluation instruments to be inconsistent due to the limited amount of

research in determining the influence of standards-based evaluations on principal practice

or effect on student achievement (Amsterdam et al., 2003; Tschannen-Moran & Garcia,

2004). As a result, districts receive little guidance to identify characteristics critical for

principal effectiveness in evaluation documents.

In a similar study, Yavuz (2010) concluded evaluation instruments aligned more

to performance checklists, as opposed to a focus on behaviors that affect student

achievement. Because local school districts tend to develop principal evaluation instruments with little input from the campus principal, instruments used for appraisal purposes traditionally lack a published or tested research base, which brings into question an instrument's validity and reliability. For an evaluation instrument to be considered valid the instrument should be supported by theory and evidence that the measured leadership behaviors enhance both teaching and learning; to be reliable, the instrument should produce consistent results when used repeatedly by multiple evaluators over time (Goldring et al., 2009).

Implementation

Accountability for job performance involves application of systems or strategies that measure performance; therefore, the quality of implementation in an effective principal evaluation system is critical as "implementation trumps instruments in terms of fidelity" (Kimball, et al., 2009, p. 258). For an evaluation process to have fidelity there must be a defined set of protocols to ensure the accurate and consistent application of the process, thus developing protocols that accurately represent what principals actually do and how they execute practices is a daunting task (Ginsberg & Berry, 1990). Early research regarding the implementation of principal evaluation systems indicates that evaluation processes must be constructive, practical, useful, responsive to legal requirements, easily implemented, and readily acceptable (Glassman & Martens, 1993). However, recent studies indicate most evaluation systems;

1. Focus on criteria rather than outcomes,

2. Lack alignment to professional standards,

3. Use a variety of invalid or unreliable methods to gather and analyze

    performance, and

4. Lack a consistency of application resulting in a lack of validity and reliability

    (Catano & Stronge, 2006; Davis & Hensley, 1999; Derrington & Sharratt,

    2008; Goldring et al., 2009a; Harrison & Peterson, 1986; Kimball et al., 2009;

    Kimball, Heneman, & Milanowski, 2007; Thomas et al., 2000).

A lack of available research leaves open to debate practices that constitute effective principal evaluations (Ginsberg & Berry, 1990). While considerable research of effective practices for school principals exists, little evidence is available for models that allow evaluators to judge effective principal behaviors given the unique contextual needs and cultural characteristics of individual school circumstances (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985; Rinehart & Russo, 1995; Thomas et al., 2000). In addition, due to the wide use of locally developed evaluation processes, most systems lack continuity among practices or valid and reliable measures of principal performance (Ginsberg & Berry; Rinehart & Russo).

Several studies have outlined critical elements for judging principal effectiveness. These elements include: (a) performance goals and outcomes, (b) attitudes and behaviors of key staff, (c) organizational structures, (d) positive school climate, and (e) compliance with ethical practices (Glassman & Heck, 1992; Johnson, 1989; Murphy & Pimentel, 1996; Reeves, 2004; Rinehart & Russo, 1995; Stufflebeam & Nevo, 1993). To measure these areas, Thomas et al. (2000) support the use of multiple sources of data collected by evaluators to determine principal competency. Sources of data include evaluation instruments and documentation, self-evaluation reflections, team assessments, and the

development of individual portfolios (Ginsberg & Berry, 1990). Reeves (2004)

encourages districts to consider using an in-depth assessment of a fewer number of

principal domains as opposed to a shallow review of a large number of indicators.

Unique to the findings is the differentiation between levels of performance appropriate to

the various stages principals will progress throughout the principal's career. Ginsberg and

Berry (1990) and Rinehart and Russo (1995) found the use of both formative and

summative processes as a critical process to judge principal performance. Formative

processes promote individual professional growth opportunities, while summative

assessments identify performance accomplishments. While Johnson (1989) reported

principal evaluations prove more effective when performed through a variety of

constructive practices, including explicit criteria, defined performance expectations, and

frequent feedback, additional studies of district practices find opposing conclusions

(Rinehart & Russo).

From a study of evaluations in South Carolina schools, Ginsberg and Berry

(1990) concluded that principals exerted considerable influence over evaluation outcomes

due to the loose relationship between principals and their evaluators. Conclusions suggest

principals often exaggerate performance on a variety of indicators. As a result, systems

that do not measure performance against results function on the premise principals are

competent unless proven otherwise. To analyze principal evaluation processes in

California, Davis and Hensley (1999) interviewed school leaders and found inconsistent

implementation of processes due to differences in evaluators' knowledge of effective

practices. District leaders reported little opportunity to spend time observing principal

leadership behaviors at the campus level or having received appropriate training regarding district purpose and procedures to increase consistency, fairness, and accuracy.

Recent studies report similar findings regarding the development of processes and procedures to implement effective principal evaluations. Catano and Stronge's (2006) analysis of 132 Virginia schools found that districts linked their evaluation systems to instructional management, organizational management, communication processes, and professional development opportunities. However, the researchers questioned whether the implementation of principal evaluations aligned with the criteria and whether the evaluation process improved principal effectiveness. Sun and Youngs (2009) concluded principals are more likely to engage in leadership behaviors when school districts use evaluation processes that hold them accountable for school and district priority goals; encourage personal, professional development, and promote school restructuring. The researchers found when evaluation systems concentrated on individual knowledge, skills, and behaviors, learner-centered leadership behaviors were more likely to occur. Finally, the study revealed that when district evaluations stressed goal setting, curriculum design, teacher professional development and evaluation, and monitoring student performance, learner-centered leadership behaviors increased (Sun & Youngs).

District Policies for Principal Evaluations

Well-defined principal evaluation systems assist school districts in ensuring they have competent principals and effective schools (Thomas et al., 2000). In an effort to develop a successful evaluation program that positively influences performance, districts should employ clear policies that enhance the evaluation process. District policies, which promote effective evaluations, focus on three main areas (a) setting criteria; (b) sampling

performance; and (c) communicating results regarding expected growth (Harrison &

Peterson, 1986). Heck and Marcoulide's (1996) expanded these policies to include

actions which require; (a) gathering information related to performance in various role-

related domains; (b) recognizing the local context; (c) creating flexibility for different

role perceptions; and (d) utilizing different data sources. Thomas et al. (2000) analyzed

data related to the superintendent and principals' satisfaction with district evaluation

policies and found districts tend to follow most of the districts' evaluation policies.

However, superintendents identified several constraints related to compliance. First,

superintendents indicated a lack of written policies due to administrative overload.

Second, time constraints prevented evaluators from completing the evaluation process as

defined in the policy. Finally, policies primarily designed to promote professional growth

become problematic when a district identifies the need to terminate a current

administrator.

Currently, principal evaluation policies have come under greater scrutiny as

education reformists have called for the use of student achievement data in the evaluation

process. According to Piro, Wiemers, and Shutt (2011) recent legislative acts related to

school accountability call for measurement of principal effectiveness to incorporate

student achievement data as part of the evaluation process. Researchers found, as of June

2011, almost half of the state legislatures adopted legislation requiring the use of student

achievement data in district evaluation policies. Such requirements ranged from (a) the

optional use of student achievement data; (b) required student achievement measures

with no specified amount regarding to impact of the evaluation rating; and finally (c)

student achievement measures must comprise 50% of the total evaluation rating. Due to

the early stages of implementing such measures in principal evaluations, future implications are unknown at this time.

Issues with Principal Evaluation

Since the early 1980's researchers have determined no satisfactory method for measuring principal performance has been developed (Amsterdam et al., 2005; Hart, 1994; Heck & Marcoulides, 1992; Lipham, Rankin, & Hoeh, 1986; Thomas et al., 2000). While different methods of collecting data exist, such as questionnaires, checklists, and observations, such procedures often measure the frequency of principal behaviors opposed to the quality of principal interactions (Thomas et al., 2000). Issues with instrument-based evaluations often weaken the efficacy of the principal evaluation process due to poor quality of evaluation instruments to effectively reflect evaluation criteria. Instead of using researched-based practices, principal evaluation systems often draw criteria from accreditation organizations to identify effective behaviors.

In a review of principal evaluation systems, Amsterdam et al. (2005) concluded a major concern regarding the validity of principal evaluation systems is the vagueness of the evaluation criteria. Heck and Marcoulides (1992) concur with these findings as instruments used to measure the principal effectiveness lack psychometric qualities due to the lack of theory in the development process. Evaluation instruments often restrict the ability to measure observable behaviors of effective principals. Snyder and Ebmeier (1992) found evaluation instruments assess trivial principal behaviors, thus lack sustenance. While decision-making and problem-solving abilities are critical to the effectiveness of the school principal, Heck and Marcoulides (1992) argue problems exist in how to measure these actions.

The second issue in the evaluation process stems from a lack of clarity in communicating expectations. In a study related to theory and practice in principal evaluation systems, McAdams and Barilla (2003) noted communication between superintendents and principals regarding the purpose and process for evaluations are either weak or non-existent. Thomas et al. (2000) determined while the responsibility to communicate the expectation rests with the principal evaluator, the majority of confusion results from the vague language within the instrument.

In addition to the lack of clarity in expectations, ambiguous objectives compound the lack of clarity when the purpose for conducting evaluations is unclear, due to lack of empirical research to create and validate appropriate domains to determine principal effectiveness (Heck & Marcoulides, 1992). As a result, evaluation instruments contain a wide variety of objectives in the evaluation process, thus creating confusion for the primary purpose to conduct principal evaluations. Evaluation instruments often vary from district to district in terms of expectations; Smylie and Crowson (1993) concluded evaluators whose conflict of interest, district politics, and positioning of evaluator power tend to guide performance evaluations rather than the specific actions of principal necessary to result in an increase of student achievement.

Finally, Davis and Hensley (1999) reported a lack of trust regarding the motives or intentions of district office evaluators and rarely included information from key stakeholders such as teachers, parents, and students. In a 1999 interview of principals and superintendents from North California, Davis and Hensley (1999) found principals believed formal evaluations did not support the "shaping or directing their professional development or in promoting school effectiveness" (p. 399). Principals and evaluators

often experience "overload" due to the large number of items in the instrument, redundancy within the approach and, most important, time constraints in meeting the evaluation requirements. As a result, the evaluator's inconsistent level of fidelity in the implementation process and evaluation criteria compromises the degree to which principals perceived the approach as helpful (Davis & Hensley, 1999; Derrington & Sharratt, 2008; Kimball et al., 2009).

Stakeholder Perceptions

In an attempt to explore the relationship between effective principal behaviors and student achievement, several studies have focused on the perceptions of key stakeholders in the principal evaluation process. Findings suggest both principals and superintendents perceive the district's purpose for evaluation is to promote personal professional development, enhance school restructuring, and increase student achievement (Catano & Stronge, 2006; Sun & Young, 2009). However, the instruments for evaluation and implementation of the process do not necessarily produce the desired results. Studies indicate principals find the evaluation process lacks the use of multiple measures of data and is a mere checklist of principal competencies related to managerial tasks. For example, instructional leadership practices formed the superintendents' central focus for evaluations where principals perceived operational management as the most important focus in the evaluation process.

Additional criticisms included the poor alignment to state standards, lack of flexibility regarding the contextual needs of the campus, and subjective nature of the overall evaluation process (Brady (2012); Johnson (1989); Yavuz (2010). Strong, trusting, and collaborative relationships between principals and district office evaluators

are important to the success of the evaluation process to determine how the district defines and assesses principals' instructional leadership practices. Feedback to campus administrators is a critical component of the process. Unfortunately, given the various professional demands placed on district evaluators, districts struggle to complete principal evaluations consistently or with fidelity (Goldring et al., 2009a). As a result, principals have little confidence towards the motives or intentions of the district office evaluators. Principals report evaluators typically spent little time on campus observing leadership behaviors and often lacked essential training in effective evaluation techniques (Brady, 2012; Davis & Hensley, 1999; Johnson, 1998; Yavuz, 2010).

In Davis and Hensley's (1999) study of principal and superintendent perceptions, principals indicated the formal evaluation process did little in shaping or changing effective behaviors. As one participant stated, "Evaluations are good if you want to fire me, not if you want to improve me" (Davis & Hensley, 1999, p. 401). Interestingly, superintendents in that same study felt the evaluation systems were well-developed and were the basis for all performance improvements by their principals. This gap between principals and superintendents perceptions is echoed in the Thomas et al. (2000) study on policies and practices related to principal evaluation. Researchers found widespread diversity between the evaluation process and a substantial difference between how principals and superintendents view the importance and usefulness of principal evaluation. This belief supports previous findings of Harrison and Peterson (1986), which indicates a critical pitfall in principal evaluations may result from favorable perceptions regarding the process by the superintendent opposed to principal perceptions.

Researchers have shown when principal's function as an instructional leader, they can impact student achievement (both directly and indirectly) by as much as 25% (Hallinger& Heck, 1998; Leithwood et al., 2000). Critical factors of effective leadership include the principal's proficiency in promoting the school climate and culture through (a) providing a safe and orderly environment, (b) supporting the mission and vision of the school, (c) encouraging stakeholder involvement, (d) monitoring academic achievement, (e) upholding a campus-wide instructional focus, maintaining high expectations for student performance, and (f) endorsing and participating in professional development (Nettles & Herrington, 2007). Berebitsky, Goddard, and Carlisle (2014) study of Title 1 schools in Michigan, concluded teachers report collaboration and communication as a necessary component of changes in the school climate to positively impact student achievement. Principals support school change by providing opportunities for teachers to improve instruction and provide risks for innovative instructional strategies. The researchers finding collaborate previous studies related to the teacher's perception of the principal's role of improving the campus culture and climate.

Williams (2009) study of a large urban school district in Georgia indicated that teacher morale is a critical component to a positive school climate and correlates to increased student achievement. This study specifically focused on the role of the principal in supporting teachers with student discipline by developing system-wide classroom management strategies and adherence to the campus discipline plan. This can occur through professional development opportunities, collaboration among staff indicating best practices of discipline strategies, coupled with behavior and classroom management techniques.

While research studies address the perceptions of key stakeholders (principals, superintendents, and principal supervisors) regarding the impact of the principal evaluation processes and potential influence on student achievement, virtually no studies have incorporated the voice of teachers related to this topic (Catano & Stronge, 2006; Davis & Hensley, 1999; Goldring et al., 2009a; Sun & Young, 2009; Thomas et al., 2000). Available research incorporating teacher perceptions is limited to examining principal instructional behaviors that influence student achievement and does not incorporate the potential impact of the evaluation process (Leithwood, Patten, & Jantzi (2009).Thus, additional studies that incorporate teacher perceptions of principal best practices in relation to student achievement and incorporate the perceptions to principal evaluation processes will expand the current body of research.

Summary of Literature

Research spanning the last 30 years indicates principal behaviors have a positive impact on student achievement (Witziers, Bosker, & Krüger, 2003). In order to make a significant impact on student learning, campus principals must maximize skills in the areas of instructional and transformational leadership (Leithwood et al., 2009; Valentine & Prater, 2011). Principals who focus on best practice and high expectations for learning produce the greatest gains in achievement (Condon, 2009; Dean, 2012; Sun &Young, 2009).

While research supports the impact of leadership on achievement, aligning evaluation processes to improved learning is contradictory. Catano and Stronge (2006) found when evaluation instruments align to standards, principal behavior aligned to student achievement. However, contradictory findings indicate principal standards in the

evaluation instrument do not cover behaviors to ensure a rigorous curriculum or quality instruction, a necessary component to enhance student achievement (Goldring et al., 2009a). Most principals indicate that evaluation methods fail to provide support to the campus leader or effectively measure individual leadership skills. Often the use of goal setting processes within the evaluation instrument were found to lack alignment to the unique needs of individual campuses (Brady, 2012).

 Research noted evaluation instruments tend to be simple checklists of principal accomplishments, developed on a local level with a little research to provide validity and reliability. Evaluation process lack connections to personal professional growth opportunities, a necessary component for increasing leadership abilities in the areas of school climate and organizational operations (Condon, 2009; Davis & Hensley, 1999). Most discerning in the research was the perception of lack of consistency and punitive use for the evaluation process (Kimball & Pantsch, 2008). In order to produce effective principals who have the skills to develop student potential, districts and states must reassess evaluation processes. Not only should the focus for performance be placed on "what" measures for evaluation, additional focus should encompass "how" to evaluate in order to optimize their impact on student achievement.

Theoretical Framework

The quality of principal leadership constitutes a primary indicator of school effectiveness (Elmore, 2000; Ginsberg & Thompson, 1992; Lezotte, 1992). Recent accountability measures now require districts to evaluate principal effectiveness in terms of student achievement (Piro, Wiemers, & Shutt, 2011). Multiple theories related to effective leadership practices help to recognize how principals influence student

achievement. These theories provide a framework for analyzing the various contexts related to principal evaluations and student achievement.

Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, and Rosenthall (1964) indicate in the development of role theory, that the expectation of others (superintendents, peers, teachers, students, and parents) influences the leadership practices of principals. The primary issue of role theory, in terms of the principalship, is the uncertainty related to matching of the needs of the school and personal professional growth (Edwards, Caplan, & Van Harrison, 1998). As a result, role ambiguity can cause stress, anxiety, and job dissatisfaction (Pearce, 1981). Over the last 30 years, education reform has resulted in drastic change in the role of the campus principal. Principals must embrace new standards of performance, individual competencies, and transition to the role of the instructional leader (Grigsby et al., 2010; Marzano et al. 2005). In the development of evaluation instruments, school districts define the behaviors principals should display when performing administrative duties based upon evaluation objectives and criteria. The evaluation process further defines these roles due to the expectations set by the principal's supervisor, the principal, occasionally subordinates, and others with whom principals interacts while performing duties. These individuals develop beliefs, attitudes, and expectations about what principals should or should not do as part of the role as school leaders (Torrence, 2002).

Expectancy theory is the most inclusive motivational model that seeks to forecast or clarify task-related effort (Lewis, Goodman, & Fandt, 1995). The theory emphasizes that three influences determine motivation in the workplace: (a) expectancy, the estimate of an individual's ability to participate in required actions, (b) instrumentality, insights regarding the link between expected behaviors and desired outcomes, and (c) valence,

perceived rewards based upon performance. That is, anticipated outcomes of individuals'

actions and motivation at work or the perceived link between effort and reward sway

personnel performance.

In regards to principal evaluation processes and potential influence on student

achievement, factors which influence expectancy include "whether the individual

believes that he or she has the skills and knowledge required, whether there is a clear

understanding about the nature of the performance that is to be attained and it is viewed

as attainable, and whether the individual believes that there is situational support for the

performance" (Mohrman & Lawler, 1996, p. 121). Jacobson's (1987) inclusion of

feedback during the evaluation processes enhances the application of expectancy theory.

The research suggests the use of feedback allows individuals the opportunity to re-assess

the estimate of their ability and effort, the link between individual effort and perceived

reward, and the attractiveness to the perceived reward. Additional studies of principal

evaluation processes, which include principal workload, limited ability to allocate

resources, and overall application of the evaluation process, indicate a potential negative

influence of individual perception regarding overall expectancy (Leithwood, Steinbech &

Jantzi, 2002; Tschannen-Moran & Garcia, 2004).

Simply put, expectancy theory implies that motivation connects to the perceived

association between a person's effort, performance, and consequences or penalties

associated with job performance (Jacobson, 1987, Lawler, 1973; Vroom, 1964).

Therefore, administrators and legislators must recognize the expectancy values that link

effort to job satisfaction to performance. To achieve a high level of expectancy in the

evaluation process, principals just as it is for teachers, must take control over individual performance and outcomes (Schumacher, 2010).

The adaptive-reactive theory (Osborn & Hunt, 1975) represented an expansion of path-goal theory. Leaders' effectiveness may be a direct consequence of their capability to adjust to the specific needs of their subordinates and their particular situations. This adaptation process to particular conditions and need assessments may allow leaders to experience a reactive behavior from their subordinates. This explicit dynamic between leaders and subordinates represents a dual association where leaders' behaviors are clearly transformed by the situations and specific needs of the subordinates, and at the same time subordinates tend to react based on the actions of the leader. The main rationale behind this theory is establishing a leader's ability to categorize and react to the subordinates' requirements, wishes, and struggles. Kegan and Lahey (2001) explain that this theory is conflicted by the identification and calculation of subordinates' incentives. Collectively, these theories provide a foundation for researching policies and processes that accurately measure principal performance evaluations and potential impact on student achievement. However, application of Expectancy Theory provided the conceptual framework most aligned to the data collection and analysis processes.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between school

districts' principal evaluation instruments and processes, and potential impact on student

achievement in the areas of reading and mathematics. First, the study analyzed the

content of principal evaluation instruments utilized by school districts or charters and

their student scores on the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) in

reading and mathematics to determine if a potential relationship existed between the

quality of principal evaluation instruments and student performance. Next, a purposeful

sample of campus principals in the 4,610 elementary schools in Texas, during the 2010-

2011 academic school year, participated in an online survey to gather their perceptions

regarding their evaluation processes and potential impact on student achievement. In

addition, interviews of district personnel, responsible for conducting the principal

evaluations, provided supervisor perspectives related to the district's evaluation process

and potential impact on student achievement. Finally, classroom teachers participated in

an online questionnaire to determine their insights concerning the principal evaluation

process and to identify principal behaviors that may positively influence student

achievement. This chapter presents an overview of the research problem,

operationalization of theoretical constructs, research purpose and questions, research

design, population and sampling selection, instruments, data collection

procedures, data analysis, privacy and ethical considerations, and the research design

limitations for this study.

Overview of the Research Problem

"No great accomplishments ever happened without great leadership, and

transforming public education is no exception" (New Leaders, 2013, para 1). One would

assume if the most critical task for schools is to provide high-quality instruction, then the

most critical issue for the school must be student achievement (Condon, 2009). Research

has shown that the school principal accounts for nearly 25% of the total influence on

student achievement (Marzano et al., 2005). Over the last 30 years, research has

examined the role principals play in shaping school improvement and developing a

foundation for student learning (Clifford & Ross, 2012). Evaluating principal

effectiveness is an essential part of the landscape of contemporary educational reform.

The Center for Public Education (2012) defines an "effective" principal as one whose

students make greater than average gains than students in other schools with comparable

demographics. In an effort to ensure effective principals are leading our nation's schools,

states and local school districts need to implement evaluation systems that promote

effective principal behaviors that positively affect student achievement.

Current criticisms of principal evaluation systems include their lack of clear

performance standards and rigor in both the design and attention to implementation

(Goldring et al., 2099b; Reeves, 2004). Additionally, few widely available principal

evaluation instruments display rigor or make testing public so that validity and reliability

can be examined (Goldring et al., 2009a; Heck & Marcoulides, 1996). Currently, TEA

mandates the annual evaluation for public school principals on nine performance

domains, including effective supervision of teachers and student achievement (TEA, 2010). Although the Texas Administrative Code does not indicate the weight of student achievement for principal evaluation ratings, a TEA 2011 survey of school district administrators stated that only 30% of local school districts reported the principal evaluation system included a student achievement component (TEA, 2011a). At present, TEA does not utilize a standardized principal evaluation instrument for school district use, thus permitting school districts to develop independent evaluation procedures. The purpose of this mixed methods study was to examine the relationship between school districts' principal evaluation instruments and processes to determine the potential impact on student achievement in reading and mathematics.

Operationalization of Theoretical Constructs

This study consisted of two constructs: (a) principal evaluation, and (b) student achievement. Principal evaluation was defined as the process by which school principal evaluations provided information regarding the performance of job-related responsibilities and professional obligations (Marzano et al., 2005). The principal evaluation construct was measured by the *Principal Evaluation Attributes, Feedback and Perceptions* (PEAFP) survey (Condon, 2009). In addition, principal evaluation instruments were analyzed for alignment to state requirements utilizing the *Principal Evaluation Instrument Rubric (*PEIR*).*

Student achievement was defined as a student's score on the state assessment (U.S. Department of Education, 2014). Achievement measures were based on campus reading and mathematics performance on the *Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills*

(TAKS) scores for the 2011 academic year. The TAKS test was the Texas state standardized test from 2003 until 2012.

Research Purpose, Questions, and Hypotheses

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between school districts' principal evaluation instruments and processes and potential impact on student achievement in the areas of reading and mathematics. This study sought to answer the following research questions:

1. Is there a relationship between principal evaluation instruments and school-level performance on state assessments in reading and mathematics?

    H_a: There is a relationship between principal evaluation instruments and school performance on state assessments in reading and mathematics.

2. What, if any, are commonly employed processes (objectives, methods, frequency of feedback) districts utilize for principal evaluations?

3. How do campus principals perceive the principal evaluation process and potential effect on student achievement?

4. How do district principal evaluators perceive the principal evaluation process and potential effect on student achievement?

5. What, if any, are the principal behaviors teachers perceive as having a positive impact on student achievement?

Research Design

This study employed a mixed methods design. Johnson, Onwuegbuzie, and Turner (2007) defined mixed methods research as "the type of research in which a researcher or teams of researchers combine elements of qualitative and quantitative

research approaches for the purposes of breadth and depth of understanding and corroboration" (p. 123). This design consisted of two phases: first, a quantitative phase and second, a qualitative one. Forty-one elementary school principals from 27 Texas school districts and charter schools were solicited to complete an online survey assessing the attributes and regularity of feedback based upon the district evaluation processes. In addition, the survey gathered principal perceptions regarding the influence the evaluation process had on student achievement. Semi-structured interviews of district evaluator staff, assigned the task of conducting principal evaluation and an online questionnaire of teachers provided insight regarding the effect principal evaluation processes may have on student achievement. Finally, a rubric was developed to rate each of the 27 districts' principal evaluation instruments for alignment to state requirements and the potential effect on student achievement. Quantitative data was analyzed using percentages, frequencies, and Pearson's product moment correlations (r), while an inductive coding process was used to analyze the qualitative survey and interview data.

Population and Sample

The population for this study included 4,610 elementary schools across the state of Texas, educating 3.24 million students in grades 3-11 during the 2010-11 academic year (TEA, 2012b). Demographic and student achievement in reading and mathematics data obtained from 41 elementary schools across 27 school districts and charter schools in Texas were included in this study. On average, the sample campuses were 87.0% Economically Disadvantaged, 33.5% African American, 56.0% Hispanic, 7.5% Anglo, 26.9% Limited English Proficient, and have a mobility rate of 24.5%.

Annually the state of Texas evaluates campuses on federal accountability standards. To meet adequate yearly progress (AYP) campuses must achieve set standards in reading, mathematics, attendance rate, and graduation rate. If a campus fails to meet one of the standards for two or more years, the campus progresses through five stages of improvement required and sanctions. For this study, the elementary school in Texas targeted for stage five school improvement requirements due to poor AYP measures, was purposefully identified based on obtaining the lowest state performance in reading and mathematics in 2011 on the state TAKS assessment. Using Campus Comparability report from the Texas Education Agency's 2011 Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS), a matched sample of all of the elementary schools in Texas that had a similar percentage of students who were Anglo, African-American, Hispanic, economically disadvantaged, mobility rate, and limited English proficient were created to be used in this study. In addition, a convenience sample of campus principals who served at the campus during the 2010-11 academic year and still served as the principal in the spring of 2013 were identified for survey data collection purposes. In addition to principal perspectives regarding district evaluation processes, telephone interviews were conducted with central office personnel responsible for principal evaluation processes, and an online questionnaire was completed by teachers assigned to the campuses during the 2010-2011 academic year. Table 3.1 provides the campus comparison group demographic data by percentage utilizing the Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) of Texas.

Table 3.1

Campus Sample Student Demographic Data

Campus Name	District/ Charter	% Eco. Dis.	% Afr Amer	% Mobility	% LEP	% Hispanic	% Anglo
Campus A	Charter A	87.5	19.7	18.4	8.3	77.3	2.7
Campus B	District B	86.3	20.4	42.3	12.4	59.9	13.9
Campus C	District C	87.2	27.7	24.6	18.3	64.6	5.3
Campus D	District D	86.6	7.9	22.8	20.5	68.3	20.9
Campus E	District D	87.7	14.4	20.4	11.4	67.8	14.4
Campus F	District D	87.0	13.1	16.1	20.7	66.7	18.0
Campus G	District E	87.4	0.7	18.6	9.5	85.5	13.1
Campus H	District F	86.5	11.3	22.0	51.7	72.8	12.3
Campus I	District G	87.0	4.5	25.6	8.5	78.5	16.0
Campus J	District H	87.7	80.8	33.0	9.7	18.5	0.2
Campus K	District H	86.5	79.4	36.9	12.5	16.9	1.5
Campus L	District I	86.9	23.7	16.3	43.4	67.4	6.3
Campus M	District I	87.4	38.7	24.5	24.5	49.1	8.9
Campus N	District J	87.2	17.5	17.3	43.2	74.3	6.8
Campus O	District J	86.2	41.6	26.7	33.3	47.1	6.9
Campus P	District J	86.6	10.6	18.0	46.4	78.3	8.7
Campus Q	District K	86.6	88.9	25.2	1.2	7.6	1.6
Campus R	District L	87.3	21.4	20.1	42.6	77.6	0.9
Campus S	District L	87.5	25.5	33.1	12.5	71.8	1.9
Campus T	District M	86.5	78.1	24.9	8.3	19.2	0.3
Campus U	District N	87.2	45.0	20.0	35.2	48.6	5.1
Campus V	District O	86.5	2.0	13.5	16.2	83.8	13.1

Campus Name	District/ Charter	% Eco. Dis.	% Afr Amer	% Mobility	% LEP	% Hispanic	% Anglo
Campus W	District P	86.9	42.0	28.7	39.6	53.6	1.0
Campus X	District P	87.3	23.2	27.3	52.7	73.5	1.7
Campus Y	District Q	87.4	1.4	18.1	44.3	81.6	14.2
Campus Z	District R	87.2	29.2	23.9	35.3	61.7	6.3
Campus AA	District R	87.3	26.4	20.3	42.1	67.1	4.0
Campus AB	District S	86.5	93.2	22.2	0.0	4.7	0.5
Campus AC	District T	86.6	50.9	24.7	27.6	41.0	1.1
Campus AD	Charter U	86.4	57.7	12.4	0.0	38.6	1.8
Campus AE	District V	87.4	43.7	27.3	9.7	34.0	16.2
Campus AF	District W	86.3	14.9	19.4	41.8	60.9	22.6
Campus AG	District X	87.6	50.1	43.8	24.0	39.4	6.3
Campus AH	District X	86.8	18.9	14.9	33.0	56.4	12.9
Campus AI	District Y	87.4	17.9	30.7	47.7	67.4	10.8
Campus AJ	District Y	86.9	79.5	29.6	20.5	17.2	1.3
Campus AK	District Y	87.4	17.9	30.7	47.7	67.4	10.8
Campus AL	District Z	86.4	7.8	23.7	44.6	85.2	4.9
Campus AM	District Z	87.5	20.0	17.2	34.7	67.6	10.1
Campus AN	District AA	86.3	5.3	21.8	8.2	73.4	19.6
Campus AO	District AA	86.4	70.9	20.9	0.0	24.5	2.0
Group Average		87.0	33.5	24.5	26.9	56.0	7.5

Instrumentation

Principal Evaluation Rubric

Given that a rubric to evaluate/score locally developed district principal evaluations in terms of whether they complied with the Texas Education Commissioner's rules was nonexistent, one had to be developed. The development of the *Principal Evaluation Instrument Rubric* (PEIR) was a collaborative effort of seven professional educators serving in the principal leadership division from different Regional Education Service Centers in Texas.[1] To serve on the expert panel, individuals were required to have had previous principal experience, as well as experience in performing principal evaluations at the district level. Table 3.2 provides the demographics of the expert panel for the development of the PEIR. The expert panel first reviewed the Commissioner's Rules concerning administrator appraisals in Texas and developed a 4-point rating scale (0 = *Unsatisfactory*, 1 = *Basic*, 2 = *Proficient*, and 3 = *Exceeds Expectations*) to rate the state's nine performance domains and 36 indicators for each evaluation instrument submitted to the Texas Education Agency by participating districts (TEA, 2010).

---

[1] The Regional Education Service Centers (RESCs) are quasi-governmental entities serving school districts in 20 regions statewide with the primary goal of enabling school districts within each region to operate more efficiently and economically. This is accomplished by providing a number of services to the school districts in their regions, and to a limited extent to school districts around the state (Texas Legislative Budget Board, 2012).

Table 3.2

PEIR Development Expert Panel Demographics

Panel Members	Current Position	Years Served as Campus Principal	Years of Experience as Principal Supervisor
1. Panelist 1	Region 1 Education Service Center, Edinberg	3	12
2. Panelist 2	Region 2 Education Service Center, Corpus Christi	7	15
3. Panelist 3	Region 4 Education Service Center, Houston	6	7
4. Panelist 4	Region 4 Education Service Center, Houston	6	8
5. Panelist 5	Region 13 Education Service Center, Austin	9	12
6. Panelist 6	Region 12 Education Service Center, Waco	5	10
7. Panelist 7	Region 20 Education Service Center, Midland/Odessa	6	13

To determine the descriptor for each indicator, the members of the expert panel referenced two documents to clarify statements for each descriptor, *Leading Learning Communities - Standards for What Principals Should Know and Be Able to Do* (NAESP, 2008) and the *New Leaders Principal Evaluation Rubric* (New Leaders, 2013). Expert panelists participated in both group and individual feedback sessions with the researcher to create the PEIR (see Appendix B). Three group and multiple individual sessions with panelists allowed the researcher to edit the contents of the rubric, leading to final consensus regarding the descriptors for each indicator based upon the rating scale and feasibility for use in this study.

Utilizing the PEIR, a team of central office school superintendents, assistant superintendents, and other education service center leadership staff were identified to review and score each of the participating district's principal evaluation instruments. Members of the PEIR Rater Expert Panel were selected to provide representation from large, medium, and small districts in both urban and rural settings, as well as individual experience as a principal and the facilitation of campus principal evaluations. Due to the possibility members of the PEIR Rater Expert Panel may have experienced in the districts participating in the study, all the district identifications were replaced with an evaluation identification number to eliminate potential bias. Table 3.3 summarizes the PEIR Rater Expert Panel demographics.

Table 3.3

PEIR Rater Expert Panel Demographics

Panel Members	Principal Evaluation Experience	Central Office Evaluator District Size
1. Panelist 1	Principal, Central Office Evaluator, Education Service Center Leadership Trainer	Large Urban
2. Panelist 2	Principal, Central Office Evaluator, Assistant Superintendent	Small Rural
3. Panelist 3	Principal, Central Office Evaluator, Education Service Center Leadership Trainer	Large Urban
4. Panelist 4	Principal, Central Office Evaluator, Education Service Center Leadership Trainer	Large Urban
5. Panelist 5	Principal, Central Office Evaluator, Education Service Center Leadership Trainer	Large Urban
6. Panelist 6	Principal, Central Office Evaluator , Assistant Superintendent,	Large Urban
7. Panelist 7	Principal, Central Office Evaluator, Superintendent, Education Service Center Leadership Trainer	Medium Rural

The composite scores on the PEIR rating sheet from each expert panelist-indicating adherence on state requirements for principal evaluation for the nine domains and 36 indicators identified in the Texas Education Code were downloaded from Excel into SPSS in order to calculate the inter-rater reliability. Inter-rater reliability allows for one to know how consistent the reported scores per district principal evaluation were across all of the seven raters. Given that there were more than two raters, the appropriate

analysis to determine inter-rater reliability was an interclass-correlation coefficient (ICC) (Shrout & Fleiss, 1979). The information was obtained by calculating the ICC as the percentage of agreement across all of the raters. The ICC analysis resulted in a score of .931 indicating consistency among scores assigned by the rates on the PEIR rating sheet.

Principal Evaluation, Attributes, Feedback and Perception Survey

This study also employed Condon's (2009) *Principal Evaluation Attributes, Feedback and Perception* (PEAFP) survey (see Appendix A). To develop the PAEFP survey, Condon (2009) solicited the dissertation committee for input regarding the wording of the survey questions in relation to the survey constructs. The survey questions were crafted to gather information related to principal evaluation instruments in a way not to be confusing, misleading, or biased.

The PEAFP survey (Condon, 2009) was validated by a pilot administration to a group of principals not participating in the study but sharing similar backgrounds. The pilot administration provided feedback regarding the integrity of the instrument and its fidelity to the constructs being measured. As a result of the pilot administration, Condon (2009) concluded the survey questions were clear, specific to achieve their purpose and lacked bias to mislead or sway participant opinions. Therefore, the use of peer-review question development and pilot of the survey provided researchers the necessary validity for use in future research studies.

The PEAFP questionnaire consisted of 33 items broken into four subscales: (a) the extent of various methods used to evaluate the performance level of campus principals; (b) the frequency of principal evaluation; (c) the perception of the campus principal related to the evaluation process in the areas of accountability, increased student

achievement, professional growth, incentives for improvement, adherence to policy, and fostering school climate; and (d) demographics. Participants responded by either selecting the most appropriate response on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = *Not at All*; 7 = *Very Much*), filling in the blank with the requested information or providing more in-depth answers to open-ended response items (Condon, 2009).

Student Achievement

Currently, a substantial amount of research exists linking effective principal behaviors to student achievement (Condon, 2009; Marzano et al., 2005; Stronge, Richard, & Catano, 2008; Witziers et al., 2003). In order to make a significant impact on student learning, campus principals must maximize skills in the areas of instructional and transformational leadership (Leithwood et al., 2009; Valentine & Prate, 2011). Principals who focus on best practices and high expectations for learning produce the greatest gains in achievement (Condon, 2009; Dean, 2012; Sun &Young, 2009). The process of evaluating principals provides the opportunity to improve individual practice, build human capacity, promote accountability for teacher performances, and focus on student growth in order to ensure that all the principals positively affect student performance. Therefore, principal evaluation represents a key strategy for improving schools, closing the achievement gap, and ultimately increasing student achievement. For principal evaluations to achieve these major goals, the school districts must design evaluation instruments, implementation systems, as well as policies to facilitate the entire dynamic for the evaluators. The process should be sufficiently easy for its administration, capturing the role of the school principal, and providing valid and reliable data to enhance professional development and performance evaluations (Goldring et al., 2009a).

To expand upon this knowledge, the purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between school districts' principal evaluation processes and potential impact on student achievement in the areas of reading and mathematics. Reading and mathematics achievement was measured using scores obtained from the 2011 administration of the TAKS test. The TAKS assessment is a standardized test that was administered from 2003-2011 in Texas for grades 3-11 to measure the extent to which a student has learned and is able to apply the defined knowledge and skills at each tested grade level. The TAKS test was developed and scored by Pearson, in collaboration with the Texas Education Agency (TEA, 2015). The test-development process included the use of committees, which were comprised of Texas educators. The primary purpose of each committee was to develop student-learning objectives based upon the *Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills* (TEKS) to be selected for inclusion on state assessments for each grade and subject area tested. A committee of TEA Student Assessment and Curriculum staff incorporated the selected TEKS, along with the draft objectives for each subject area, into surveys. Surveys were then sent to Texas educators for review. Based on input received from more than 27,000 survey responses, TEA developed a second draft of the objectives and TEKS. In addition, survey input during the development of draft objectives and student expectations for grades 3 through 10 ensured that the TAKS program, like the TEKS curriculum, were vertically aligned. This vertical alignment was a critical step in ensuring that the TAKS tests would become more rigorous as students moved from grade to grade.

Next, the TEA posted on the agency website the second draft of the objectives and TEKS for all tested levels to allow public input. Each draft document focused on

two central issues: first, whether the objectives included in the draft were essential to measure on a statewide assessment and, second, whether students would have received enough instruction on the TEKS included under each objective to be adequately prepared to demonstrate mastery of that objective in the spring of the school year. TEA received more than 57,000 campus survey responses. These responses, along with feedback from national experts, were utilized to finalize the TAKS objectives and aligned TEKS.

In the thorough test-development process that TEA used for the TAKS program, heavy emphasis on educator input was used to develop items that were appropriate and valid measures of the objectives and TEKS student expectations. This input included an annual educator review and revision of all proposed test items before field-testing and a second annual educator review of data and items after field-testing. In addition, each year panels of recognized experts in the fields of English language arts (ELA), mathematics, science, and social studies meet in Austin to review the content of each of the TAKS assessments to be administered that year (TEA, 2007).

Data Collection Procedures

Quantitative

The researcher gained approval from the University of Houston Clear-Lake's (UHCL) Committee for Protection of Human Subjects (CPHS) before any data was collected. Annually, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) publishes campus wide student assessment results based upon federal accountability measures required to meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). To meet AYP measures, campuses must achieve identified performance standards in the areas of reading, mathematics, attendance rate and graduation rate. If a campus fails to attain set performance measures in the same area for two consecutive years, the TEA assigns a rating of level one school improvement. Should a campus continue to miss annual AYP targets in the same measures over the next several years, a campus progresses from level one school improvement to the highest stage of school improvement, level five (TEA, 2011b).

Utilizing the TEA annual AYP report for the 2010-2011 academic year, the elementary school with the lowest reading and math scores on the 2011 TAKS assessment in the highest stage of school improvement (level 4) was identified (TEA, 2011c). This campus was selected in order to identify comparison campuses with similar demographics to analyze test performance and potential impact on student achievement. Using the TEA's 2011 Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS), a matched sample of all of the elementary schools in Texas that had a similar percentage of students who were Anglo, African American, Hispanic, economically disadvantaged, mobility rate, and limited English proficient also participated in this study (TEA, 2011d).

In 2011, all districts in Texas were required to upload to a portal on the TEA website, local instruments utilized for principal evaluation purposes. Next, The *Principal Evaluation Instrument Report* was released by the agency for public viewing (TEA, 2012a). For the purposes of this study, the 27 principal evaluation forms utilized to evaluate the 41 campus principals was downloaded for analysis regarding instrumentation content and their potential influence on student achievement.

Using the *Principal Evaluation Instrument Rubric* (PEIR) developed by a panel of Texas Regional Education Service Center experts, each evaluation instrument was rated based on its alignment to the nine performance domains and 36 descriptors required in the Texas Administrative Code. The PEIR rater expert panel that completed the scoring has comprised of central office school superintendents, assistant superintendents, and other education service center leadership staff. Members of the PEIR rater expert panel were selected to provide representation from large (over 10,000 students), medium (1,000-9,999 students), and small (under 1,000 students)(TEA, 2012a) districts in both urban and rural settings, criteria also included individual experience as a principal and in the facilitation of campus principal evaluations (see Table 3.3). PEIR rater panelists were solicited to participate in this study during a March 2013 meeting of the TEA Principal Evaluation Development Committee. Of the ten committee members interested in participating in this study, seven met the requirements to serve as a panelist.

In a combined online and face-to-face meeting, PEIR rater panelists were introduced to the purpose of the study, as well as the PEIR and scoring document (see Appendix B). As a group, the rater team collaboratively analyzed a principal evaluation instrument collected from a district not participating in the study. In addition, the

panelists independently scored two additional evaluation instruments and collaborated on

their analysis to ensure a consistent application of the PEIR coupled with the PEIR

scoring document to ensure a consistent application of rating requirements. At this point,

raters were mailed packets of the 27 district evaluation instruments and emailed

electronic score sheets to record individual analysis. Raters were given three weeks to

complete the rating analysis and return district documents and electronic score sheets to

the researcher for further analysis.

   Next, school achievement data, reported as the percentage of students within each

of the 41 identified campuses performance measure on the reading and mathematics

TAKS examination, was retrieved from the TEA website reporting student accountability

Table 3.4 displays the campus reading and mathematics scores for each campus

Table 3.4

Campus Sample TAKS Mathematics and Reading

Campus	District/Charter	Reading Score	Mathematic Score
Campus A	Charter A	91%	88%
Campus B	District B	78%	77%
Campus C	District C	78%	77%
Campus D	District D	80%	88%
Campus E	District D	95%	91%
Campus F	District D	81%	83%
Campus G	District E	94%	92%
Campus H	District F	92%	93%
Campus I	District G	71%	78%
Campus J	District H	84%	84%
Campus K	District H	91%	91%
Campus L	District I	85%	89%
Campus M	District I	74%	81%
Campus N	District J	92%	92%
Campus O	District J	81%	83%
Campus P	District J	96%	95%
Campus Q	District K	75%	81%
Campus R	District L	89%	88%
Campus S	District L	85%	85%

Campus	District/Charter	Reading Score	Mathematic Score
Campus T	District M	83%	89%
Campus U	District N	77%	76%
Campus V	District O	97%	90%
Campus W	District P	88%	82%
Campus X	District P	90%	81%
Campus Y	District Q	94%	91%
Campus Z	District R	93%	90%
Campus AA	District R	94%	90%
Campus AB	District S	79%	76%
Campus AC	District T	88%	85%
Campus AD	Charter U	96%	4%
Campus AE	District V	93%	92%
Campus AF	District W	81%	77%
Campus AG	District X	67%	71%
Campus AH	District X	89%	82%
Campus AI	District Y	86%	81%
Campus AJ	District Y	63%	69%
Campus AK	District Y	83%	89%
Campus AL	District Z	85%	74%
Campus AN	District Z	94%	86%
Campus AN	District AA	90%	85%
Campus AO	District AA	80%	90%

Upon approval from the UHCL's CPHS, campus principals from the 41 campuses in the study, who have served at the campuses since 2011, were identified to ensure principals participating in the *Principal Evaluation, Attributes, and Feedback* (PEAFP) survey were also employed on the campus as principal during the 2011 testing year. The PEAFP Survey indicators included methods used to evaluate principal performance, the frequency of evaluations, and the impact on achieving objectives such as the identification of needs for principal professional development.

The PEAFP survey was available online, via an electronic link generated for ease of access. This format required that the researcher obtain all participants' email addresses, which were accessible through publicly available information from TEA. An e-mail message was sent to potential participants to introduce the survey (see Appendix C). Research participants were informed that the purpose of the survey was to examine methods and feedback frequency of principal evaluations and potential impact on student achievement. Participants were informed that the survey would take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete based on experience from previous use of the survey (Condon, 2009), that participation was voluntary and that all responses would be kept completely confidential. Additionally, no obvious undue risks would be endured, and participants could stop participation at any time.

After the survey was available for 15 days, a participation reminder e-mail was sent to the research subjects (see Appendix D). Upon receipt of the survey responses, the data was transferred from Microsoft Excel to the quantitative research software Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for further analysis. Data collected was stored in

two locations, the researcher's computer hard drive and a memory stick. It will be

maintained in these two locations for five years following the conclusion of the research

before destruction.

Qualitative

In an attempt to explore the relationship between effective principal evaluation

processes and the potential influence on student achievement, it was necessary to collect

qualitative data from key stakeholders in the principal evaluation process. While the

PEAFP Survey retrieved principal perceptions regarding this potential relationship, the

researcher needed to collect additional data from central office administrators in charge

of the principal evaluation process, as well as teachers, to determine if an alignment in

perceptions between the three groups existed. Therefore, 10 semi-structured interviews

of 20-30 minutes in length were conducted with a purposeful sample of school district

principal evaluators representing small, medium, and large districts included in the study.

To determine districts selected for central office interviews, districts within each of the

three classifications (small, medium, and large) were assigned a number based upon the

number of districts within each of the three classifications. Utilizing a random number-

generating tool, for each classification, five large, four medium, and one small district or

charter were then selected for interview purposes.

Prior to the interview, central office participants were emailed a consent form

describing the purpose of the study, and that participation was voluntary. Participants

were informed identities would remain confidential and were provided an outline of the

interview process (see Appendix E). Interview questions focused on the districts'

purpose, processes, and instruments utilized to evaluate campus principals. In addition,

participants were asked to determine if and how the district evaluation processes
potentially effected student achievement. Appendix F contains the Interview Guide
listing the interview questions.

Interviews with teachers assigned to the campuses employed in the study were
used to obtain perspective regarding the principal evaluation process and potential impact
on student achievement. The interview was available online via an electronic link
generated for ease of access. This format required that the researcher obtain participants'
campus email addresses, which were accessible through individual district and campus
websites. An e-mail message was sent to potential participants to introduce the interview
(see Appendix G). Research participants were informed that the purpose of the interview
was to examine principal evaluation processes and potential impact on student
achievement. Participants were informed that the interview would take approximately 10-
15 minutes to complete and all responses would be kept completely confidential.
Additionally, participation was voluntary, no obvious undue risks would be endured, and
participants could stop participation at any time.

After the interview was available for 15 days, a participation reminder e-mail was
sent to the research subjects (see Appendix H). After the questionnaire was available for
two weeks, a follow-up e-mail was sent to the research subjects to participate, if they had
not already done so (see Appendix I).   A final e-mail informed non-respondents that the
questionnaire was closing on a specific date (see Appendix J). Upon receipt of the
interview responses, the data was transferred from Microsoft Excel to the quantitative
research software Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for further analysis.
Data collected was stored in two locations, the researcher's computer hard drive and a

memory stick. It will be maintained in these two locations for five years following the conclusion of the research before destruction.

Data Analysis

Quantitative

To answer research question one [*Is there a relationship between principal evaluation instruments and school-level performance on state assessments in reading and mathematics?*] an analysis was required to ascertain whether or not the of the district evaluation instrument was aligned with the classifications of the *Principal Evaluation Rubric* and student achievement scores in reading and mathematics on the 2011 TAKS assessment. First, principal evaluation instruments for each district identified to participate in the study were retrieved from TEA's *Systems Used to Evaluate Principal Performance Report* (TEA, 2010). To ensure the evaluation instruments retrieved were utilized in 2011, the researcher contacted each of the 27 districts for clarification. Two districts submitted updated evaluation instruments for use in this study. The researcher then redacted features within the evaluation instrument that could identify individual districts.

In a combined online and face-to-face meeting, PEIR rater panelists were introduced to the purpose of the study, as well as the PEIR and scoring document (see Appendix B). As a group, the rater team collaboratively analyzed a principal evaluation instrument collected from a district or charter not participating in the study. In addition, the panelists independently scored two additional evaluation instruments and collaborated on their analysis to ensure a consistent application of the PEIR coupled with the PEIR scoring document to ensure a consistent application of rating requirements. At this point,

raters were mailed packets of the 27 district or charter evaluation instruments and emailed electronic score sheets to record individual analysis. Raters were given three weeks to complete the rating analysis and return evaluation instrument documents and electronic score sheets to the researcher for further analysis.

In addition, the composite scores on the PEIR rating sheet from each expert panelist-indicating adherence on state requirements for principal evaluation for the nine domains and 36 indicators identified in the Texas Education Code were downloaded from Excel into SPSS in order to calculate the inter-rater reliability. Inter-rater reliability allows for one to know how consistent the reported scores per district principal evaluation were across all of the seven raters. Given that there were more than two raters, the appropriate analysis to determine inter-rater reliability was an interclass-correlation coefficient (ICC) (Shrout & Fleiss, 1979). The information was obtained by calculating the ICC as the percentage of agreement across all of the raters. The ICC analysis resulted in a score of .931 indicating consistency among scores assigned by the rates on the PEIR rating sheet.

Finally, school achievement data reported as the percentage of students within each of the 41 identified schools as passing the reading and mathematics TAKS examination were retrieved from the TEA website reporting student accountability. A Pearson's product moment correlation (*r*) was conducted to examine the potential relationship between principal evaluation instrument scores and school performance on the 2011 TAKS assessment in reading and mathematics. Given that all of the variables listed were measured on a ratio scale (continuous in measurement with a series of exact size intervals) and the research design was intended to assess only whether or not a

correlation existed between the variables and not whether one variable caused or affected the other, a Pearson's product moment correlations (r) statistical analysis was deemed appropriate. A significance value of .05 was used to separate the most unlikely (or extreme) 5% of the sample means from the most likely 95% of the sample means (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2009).

Research question two [*What, if any, are commonly employed processes (objectives, methods, frequency of feedback) districts utilize for principal evaluations?*] was addressed by calculating frequencies and percentages for all of the participant responses for the PEAFP Survey Items 1-24 (see Appendix A). To identify commonly employed processes districts utilize for principal evaluations data, the PAEFP Survey collected information regarding: (a) district and principal demographics, (b) identification of evaluation methods, (c) frequency of evaluative processes, (d) perceived objectives on the principal evaluation, and (e) emphasis on student achievement within the scoring of the evaluation process. Principals were asked to identify the number of years as principal on their current campus, total years of service as a campus principal, campus grade level structure/span, and number of campuses within the district.

The participants were also asked to express the amount of emphasis placed by the district in the evaluation processes regarding the use of items such as: (a) checklist/rating system, (b) supervisor observation, (c) survey data from key stakeholders, (d) portfolio developments, and (e) several other evaluative methods. Principals then identified the frequency of the evaluation process as either monthly, quarterly, semi-annually, annually, or other time spans presented in the survey. Next, principals were asked to rate, using a scale of one to seven with seven representing very much, 11 statements related to

potential principal outcomes during the evaluation process. These statements included items, such as satisfy accountability requirements, provide principals professional growth, or document sub-standard principal performance. Finally, principals identified the extent to which districts incorporated student achievement into the final principal evaluation rating. Choices included none, 1-10%, 11-20%, 21-30%, 31-40%, 41-50%, and more than 50%.

Qualitative

To address research question three, four, and five, [*How do campus principals perceive the principal evaluation process and potential effect on student achievement? How do district principal evaluators perceive the principal evaluation process and potential effect on student achievement? What, if any, are the principal behaviors teachers perceive as having a positive impact on student achievement?*], qualitative data were utilized from responses to open-ended survey items (25-28) from campus principals, semi-structured interviews with district evaluators responsible for conducting principal evaluations, and online questionnaires with teachers employed at the 41 campuses during the 2010-2011 school year. This data assisted the researcher in determining how campus principals, district evaluators, and teachers perceive the principal evaluation process and the potential effect on student achievement. Qualitative data from the principal survey, as well as district evaluator interviews and teacher on-line questionnaires were analyzed using an inductive coding process. According to Miles and Huberman, (1994), "Codes are tags or labels for assigning units of meaning to the descriptive or inferential information compiled during a study. Codes were usually attached to 'chunks' of varying size – words, phrases, sentences or whole paragraphs" (p. 54). As themes emerged, they

were organized into categories to develop a summary of findings of the participants'

perceptions. Combining this information with quantitative findings provided the

researcher an in-depth understanding of principal perceptions related to evaluation

processes and potential impact on student achievement.

To provide validity to the interview process, member checking occurred as the

researcher restated comments provided by the district evaluator personnel to ensure

interpretations reflected the perceptions of the interviewee. Finally, a triangulation of the

multiple sources of data occurred through the merging of findings from themes identified

from principal survey, district evaluator interviews, and teacher interviews.

Privacy and Ethical Considerations

The researcher gained approval from UHCL's CPHS before any data were

collected. A survey cover letter containing a link to the PEAFP Survey was e-mailed to

all perspective principals stating the purpose of the study, participation in the study was

voluntary, and participants were assured that identities would remain confidential (sees

Appendix C). Participation in the survey indicated individual consent to participate in the

study. At all times, the data was secured on the researcher's hard drive and pin drive

stored in the researcher's office. Once the study has been completed, the researcher will

maintain the data for five years, which is the required time set forth by the CPHS. Once

the deadline has passed, the researcher will destroy all data files.

Ten district evaluators, purposefully selected from small, medium, and large

districts participating in the study, responsible for conducting principal evaluations were

solicited to participate in telephone interviews. Each interview lasted approximately 20-

30 minutes and were semi-structured in format. Interview questions focused on the

district's purpose, processes, and instruments utilized to evaluate campus principals (see Appendix E). In addition, participants were asked to determine if and how the district evaluation processes potentially influences student achievement.

Prior to the interview, district evaluator participants were emailed a consent form describing the purpose of the study, and that participation is voluntary (see Appendix F). Participants were informed their identity will remain confidential and provided an outline of the interview process. Sessions were audiotaped and transcribed by the researcher. To enhance the validity of the data collected during the interview process, member-checking processes such as restating and summarizing data for further clarification occurred.

The teacher questionnaires were conducted in an online format (see Appendix G). This format required that the researcher obtain participants' email addresses, which were accessible through publicly available information on the school districts' and campus websites. An e-mail message was sent to potential participants to provide an introduction to the questionnaire, with a link to the survey instrument included in the message (see Appendix H). The link then lead the participants directly the first page of the online survey.

After the questionnaire was available for two weeks, a follow-up e-mail was sent to the research subjects to participate, if they had not already done so (see Appendix I). A final e-mail informed non-respondents that the questionnaire was closing on a specific date (see Appendix J). The survey then closed to participants when the window had expired. The qualitative data required an inductive coding process for analysis. Data collected was stored in two locations: the researcher's computer hard drive and on a memory stick. The researcher will keep the data for five years before destroying it.

Research Design Limitations

There were several limitations to this study. First, a failure to use a random sampling technique for participating districts significantly limited the ability to make broader generalizations from the results. Therefore, the external validity of the study was lowered, as findings cannot be applied to larger samples of districts or principals. Given that the potential participants identified for this study span multiple districts, controls for consistent evaluation processes were difficult, thus limiting internal validity. Thus, the study did not account for the fidelity in implementing principal evaluation processes across multiple districts.

In addition, the study did not control for the competency and consistency of the individuals responsible for conducting the evaluations of campus principals among the districts identified for participation. Given the evaluation instruments utilized by the 27 district were locally developed, there was no consistent (if any) training for the central office evaluators and principals or standard requirements for evaluation processes. Furthermore, perceptions of individual participants may have varied based upon experience and size of the district. Larger districts may have utilized more than one individual in the evaluation process, such as assistant superintendents, directors, or coordinators. Therefore, the potential for variations in observations and scoring may have occurred in the scoring of principal performance. In smaller districts, the superintendent usually conducts evaluations, which provides consistency in the evaluation process. Given the majority of data collected regarding the implementation of the principal evaluation derived from larger districts, had smaller districts had greater representation, perceptions may have resulted in different outcomes and conclusions. Also, the study did

not control for the level of expertise of principal evaluators in conducting the process with fidelity. Principal evaluators may have been trained at different times and by different trainers resulting in inconsistent implementation of processes. Finally, the period of the study resulted in several limitations. Given the data collected regarding student achievement derived from assessment scores in 2010-2011, identifying participants for qualitative analysis in 2014 was difficult. The decision to utilize 2011 achievement data resulted from the state of Texas' transition to a new assessment administered in 2013. Student achievement data for the new assessment was not available when this study was initiated.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between school

districts' principal evaluation instruments and processes, and potential impact on student

achievement in the areas of reading and mathematics. This chapter presents the analysis

of the quantitative data derived from the PEAFP Survey regarding the perception of

principals and the qualitative data from the interviews of district principal evaluators and

teachers regarding the districts' principal evaluation process and potential influence on

student achievement. Quantitative data was analyzed using descriptive statistics and

Pearson's product moment correlations, while an inductive coding process was used to

analyze the qualitative data. This chapter initially addresses a demographic description

of the participants, followed by analysis for each of the five research questions. It

concludes with a summary of findings.

Participant Demographics

Annually, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) publishes campus wide student

assessment results based upon federal accountability measures required to meet Adequate

Yearly Progress (AYP). To meet AYP measures, campuses must achieve identified

performance standards in the areas of reading, mathematics, attendance rate, and

graduation rate. If a campus fails to attain set performance measures in the same area for

two consecutive years, the TEA assigns a rating of level one school improvement.

Should a campus continue to miss annual AYP targets in the same measures over the next

several years, a campus progresses from level one school improvement to level five, the

highest stage of school improvement (TEA, 2011b). Utilizing the TEA annual AYP

report for the 2010-2011 academic year, the elementary school with the lowest reading

and math scores on the 2011 TAKS assessment in the highest stage of school

improvement was identified as the primary investigative campus for this study.

Employing the TEA Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) Campus

Comparison Report, elementary schools (n = 41) from multiple school districts and

charter schools (n = 27) across Texas were selected for this study that matched the

primary investigative campus regarding the following demographics: percentage of

students who are Anglo, African American, and Hispanic; Economically Disadvantaged,

Limited English Proficient; and mobility rates. The final sample was comprised of 16

principal participants from the 41 campuses in the 27 different districts who served as

principals at the selected campus during the 2010-2011 academic year and remained in

the principal position through 2014. Based upon demographic responses by the 16

principal responses to the *Principal Evaluation Attributes, Feedback and Perception*

(PEAFP) survey, the selected sample provided a wide range in school structures, district

size, principal longevity in a single position, as well as total years of principal experience.

Table 4.1 displays the school structure, Table 4.2 identifies the number of campuses per

district or charter, and Table 4.3 provides the number of years serving as the campus

principal at the current school and total number of years of principal experience.

Table 4.1

School Structure per District or Charter School

School Structure	Frequency (*n*)	Percentage (%)
K-4	5	31.3
K-5	9	56.3
K-6	1	6.3
2-5	1	6.3

Table 4.2

Number of campuses in the district or charter

	Frequency (*n*)	Percentage (%)
Number of Campuses in the District or Charter		
1	1	6.3
2	1	6.3
3	1	6.3
5	1	6.3
14	1	6.3
15	2	12.5
19	3	18.8
22	1	6.3
36	1	6.3
66	1	6.3
70	1	6.3
72	1	6.3
73	1	6.3

Table 4.3

Years at Current School and as a Campus Principal

	N	Mean	Std. Dev.
1. Years at Current School	16	5.50	4.818
2. Years as a Principal	16	9.60	4.706

The school structures in which the principals were employed indicate that the majority of the principals oversee a traditional K-5 school structure ($n = 9$, 56.3%). The next most frequent structure was K-4 ($n = 5$, 31.3%). The majority of participants were employed in districts that had 15 or more campuses ($n = 11$, 68.8%).

Ten semi-structured telephone interviews captured the perspective of district evaluators regarding the districts' principal evaluation processes and potential influence on student achievement. Semi- structure interviews allow for a prescribed set of open-ended questions, as well as the freedom for the conversation to vary based upon participant responses (Miles & Gilbert, 2005). Given the various school structures employed in this study, it was necessary to ensure the district evaluator interviews were conducted with representatives from small (under 1,000 students), medium (1,000- 9,999 students), and large (over 10,000 students) districts (TEA, 2012a). Utilizing the 2010-2011 Snapshot Detail Search located on the TEA website, the student enrollment was recorded for the 27 districts and charter schools (TEA, 2012b). Table 4.4 reports the student enrollment for the districts and charters in this study and their size classification.

Table 4.4

School District and Charter Schools Student Enrollment and Size Classification

Name of District or Charter	Student Enrollment 2010-2011	Size Classification
Charter A	1,115	Medium
District B	66,364	Large
District C	22,016	Large
District D	12,671	Large
District E	18,339	Large
District F	55,294	Large
District G	315	Small
District H	156,784	Large
District I	12,880	Large
District J	57,614	Large
District K	6,253	Medium
District L	24,535	Large
District M	68,710	Large
District N	8,482	Medium
District O	4,839	Medium
District P	62,945	Large
District Q	8,617	Medium
District R	21,557	Large
District S	203,294	Large
District T	45,092	Large
Charter U	205	Small
District V	15,240	Large
District W	6,464	Medium
District X	64,380	Large
District Y	81,511	Large
District Z	10,673	Large
District AA	14,043	Large

The majority of the districts and charter schools in this study are classified as large ($n = 19$, 70.3%). The next most frequent classification was medium ($n = 6$, 22.2%), with the lowest classification as small ($n = 2$, 0.07%). To determine districts or charters selected for evaluator interviews, each district or charter within the three classifications were assigned a number based upon the range in the classification. Utilizing a random number-generating tool, districts or charters were selected for interview purposes. Table 4.5 identifies the districts or charters selected for interviews, the student enrollment in 2010-2011, and size classification.

Table 4.5

Districts Selected for District Evaluator Interviews, Student Enrollment, and Size Classification

Name of District	Student Enrollment 2010-2011	Size Classification
District B	66,364	Large
District D	12,671	Large
District E	18,339	Large
District G	315	Small
District K	6,253	Medium
District L	24,553	Large
District N	8,482	Medium
District O	4,839	Medium
District Q	8,617	Medium
District Z	10,673	Large

The selection of districts for district evaluator interviews regarding the districts' principal evaluation process and potential influence on student achievement comprised mostly of large districts ($n = 5$, 50.0%) followed by medium sized districts ($n = 4$, 40.0%) and small districts ($n = 1$, 10.0%).

To collect teacher perspectives regarding the principal evaluation process and potential influence on student achievement, an online questionnaire was conducted with teachers who were assigned to the campuses during the 2010-2011 school year. Teacher emails were collected via the campus website and teachers were emailed a description of the purpose of the study and a link to participate in the online interview. A total of 917 emails were distributed to potential respondents. Thirty-six percent ($n = 333$) of the teachers responded to the online questionnaires. Of those responding, 46.8% ($n = 156$) were disqualified due to the requirement that they were to have been a teacher at the campus in 2010-2011. Of the remaining 177 participants who qualified for the study, approximately 40% ($n = 72$) of the teachers completed the online questionnaire.

Research Question One

The data collected from this mixed methods study initially addressed the following research question (RQ #1): *Is there a relationship between the principal evaluation instruments and school level performance on state assessments in reading and mathematics?* To answer this question, an analysis was conducted of district evaluation cumulative average scores assigned by the PEIR raters and categorization aligned to classifications of the PEIR based upon potential points for each classification: (a) Unsatisfactory (0-27 points), (b) Basic (28-54 points), (c) Proficient (55-81 points), and (d) Exceeds Expectation (56-108 points). In addition, student performance on the 2011

TAKS assessments in reading and mathematics was retrieved from the TEA website.

Table 4.6 displays each district cumulative average score from the PEIR raters and

assigned Principal Evaluation Instrument Classification. District names are masked to

protect their identity.

Table 4.6

Principal Evaluation Instrument Cumulative Average Score and Assigned Classification

Name of District or Charter	Cumulative Average Score	Principal Evaluation Instrument Classification Rating
Charter A	1	Unsatisfactory
District B	30	Basic
District C	29	Basic
District D	21	Unsatisfactory
District E	32	Basic
District F	1	Unsatisfactory
District G	1	Unsatisfactory
District H	0	Unsatisfactory
District I	57	Proficient
District J	43	Basic
District K	40	Basic
District L	37	Basic
District M	39	Basic
District N	30	Basic
District O	19	Unsatisfactory
District P	45	Basic
District Q	1	Unsatisfactory
District R	36	Basic
District S	48	Basic
District T	11	Unsatisfactory
Charter U	0	Unsatisfactory
District V	28	Basic
District W	36	Basic
District X	36	Basic
District Y	64	Proficient
District Z	32	Basic
District AA	1	Unsatisfactory

Regarding the districts' principal evaluation instruments classification ratings, the

majority of districts are classified as *Basic* ($n = 15$, 55.5%). The next largest classification

was *Unsatisfactory* ($n = 10$, 37.0%), followed by two campuses receiving a rating of

Proficient ($n = 2$, 0.07%), and none of the districts or charter schools received a rating of

Exceeds Expectation. Table 4.7 combines this data with campus student performance in

Reading and Mathematics on the 2011 TAKS assessments to display each campus'

Principal Evaluation Instrument Classification and student assessment performance.

Table 4.7

Principal Evaluation Instrument Classification Rating and Student Achievement on 2011 Reading and Mathematics TAKS Assessments

Campus	Principal Evaluation Instrument Classification Rating	Reading Score	Mathematic Score
Campus A	Unsatisfactory	91%	88%
Campus B	Basic	78%	77%
Campus C	Basic	78%	77%
Campus D	Unsatisfactory	80%	88%
Campus E	Unsatisfactory	95%	91%
Campus F	Unsatisfactory	81%	83%
Campus G	Basic	94%	92%
Campus H	Unsatisfactory	92%	93%
Campus I	Unsatisfactory	71%	78%
Campus J	Unsatisfactory	84%	84%
Campus K	Unsatisfactory	91%	91%
Campus L	Proficient	85%	89%
Campus M	Proficient	74%	81%
Campus N	Basic	92%	92%
Campus O	Basic	81%	83%
Campus P	Basic	96%	95%
Campus Q	Basic	75%	81%
Campus R	Basic	89%	88%

Campus	Principal Evaluation Instrument Classification Rating	Reading Score	Mathematic Score
Campus S	Basic	85%	85%
Campus T	Basic	83%	89%
Campus U	Basic	77%	76%
Campus V	Unsatisfactory	97%	90%
Campus W	Unsatisfactory	80%	90%
Campus X	Basic	88%	82%
Campus Y	Basic	90%	81%
Campus Z	Unsatisfactory	94%	91%
Campus AA	Basic	93%	90%
Campus AB	Basic	94%	90%
Campus AC	Basic	79%	76%
Campus AD	Unsatisfactory	88%	85%
Campus AE	Unsatisfactory	96%	4%
Campus AF	Basic	93%	92%
Campus AG	Basic	81%	77%
Campus AH	Basic	67%	71%
Campus AI	Basic	89%	82%
Campus AJ	Proficient	86%	81%
Campus AK	Proficient	63%	69%
Campus AL	Proficient	83%	89%
Campus AM	Unsatisfactory	85%	74%

Campus	Principal Evaluation Instrument Classification Rating	Reading Score	Mathematic Score
Campus AN	Unsatisfactory	94%	86%
Campus AO	Basic	90%	85%

In comparison to campus analysis of district principal evaluation instrument classification ratings, the results were similar with the majority of the campuses in this study located in districts receiving a basic rating ($n = 21$, 51.2%), followed by districts awarded an unsatisfactory rating ($n = 15$, 36.5%), with the least number of campuses in districts receiving a proficient rating ($n = 5$, 12.2%).

Data collected from Table 4.7 were analyzed by conducting a Pearson's product moment correlation (r) to assess whether a relationship existed between district evaluation instrument scores assigned by the PEIR rating team and campus passing rates on state assessments in reading and mathematics Data collected from Table 4.7 was analyzed by conducting a Pearson's product moment correlation to assess whether a relationship existed between student performance on state assessments in reading and mathematics scores and district evaluation instrument scores assigned by the PEIR rating team. A $p<.05$ value was used to determine if a statistically positive relationship existed. Table 4.8 describes the relationship between district reading scores and principal evaluation instrument rating, while table 4.9 describes the relationship with mathematics scores.

Table 4.8

Correlations of Reading Scores and Principal Evaluation Instrument Ratings

	Reading Scores	Principal Evaluation Instrument Classification Rating
Pearson Correlation	1	-.271
Sig. (2-tailed)		.115
N	35	35

Table 4.9

Correlations of Mathematic Scores and Principal Evaluation Instrument Ratings

	Math Scores	Principal Evaluation Instrument Classification Rating
Pearson Correlation	1	-.212
Sig. (2-tailed)		.221
N	35	35

Findings suggested that a statistically significant relationship does not exist between district principal evaluation instrument scores and student reading, $r = -.271$, $p = .115$, and mathematics scores, $r = -2.12$, $p = .221$. Thus, a district's rating on the PEIR had nothing to do with their students' achievement in reading and mathematics.

Research Question Two

Data collected from the PEAFP Survey addressed Research Question #2: *What are the various methods used, district objectives, and frequency of feedback utilized by*

districts to evaluate campus principals? The purpose of the survey was to: (a) identify

various methods used to evaluate the performance level of campus principals; (b)

determine the frequency of principal evaluation; and (c) obtain the perception of the

campus principal related to the evaluation process in the areas of accountability,

increased student achievement, professional growth, incentives for improvement,

adherence to policy, and fostering school climate. Data was summarized by calculating

percentages and frequencies based upon survey responses. Table 4.10 displays the

frequency data reported for methods districts use to evaluate campus principals, while

Table 4.11 displays a collapsed version of Table 4.10 combining the *Much/Very Mu*ch

and *Little/Not at All* results for analysis purposes.

Table 4.10

Principal Responses to the Type of Principal Evaluation Methods Used To Rate Performance (%)

Evaluation Methods	Not At All			Neutral			Very Much
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Narrative	12.5	6.3	0.0	18.8	12.5	18.8	18.8
	($n = 2$)	($n = 3$)	($n = 0$)	($n = 3$)	($n = 2$)	($n = 3$)	($n = 3$)
2. Portfolio	25.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	6.3	12.5	6.3
	($n = 4$)	($n = 4$)	($n = 0$)	($n = 4$)	($n = 1$)	($n = 2$)	($n = 1$)
3. Checklist/Rating	0.0	6.3	0.0	6.3	12.5	18.8	56.3
	($n = 0$)	($n = 1$)	($n = 0$)	($n = 1$)	($n = 2$)	($n = 3$)	($n = 9$)
4. Supervisor Observations	18.8	0.0	0.0	6.3	18.8	25.0	31.3
	($n = 3$)	($n = 0$)	($n = 0$)	($n = 1$)	($n = 3$)	($n = 4$)	($n = 5$)
5. Narrative by Supervisor	12.5	6.3	6.3	18.8	25.0	25.0	6.3
	($n = 2$)	($n = 1$)	($n = 1$)	($n = 3$)	($n = 4$)	($n = 4$)	($n = 1$)
6. Data Based	12.5	0.0	6.3	6.3	0.0	31.3	43.8
	($n = 2$)	($n = 0$)	($n = 1$)	($n = 1$)	($n = 0$)	($n = 5$)	($n = 7$)
7. Survey Data	31.3	6.3	6.3	18.8	12.5	12.5	12.5
	($n = 5$)	($n = 1$)	($n =1$)	($n = 3$)	($n = 2$)	($n = 2$)	($n = 2$)
8. Peer Review	75.0	0.0	6.3	6.3	12.5	0.0	0.0
	($n = 12$)	($n = 0$)	($n = 1$)	($n = 1$)	($n = 2$)	($n = 0$)	($n = 0$)
9. Anecdotal Evidence	43.8	0.0	12.5	18.8	12.5	6.3	6.3
	($n = 7$)	($n = 0$)	($n = 2$)	($n = 3$)	($n = 2$)	($n = 1$)	($n = 1$)
10. Perception Feedback	56.3	0.0	6.3	12.5	6.3	6.3	12.5
	($n = 9$)	($n = 0$)	($n = 1$)	($n = 2$)	($n = 1$)	($n = 1$)	($n = 2$)

Table 4.11

Principal Responses to the Type of Principal Evaluation Methods Used To Rate Performance (%) Collapsed Data

Evaluation Method	Little/Not at All	Neutral	Much/Very Much
1. Narrative	31.3	18.8	50.0
	(*n* = 5)	(*n* = 3)	(*n* = 8)
2. Portfolio	50	25.0	25.1
	(*n* = 8)	(*n* = 4)	(*n* = 4)
3. Checklist/Rating	6.3	6.3	87.5
	(*n* = 1)	(*n* = 1)	(*n* = 14)
4. Supervisor Observations	18.8	6.3	75.1
	(*n* = 3)	(*n* = 1)	(*n* = 12)
5. Narrative by Supervisor	25.1	18.8	56.3
	(*n* = 4)	(*n* = 3)	(*n* = 9)
6. Data Based	18.8	6.3	75.1
	(*n* = 3)	(*n* = 1)	(*n* = 12)
7. Survey Data	43.8	18.8	37.5
	(*n* = 7)	(*n* = 3)	(*n* = 6)
8. Peer review	81.3	6.3	12.5
	(*n* = 13)	(*n* = 1)	(*n* = 2)
9. Anecdotal Evidence	56.3	18.8	25.1
	(*n* = 9)	(*n* = 3)	(*n* = 4)
10. Perception Feedback	62.6	12.5	25.1
	(*n* =10)	(*n* = 2)	(*n* = 4)

By collapsing the responses, the majority (*Much/Very Much)* indicated that districts implemented some type of checklist/rating system for principal evaluation purposes (*n* = 14, 87.5%). In addition to district checklists for principal evaluation purposes, respondents also indicated the use of supervisor observations (*n* = 12, 75.1%) and data based analysis (*n* = 12, 75.1%) to determine performance summaries. The

collapsed data also revealed least used evaluation methods (*Little/Not at ALL)* included

peer reviews (*n* = 13, 81.3%), perception feedback from stakeholders (*n* = 10, 62.6%),

and the use of anecdotal evidence (*n* = 9, 56.3%).

In addition to the methods utilized to conduct principal evaluations, the survey

also collected evidence regarding the objectives of the principal evaluation process.

Table 4.12 identifies the principals' perceptions regarding the objective of the evaluation

process, with Table 4.13 representing collapsed data ranging from the *Much/Very Much*

and *Little/Not at All* responses.

Table 4.12

Principal Perceptions Regarding the Objectives of District Principal Evaluation Processes Used To Rate Performance (%)

Evaluation Objectives	Not At All			Neutral			Very Much
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Satisfy Requirements	0.0 (*n* = 0)	0.0 (*n* = 0)	0.0 (*n* = 0)	18.8 (*n* = 3)	18.8 (*n* = 3)	25.0 (*n* = 4)	37.5 (*n* = 6)
2. Increase Assessment Scores	12.5 (*n* = 2)	0.0 (*n* = 0)	0.0 (*n* = 0)	6.3 (*n* = 1)	12.5 (*n* = 2)	50.0 (*n* = 8)	18.8 (*n* = 3)
3. Provide Principal Professional Growth	12.5 (*n* = 2)	6.3 (*n* = 1)	0.0 (*n* = 0)	6.3 (*n* = 1)	31.3 (*n* = 5)	18.8 (*n* = 3)	25.0 (*n* = 4)
4. Document Sub-standard Performance	6.3 (*n* =1)	0.0 (*n* = 0)	6.3 (*n* =1)	6.3 (*n* = 1)	18.8 (*n* = 3)	43.8 (*n* = 7)	18.8 (*n* = 3)
5. Identify Areas of Professional Growth	12.5 (*n* = 2)	0.0 (*n* = 0)	18.8 (*n* = 3)	18.8 (*n* = 3)	6.3 (*n* = 1)	25.0 (*n* = 4)	18.8 (*n* = 3)
6. Incentives for Performance Improvement	25.0 (*n* = 4)	0.0 (*n* = 0)	6.3 (*n* = 1)	18.8 (*n* = 3)	12.5 (*n* = 2)	18.8 (*n* = 3)	18.8 (*n* = 3)

7. Reward Exemplary Performance	31.3 (*n* = 5)	6.3 (*n* = 3)	12.5 (*n* = 2)	18.8 (*n* = 3)	0.0 (*n* = 0)	18.8 (*n* = 3)	12.5 (*n* = 2)
8. Adhere to Policy and Procedures	6.3 (*n* = 1)	0.0 (*n* = 0)	0.0 (*n* = 0)	31.3 (*n* = 5)	12.5 (*n* = 2)	18.8 (*n* = 3)	31.3 (*n* = 5)
9. Support the Instructional Program	6.3 (*n* = 1)	0.0 (*n* = 0)	0.0 (*n* = 0)	12.5 (*n* = 2)	12.5 (*n* = 2)	37.5 (*n* = 6)	31.3 (*n* = 5)
10. Improve Pupil Achievement	6.3 (*n* = 1)	0.0 (*n* = 0)	0.0 (*n* = 0)	12.5 (*n* = 2)	25.0 (*n* = 4)	31.3 (*n* = 5)	25.0 (*n* = 4)
11. Foster Positive School Climate	6.3 (*n* = 1)	0.0 (*n* = 0)	0.0 (*n* = 0)	25.0 (*n* = 4)	18.8 (*n* = 3)	25.0 (*n* = 4)	25.0 (*n* = 4)

Table 4.13

Principal Perceptions Regarding District Principal Evaluation Objectives Used To Rate Performance (%) Collapsed Data

Evaluation Objectives	Little/Not At All	Neutral	Much/Very Much
1. Satisfy Requirements	0.0 ($n = 0$)	18.8 ($n = 3$)	81.3 ($n = 13$)
2. Increase Assessment Scores	12.5 ($n = 2$)	6.3 ($n = 1$)	81.3 ($n = 13$)
3. Provide Principal Professional Growth	18.8 ($n = 3$)	6.3 ($n = 1$)	76.1 ($n = 12$)
4. Document Sub-standard Performance	12.6 ($n = 2$)	6.3 ($n = 1$)	81.3 ($n = 13$)
5. Identify Areas of Professional Growth	31.3 ($n = 5$)	18.8 ($n = 3$)	50.1 ($n = 8$)
6. Incentives for Performance Improvement	31.3 ($n = 5$)	18.8 ($n = 3$)	50.1 ($n = 8$)
7. Reward Exemplary Performance	50.1 ($n = 10$)	18.8 ($n = 3$)	31.3 ($n = 5$)
8. Adhere to Policy and Procedures	6.3 ($n = 1$)	31.3 ($n = 5$)	62.6 ($n = 10$)
9. Support the instructional program	6.3 ($n = 1$)	12.5 ($n = 2$)	81.3 ($n = 13$)
10. Improve Pupil Achievement	6.3 ($n = 1$)	12.5 ($n = 2$)	81.3 ($n = 13$)
11. Foster Positive School Climate	6.3 ($n = 1$)	25.0 ($n = 4$)	68.8 ($n = 11$)

The collapsed data reveals the five primary objectives (*Much/Very Much*)

principals perceived districts attempted to achieve in the evaluation process included: (a)

satisfying state evaluation requirements, (b) increasing state test scores, (c) documenting substandard performance on the part of the principal, (d) supporting the instructional program and (e) improve overall student achievement (all five: $n = 13$, 81.3%). The least probable objectives (*Little/Not At ALL*) for principal evaluation processes encompassed: (a) rewarding exemplary principal performance ($n = 10$, 62.5%), (b) identifying areas of professional growth ($n = 5$, 31.3%), and (c) providing incentive for improvement in performance ($n = 5$, 31.3 %.).

Finally, the PEAFP Survey collected data regarding the frequency of principal evaluations related to state requirements, as well as the position of the person responsible for conducting the district's principal evaluation process. Results indicate all of the districts and charters complied with minimum state requirements of an annual evaluation of school principals ($n = 16$, 100%). Table 4.14 identifies the titles of individuals responsible for completing principal evaluations in the district.

Table 4.14

Individuals Responsible for Principal Evaluations

Title Responsible for Principal Evaluations	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
1. Superintendent	1	6.3
2. Deputy Superintendent	4	25.0
3. Area Superintendent	1	6.3
4. Assistant Superintendent	3	18.8
5. Executive Director	5	31.3
6. Other Individuals	2	12.5

The findings indicated the majority of individuals conducting the principal evaluation process include individuals other than the Superintendent. Ninety-four percent ($n = 15$) of the participants reported the evaluation process was completed by a supervisor other than the superintendent to include either a deputy superintendent ($n = 4$, 25.0%), area superintendent ($n = 1$, 6.3%), assistant superintendent ($n = 3$, 18.8 %), or an area executive director ($n = 5$, 31.3%).

Quantitative Summary

For the first research question, no significant relationship was found between the district evaluation instrument and student achievement on reading and mathematics scores. Findings suggest principal evaluation instruments, developed locally, do not reflect the minimum state requirements to have a potential effect on student achievement. Regarding the second research question, principals indicated the most widely used

instrument to measure principal performance consisted of a checklist of requirements, coupled with supervisor observations, and multiple sources of data to determine principal performance. Principals indicated the primary purpose of the evaluation process was to adhere to state requirements related to annual principal evaluations, increase student test scores and overall student achievement, document substandard performance, and support various instructional programs. Analysis of data indicates the superintendent, assistant superintendent, or other district level evaluators conducted the majority of principal evaluations.

Qualitative Results

Research Questions Three, Four and Five

A qualitative analysis was conducted of the following data obtained: the open-ended questions on the *Principal Evaluation, Attributes, and Feedback Perception* survey derived from the 13 campus principals who completed the open-ended survey, interviews with a purposeful sample of 10 district principal evaluators responsible for conducting principal evaluation, and data obtained from 72 teacher responses to open-ended questions on the *Teacher Perception of Principal Behaviors Impact Student Achievement Survey.* This analysis addressed the third, fourth, and fifth research questions: *How do campus principals perceive the principal evaluation process and potential effect on student achievement?* (RQ #3); *How do district principal evaluators perceive the principal evaluation process and potential effect on student achievement?* (RQ #4); and *What, if any, are the principal behaviors teachers perceive as having a positive impact on student achievement?* (RQ #5).

As the results gathered similar themes and categories for perceptions regarding the principal evaluation process and potential effect on student achievement, research questions three, four, and five are combined in this section. Quotes from each of the groups of participants provide insight as to how their perceptions answer the research questions. The analysis identified four distinct themes: (a) effect on student achievement, (b) measuring and improving principal performance, (c) rating principal performance, and (d) improvements to the evaluations process. The emergent themes are provided below followed by a sample of participant comments. Table 4.15 outlines the identified themes, subthemes, and categories based upon analysis of district evaluator, teacher, and principal responses.

Table 4.15

Themes, Subthemes, and Categories

Effect on Student Achievement
   Leadership capacity.
      Annual personal professional goals.
         Identification of strengths and weaknesses.
            District evaluator participant perceptions.
            Teacher participant perceptions.
            Principal participant perceptions.
         Establishing personal professional goals.
            District evaluator participant perceptions.
            Teacher participant perceptions.
            Principal participant perceptions.
      Improving instructional strategies.
         Training to Enhance Principal Coaching Skills.
            District evaluator participant perceptions.
            Teacher participant perceptions.
         Effective Feedback Practices.
            District evaluator participant perceptions.
            Teacher participant perceptions.
            Principal participant perceptions.
   Culture and climate of the school.
      District evaluator participant perceptions.
      Teacher participant perceptions.
Measuring and improving principal performance.
   Multiple sources of data.
      District evaluator participant perceptions.
      Teacher participant perceptions.
      Principal participant perceptions.
   Professional development.
      District evaluator participant perceptions.
      Teacher participant perceptions.
      Principal participant perceptions.
Rating principal performance.
   Rating instruments.
      District evaluator participant perceptions.
      Principal participant perceptions.
   Documentation of substandard performance.
      District evaluator participant perceptions.
      Principal Participant Perceptions.
Improvements to the evaluation process.
      District evaluator participant perceptions.
      Teacher participant perceptions.
      Campus morale and support of instruction.
      Inclusion of multiple stakeholders.
      Principal participant perceptions.

Effect on student achievement. For each group (district evaluators, teachers, and principals) the responses to the, interview questions, questionnaires, and open-ended survey questions reveal their perceptions regarding the principal evaluation process and potential effect on student achievement. Analysis of eight district evaluators (80.0%), 38 teacher participants (55.2%), and seven principals' (58%) responses indicated each participant group expressed the evaluation of the principal's behaviors resulted in increased student achievement. Participant responses regarding the principal evaluation process and potential effect on student achievement can be categorized into two subthemes. These include: (a) leadership capacity, and (b) culture and climate of the school.

Leadership capacity. Responses from district evaluators, teachers, and principals indicated the principal evaluation process effects student achievement as a result of providing opportunities for campus principals to enhance their leadership capacity. Nine of the 10 district evaluator participants indicated the primary purpose of the evaluation process is to improve the leadership capacity of the campus principal, as best described in District Evaluator 7's reflection: "The primary purpose for conducting principal evaluations in our district is to improve the capacity of the principal and the effectiveness in their role as the instructional leader of that campus." In terms of enhancing principal leadership capacity and effects on student achievement, all participant groups indicated the significance of goal setting processes within the principal evaluation process. Participants also described the importance of identifying strengths and weakness of the campus principal and elaborated on the processes utilized by the district to establish and monitor performance goals. In addition, all groups provided perceptions related to improving instructional strategies necessary to effect student achievement through the

development of principal coaching skills and providing effective feedback related to principal performance. Therefore, participant responses regarding the importance of building the leadership capacity of the campus principal has been categorized into two different sub-categories. Those include (a) annual personal professional goals, and (b) improving instructional strategies.

Annual personal professional goals. In order to develop principal priorities for the academic year, all participant groups agreed the use of setting personal performance goals, within the evaluation process, aides in the development of the leadership capacity of the campus principal. Participant groups discussed the importance of identifying individual strengths and weaknesses of the campus principal as necessary to identify areas of improvement and growth. In addition, district evaluators indicated the collaborative nature of establishing and monitoring personal performance goals led to enhanced leadership capacity of the campus principal. Perceptions regarding goal setting strategies are grouped into two specific processes. These processes included: (a) identification of principal strengths and weaknesses, and (b) establishing personal professional goals. Analysis of participant perceptions regarding the identification of principal strengths and weaknesses, along with perceptions related to goal setting procedures, are provided below beginning with analysis of district evaluator responses, then teacher participants, and finally principal participants.

Identification of strengths and weaknesses. Several participants within all three groups described the evaluation process as an opportunity to improve leadership capacity resulting from reflective practices centered on the identification of individual strengths and weaknesses to identify potential areas of growth. District evaluator perceptions

focused primarily on the purpose for identifying principal strengths and weaknesses, while teacher perceptions were aligned to the outcomes related to the identification of strengths and weaknesses in terms of personal growth. Finally, principals indicated the identification of strengths and weaknesses by district evaluators confirmed their own perceptions regarding their individual performance.

District evaluator participant perceptions. Three of 10 district evaluators described the purpose for determining the strengths and weaknesses of the campus principal as a necessary process to identify potential areas of principal improvement. Specifically discussed were reflective practices to determine annual growth measures and the development of performance goals for the upcoming year. District Evaluator 3 indicated the evaluation process allows both the principal and district evaluator to collaborate and define areas of needed improvement as: "[to] point out the positives and strengths and ... look for opportunities for improvement. Just looking at what are strengths, what are weaknesses, and then where do we go from there? How do we make improvements?" Similarly, District Evaluator 10 described the reflective nature related to identification of strengths and weaknesses resulting in improved principal performance:

> The majority of the goals and areas that are going to be evaluated are based on their prior year weaknesses so that the campuses focus on their weaknesses and making improvements on those, versus just the general compliance that everybody is measured on.

To determine potential performance goals for the academic year, District Evaluator 9 discussed the use of a bulleted list to: "identify strengths and focused areas of weaknesses... [to determine] goals and what they need to work on for the upcoming year."

Teacher participant perceptions. Eight teachers indicated a primary outcome of identifying principal strengths and weaknesses within the evaluation process resulted in recognized areas of personal growth for the campus principal. Teacher perceptions can be grouped into two perspectives, how the evaluation process strengthens principal growth and reflective practices resulting in identified areas of personal growth. Five teachers discussed the importance of the evaluation process to determine principal growth. According to Teachers 31, 43, and 46 a key outcome of identification of strengths and weaknesses within the evaluation process is personal growth. Teacher 31 stated: "I believe that when a principal is evaluated and given advice on areas to grow, the principal's personal growth is strengthened." Teacher 43 agreed: "I think that it [principal evaluation] has a lot of power influencing our principal's growth." In terms of enhancing job performance, Teacher 51 indicated the evaluation process allows for the identification of areas for growth: "The principal evaluation process identifies areas that principals need professional growth in so they could do their jobs."

According to Teachers 13 and 56, the evaluation process serves as to tool requiring reflective practices to identify strengths and weaknesses and potential areas of growth. Teacher 13 described how the evaluation process provides the opportunity to reflect on the previous year's performance to determine growth: "The principal evaluation [process] holds principals accountable for student success. It allows the principal the opportunity to reflect on their progress as instructional leaders, compare their current progress to previous years, and hopefully see growth." In addition, Teacher 56 perceived the evaluation process as a tool to assist principals in the identification of areas for improvement as well as enhancing identified areas of strength: "I think it will be

a positive tool if the results are given to the principals to see where there may be areas to change or positive comments in areas where strengths are seen and to continue."

Principal participant perceptions. Two principals indicated the evaluation process helped them to identify areas of growth and supports their perception regarding their performance as a campus principal. One principal explained the outcome of identified areas of strengths and weaknesses as: "I realize what I need to work on" (Principal 9). Another principal indicated the process of identified strengths and weaknesses aligns to their perception regarding personal performance: "It goes along well with my belief about my own performance" (Principal 8).

Establishing personal professional goals. Participant groups indicated the establishment of personal professional goals for the campus principal as an important process necessary to increase the leadership capacity of the campus principal. District evaluators perceived the formative conference as an opportunity to collaborate with the campus principal resulting in the development of personal performance goals. Teachers and principals also perceived the development of personal professional goals as a valuable process to influence principal behaviors resulting in increased student achievement.

District evaluator participant perceptions. Eight district evaluators identified the use of formative conferences with campus principals, at the beginning of the school year, as a means to establish annual personal professional goals. District Evaluators 1, 2, 3, 5, and 7 indicated formative conferences conducted at the beginning of the year provided the opportunity to review data and develop annual personal professional goals. For example, District Evaluator 2 stated: "We start off at the beginning of the year with a

formative conference... to review data and set goals." District Evaluator 3 also indicated

the use of the formative conference to develop personal professional goals and the use of

the self-appraisal instrument as a measure to determine alignment of perceived needs

between the principal and district evaluator:

> In the self-appraisals, the principal has to communicate three goals for the
> upcoming year for themselves. What I do is sit down and look to see
> possible needs for those principals. So when I come in we sit down and do our
> [formative] conference, I have a predetermination of what goals I think they need
> or should have for themselves. Sometimes they are very similar, and
> sometimes they are different.

> District Evaluator 1 and 7 described a multiple step planning processes during the

formative conference to examine goals and include action planning related to goal

achievement. District Evaluator 7 explained their goal tree process to set goals and

monitor goal achievement:

> During the formative conference we initiate the goal tree process...they examine
> their performance from a year before and set goals. Then they tell how they are
> going to get there, how they are going to measure and monitor our goals. Finally,
> they set different plans [for goal achievement] by projecting [action plans] for 30
> days, 60 days, and 90 days. [Performance Goals]... are set at the beginning of the
> year, where we talk about all the parts you have to do. I sit down one on one with
> the principal and mid-year we discuss where we need to focus on change... end of
> year evaluations are based upon [performance] goal achievement.

> District Evaluator 1 also indicated a multistep process to plan for goal

achievement and three-point monitoring check, yet was the only participant to extend the

concept to include the importance of fidelity in the implementation of the evaluation

process:

> At the beginning of the year, they set goals for the year and that can be based
> upon the data or if they want any other quantifiable goals. At the beginning of the
> year we go over their goal for the year and we meet mid-year to discuss
> progress towards reaching their goal and at the end of the year we meet again a
> third time and we look at goal achievement status. So certainly, that can have an

impact on instruction in a positive way if the evaluation is implemented with fidelity.

Finally, district Evaluator 5 described the importance goal setting at the beginning of the year as: "[beginning of the year goals] help to ensure [principals] are growing as a professional and as a leader. We look at what they are doing to improve themselves as leaders, or aspirations they may have the potential to greatly effect student achievement."

Teacher participant perceptions. In terms of developing principal performance goals, three teachers indicated personal professional goal focus should include campus wide improvements, not necessarily personal leadership improvements. For example, Teacher 22 reflected: "It is the principal's duty to think of their campus and what is best for it. Therefore, insights gained during the evaluation process [and identification of performance goals] should focus on campus improvement and student success." Similarly, Teacher 35 stated that, in order to effect student achievement, principals should develop personal professional goals that address processes directly associated with student achievement: "Setting student centered achievable goals is a great platform to work from that also influences student achievement." To address student centered goals, Teacher 28 emphasized the importance of planning and monitoring goal attainment progress:

> The principal should identify three goals in terms of student achievement. During the evaluation process, central office should monitor the progress towards these goals in three ways... which goals need more time to effect achievement...which goals are most likely to result in success... and which goals need a new approach to achieve needed results.

Principal participant perceptions. Five principals indicated the development of personal professional goals, especially in the area of student achievement and goal attainment, enhanced their leadership capacity. Principals expressed the outcomes

regarding the development of personal professional goals in three different ways. The first perception aligns to the impact of personal professional goals and accountability. This perception can only be seen from the following quote from Principal 8: "Student achievement keeps me accountable."

Secondly, Principal 7 and 10 provided perceptions regarding enhanced leadership capacity as a result of setting personal professional goals within the evaluation process. For example, Principal 10 indicated that the principal evaluation process developed their leadership capacity due to the clarity provided regarding areas for improvement: "I am able to clearly identify my own learning goals." In addition, Principal 7 perceived the processes within the formative conferences improved leadership capacity through the attainment of personal professional goals: "Formative conferences keep me on track to adhere to my goals."

Finally, Principal 4 and 13 provided perceptions of how participation in the development of personal professional learning goals enhanced their final performance rating in the evaluation process. Principal 4 identified participating in personal professional goal setting provided insight to overall performance as a campus principal: "Participating in goal setting [processes] serves as a reflection of my own performance." Principal 13 perceived growth associated with the development and attainment of personal professional goals positively influenced their evaluation: "I have to develop my own sense of self-evaluation and my input on my own professional learning goals are valued as my evaluation is completed."

Improving instructional strategies. To enhance principal leadership skills and potentially effect student achievement, responses from participants indicated the principal

evaluation process should include measures regarding methods employed by the campus principal to increase the use of effective instructional strategies by classroom teachers. Perceptions related to the development of teacher instructional strategies varied among the three participant groups. For example, district evaluators and teachers both indicated the development of principal coaching skills is critical to enhance teacher classroom instructional strategies. All three participant groups discussed the use of and need for explicit feedback during the evaluation process as a means necessary to improve principal performance. Perceptions regarding the improvement of instructional strategies are grouped into two strategies. These include: (a) training to enhance principal coaching skills, and (b) effective feedback strategies.

Training to enhance principal coaching skills. District evaluator and teacher responses provided perceptions regarding the importance of enhancing the campus principal's skills in the area of coaching teachers to improve instructional strategies in the classroom. District evaluators addressed the need for and specific training provided to campus principals regarding coaching skills, while teachers focused on the importance of campus principals in guiding classroom instructional practices. The following are examples of various participant group perspectives beginning with district evaluator and teacher participants.

District evaluator participant perceptions. Three district evaluator participants indicated a perceived outcome of the principal evaluation process, in terms of enhanced leadership capacity, resulted in improved coaching skills necessary to enhance the leadership capacity of the campus principal. District Evaluator participants 5, 6, and 8 indicated campus principals with the proper coaching skills motivate teachers and

students to increase productivity and achievement; however principals are often

uncomfortable with the coaching process. District Evaluator 5 explained:

> The coaching piece is a critical part of it [evaluation processes]. There are a lot of
> principals who don't have a lot of comfort with it [coaching skills] and
> developing that skill will truly make an impact [on teacher and student
> performance].

District Evaluator 8 concurred stating: "We [district evaluators] did a lot of work

around coaching [and staff relationships] this year. They [campus principals] are going to

have to get more familiar with that [to improve instruction]." District Evaluator 6 also

discussed the importance of developing coaching skills, yet was the only participant who

specified the type of training provided to campus principals:

> We implement a lot of [strategies to principals] for coaching teachers and
> improving them on how they can be a better instructor. I think that it is one thing
> related to student achievement and that is really important and vital. The
> [evaluation process] I would say has continued to make campus leaders good
> coaches and good conversationalist. We have done Crucial Conversations
> [training]... having those hard discussions is based upon what the [campus] needs
> are.

While district evaluator perspectives focused primarily on the importance of and

how the evaluation process develops the coaching skills of the campus principal, teacher

participants focused mainly on the importance of having a campus principal who can

support their personal improvement as a classroom teacher.

Teacher participant perceptions. Four teacher participants indicated that the

development of principal coaching skills is necessary to improve teacher instructional

performance. Analysis of responses can be summarized in two different perspectives.

First, Teachers 14 and 50 described principal coaching provides awareness of

instructional practices. Teacher 50 explained principal coaching provided awareness of

instruction: "The teachers are more aware of their teaching methods and are working to

try them [suggestions]. Teacher 14 agreed: "Even as adults we need ideas on how to improve teaching."

Teachers 19 and 49 interpreted principal coaching skills in terms of a critical component of job duties. For example, Teacher 19 elaborated on the principal's role in improving instruction: "Teaching is what matters most. This is what makes the most impact to student achievement. The principal's job is to coach teachers to be the best teacher they can be." Teacher 49 outlined the process for principals to provide coaching strategies to teachers: "The principal outlines the expectations, mandates needed professional developments and expectations, and then applies good coaching to improve instruction."

Effective Feedback Practices. Responses from participants again provided unique perspectives to the frequency and quality of feedback/reflections of principal performance in the evaluation process. District evaluators perceived feedback to principals as a major strength in the evaluation process, while teacher participants indicated the need for district evaluators to monitor and support principals to enhance performance. However, campus principals indicated the frequency and quality of the feedback did not improved their leadership capacity.

District evaluator participant perceptions. Nine district evaluator participants agreed that quality feedback enhances the principals' performance. Participants interpreted the use of feedback in two different ways. According to District Evaluators 1, 2, and 6 feedback to campus principals is important to build their leadership capacity and provide direction to increase effectiveness. District Evaluator 2 specified performance is determined by adherence to district procedures: "To improve performance we provide

feedback to principals regarding adherence to procedures set by different departments."

District Evaluator 6 described evaluator feedback as a tool to build principal leadership:

> A primary purpose [of the evaluation process] is to provide feedback to our principals to help assure that they are building their leadership skills and that they are going in the right direction. So, it's more like a tool we use with them.

Another district evaluator explained feedback provided during the evaluation

process serves as a measure of principal effectiveness:

> "I think it is important that principals have ongoing feedback regarding [their] performance. Not only assessment data, but actually qualitative data about how they are performing and where they are along the continuum in as far as instructional effectiveness on their campus" (District evaluator 1).

District Evaluators 7, 8, and 10 interpreted campus observations as a critical

component of the feedback process. District Evaluator 10 explained: "Feedback is based

on my observations and their [principal] level of performance." District Evaluator 8 also

indicated campus observations provide feedback and monitoring of principal

performance: "[Feedback] is a culmination of the observations. I'm giving them feedback

and we're talking about how their year went. That conversation really is a culmination of

my observations, how I've dealt with them that year." Additionally, District Evaluator 7

emphasized reviewing concerns based upon observations to enhance principal leadership

capacity:

> We [district evaluators] get a chance to simply talk with the principal about any concerns we have based upon our observations, what is his way of addressing those concerns, and then after we talk about some areas of improvement we double back and make sure we address those same concerns again.

Teacher participant perceptions. Five teacher participants provided two

perspectives regarding feedback to campus principals. Teachers 15 and 53 suggested

more feedback to principals, regarding their performance, is necessary to enhance their

leadership capacity. Teacher 14 suggested frequent feedback for struggling principals: "I would add more follow-up and feedback, especially if the principal was having a difficult year." Teacher 53 agreed, indicating the need to increase the amount of contact and communication regarding principal performance: "I also feel that administration should have more contact with the principal throughout the year. This contact should include regular campus visits... as well as feedback"

Teachers 33, 46, and 52 suggested feedback on principal performance should not be limited to district evaluators but include information from classroom teachers. Teachers 33 and 52 both stated "teacher feedback" should be included in the evaluation process to enhance principal performance. Teacher 46 further explained: "Feedback from teachers would give a more honest view of their [principal] performance."

Principal participant perceptions. Two principals provided different perspectives regarding feedback in the evaluation process. Principal 11 described the quality of feedback from district evaluators: "Feedback [from district evaluators] has been positive and supportive." To provide guidance regarding performance, Principal 4 expressed: "I would like more specific feedback."

In terms of enhancing the leadership capacity of the campus principal, evaluation processes provide an avenue for such due to their focus on procedures for setting annual personal professional goals and supporting the instructional performance of classroom teachers. A key component in the evaluation process, and area for improvement, is the opportunity to provide feedback regarding performance. Analysis of participants responses indicate the principal evaluation processes effects student achievement in terms of enhancing the leadership capacity of the campus principals.

Culture and climate of the school. Principal leadership behaviors effect overall student achievement by promoting the school campus and climate in multiple areas. Critical success factors that influence student achievement include the principal's ability to encourage stakeholder involvement and ability to uphold a campus-wide instructional focus. District evaluator and teacher participants indicated the evaluation process includes measures that enhance the overall culture and climate of the campus. District evaluators described the collection of data from a variety of stakeholders to measure principal performance; however, teachers focused on the purpose for measuring and the overall impact of the principal leadership skills regarding campus culture and climate. While district evaluator and teacher participants addressed campus culture and climate within the evaluation process, no campus principal described such a relationship. The following provided analysis of both district evaluator and teacher participant responses.

District evaluator participant perceptions. In terms of measuring principal behaviors to influence campus culture and climate, District Evaluators 2, 3, and 7 indicated the use of stakeholder surveys to enhance the leadership capacity of the campus principal. All three district evaluators outlined the use of culture and climate surveys in the evaluation process to identify areas of improvement. For example, District Evaluator 3 described the use of culture and climate surveys to measure principal performance and provide best practices models:

> They [principals] have culture and climate survey results for each campus in the district...I will go through and use some of that information [in the evaluation] for that [measuring performance]. Based upon the data... we have developed book studies regarding what high achieving schools are doing in relation to culture and climate. This provides principals models [for principals] to follow.

In terms of using survey data related to the culture and climate of the campus,

District Evaluator 2 also described how data collected from culture and climate surveys

determine if principal behaviors change over time:

> If we have principals who have a problem with culture, we have to teach that to the principal. We are very big on culture. When we talk about culture... [we mean]... student, campus, and teacher perceptions. Culture makes a big difference. We use the same surveys [from the previous year] to determine if that changed this year and is different from last year.

Additionally, District Evaluator 7 indicated the use of culture and climate survey

data to identify multiple areas of improvement:

> We look at survey data for the intended purpose to improve academics... [we collect] information from parents and teachers regarding the overall school climate...the primary purpose [of culture and climate surveys] is to identify areas of improvement in the organizational, instruction, community relations, and/or administrative procedures.

Teacher participant perceptions. Six teachers described the inclusion of campus

and culture data in the evaluation process. Teachers 28, 51, 53, 68, and 70 indicated the

principal evaluation process should include measurements related to the overall culture

and climate of the campus to affect student achievement. Teachers 28, 41, and 51

interpreted assessment of campus culture and climate as a natural extension of measuring

principal performance. For example, Teacher 28 explained: "To measure principal

performance and effect on student achievement, I would include measures to assess

campus climate." Teacher 51 provided a similar perspective: "Almost all decisions

regarding the climate of the school are a result of the principal's leadership. The principal

evaluation process has a direct impact on student achievement, as the principal is the

leader of the school." Teacher 41 provided insight to the relationship between a positive

culture and climate in regards to student achievement:

When principals build relationships with teachers (as do effective   teachers with their students) it is a trickle-down effect for success and open communication which effects and influences student achievement. When the climate of the school is positive student achievement levels will increase.   These should be included in the principal evaluation process.

Teacher participants 53, 68, and 70 indicated measurement of school climate should include specific principal behaviors such as, building relationships, monitoring academics, and increasing staff and student motivation. Teacher 70 explained: "Student achievement is linked to morale, culture, building relationships, commitment, and being an example as the leader. Principals should be evaluated on those things, and then the goal of student achievement will be realized." Teacher 53, also aligned to the principal evaluation process and monitoring of student achievement to enhance the culture and climate of a campus: I feel that the principal evaluation is a direct link to student achievement, if a principal establishes a positive culture and climate for the campus, students will strive for excellence in academic achievement. The principal evaluation process should reflect that the principal has carefully monitored campus academic performance in all content areas, and he or she should have campus data that reflects that campus plans were in place to promote as well as sustain academic achievement among all students and in all areas.

Finally, Teacher 68 promoted additional measures of principal performance related to the culture and climate of the campus to include the following:

We need to look beyond some of the principal evaluation processes to include principal effects on school culture; commitment by her/his staff to providing the best instruction and how the principal supports the efforts by teachers. If the evaluation just looks at the achievement, you are doing a great disservice to all efforts made on the students' behalf by the principal. You need to go beyond to consider how the principal affects student's motivation, perseverance, and commitment as well as how the principal supports and facilitates teachers' efforts

to maximize the learning potential of each child. Look also at community involvement (e.g. mentoring opportunities; provision of motivational programs and speakers; incentive programs for reading, science, writing, etc.).

Measuring and improving principal performance. The next theme investigates how principal evaluation processes measure and improve the performance of the campus principal to positively affect student achievement. Successful evaluation systems focus on developing expectations of behavior, analysis of performance, and communicating expected growth. Participant groups indicated that the use of multiple sources of data enhanced the evaluation process by providing insights to potential professional development opportunities. Experiences expressed by the participants are categorized into two different subthemes. Those include: (a) multiple sources of data and (b) professional development opportunities.

Multiple sources of data. Analysis of participant responses provided insight into the application of multiple sources of data within the evaluation process. Eight district evaluators, four teachers, and two principal participants agreed that the use of multiple sources of data is a valuable tool to determine principal performance. District evaluator participants presented sources of data, beyond student test scores, as insightful for outlining principal expectations in terms of desired behaviors. Teacher participants agreed the analysis of multiple sources of data supports the evaluation process, however, they indicated the need for multiple conversations regarding data analysis and use of information from multiple stakeholders as a means to determine principal performance. Finally, principals indicated analyzing data identified direction for personal growth, as well as defined expectations in terms of personal behaviors and teacher instructional practices. The following are participant perspectives regarding the use of multiple sources

of data, first from district evaluators, second from teachers, and finally principals'

perspectives.

     District evaluator participant perceptions. While student performance has been

identified as the "number one evaluator of principal performance" (District Evaluator 5),

eight other district evaluators identified multiple sources of data utilized to outline

principal behavior expectations and monitoring during campus observations. District

evaluators interpreted the use of data in three different ways. District Evaluators 2 and 5

provided insights to the types of data collected during the evaluation process to identify

areas of improvement. District Evaluator 5 discussed the following list of sources of

information included in the evaluation process to determine areas of improvement for

campus principals: "We investigate student attendance, positive behavior support,

interventions, staff attendance, discipline referral, ... walkthrough's, non-instructional

strategies... areas we might want to see some improvement. The data is directed to district

initiatives... [such as] reducing fights and increasing attendance." In addition, district

Evaluator 2 indicated the primary purpose of data disaggregation in the evaluation

process is to identify areas of improvement:

> It is part of the process of looking at data and talking with principals. It's a
> summative piece of it. The intended purpose, of course, is to improve academics.
> I mean, we identify the professional growth opportunities for the principals based
> upon not only the instrument itself but the level of implementation of things like
> the district improvement plan and the PBMAS, and that is our primary purpose.
> It is just another means of using data to evaluate and discuss the next steps for
> improvement.

     District Evaluators 1 and 6 aligned the use of data to outline principal

expectations. District Evaluator 6 stated: "[We are]...very data driven ... the data

identifies areas of expectations. I would say the [evaluation] instrument is very helpful

with student achievement because they [principals] know exactly what the expectations

are." Similarly, District Evaluator 1 indicated the use of data in defining campus

expectations:

> "expectations at every level... expectations what the district should be doing... expectations of what the principal should be doing... and expectations of what the teachers should be doing. So there are expectations at every level and they [principals] are definitely aware of that. So it [evaluations] is basically looking at data ... such as drop out, teacher attendance, student attendance, parent issues, and complaints... and communicating [expectations] with principals.

> District Evaluators 4, 7, and 10 described the collection of performance data that

occurs through campus observations and walkthroughs. District Evaluator 10 explained:

"The majority of our data collection regarding the evaluation is through our observations

of them and through meetings with them [principals]." District Evaluator 7 also described

how observations are imbedded into the evaluation process as follows:

> They [district evaluators] actually do ten walkthroughs at the campuses with the principals. Then we then meet and discuss any areas of concern. So we look at all of that data when we come together, and then we come up with what we need to target. We also check these are off as we evaluate.

> In addition, district evaluator 4 indicated the outcome of data analysis through

campus observations as: "We have central office walkthroughs. [Based on these] you

pretty much know from walkthroughs and looking at data and watching your principals...

who's doing it and who's not."

Teacher participant perceptions. Teacher participants interpreted the use of

student achievement data within the evaluation process in four different ways. Fifty-six

teachers (90.3%) emphasized the principal evaluation process should include some

measure of student achievement, including test scores, in determining principal

effectiveness. Fifteen teachers suggested student achievement data should be at least half

or a major portion of the principal evaluation process. Teachers 10, 11, 18, 26, 48, 59, and 68 indicated student achievement should encompass approximately 50% of the principal's final evaluation. For example, Teacher 59 suggested the following rating scale: "5 out of 10." While teacher participant 48 indicated: "About 50% because schools exist for the benefits of students." Teacher 10 added: "At least half of the evaluation should be placed on student achievement because this is our most important goal." Teacher 11 agreed student achievement should be major portion of the principal evaluation: "There needs to be accountability, so there should be some emphasis on student achievement, at least half." Teacher 68 also provided the following reflection: "I do think that this is one piece of the puzzle, but I would not want it to be more than half of the principal evaluation process."

Teachers 16, 22, 27, 38, 39, 41, 51, and 62 indicated student achievement should encompass a major portion of the campus principal's evaluation. For example, Teacher 22 explained: "Major emphasis (about 75%) should be placed on student achievement because this is our most important goal." Teacher 51 agreed: "95% of student achievement should be placed on principal evaluation." Teacher 38 agreed student achievement should be major portion of the principal evaluation: "I believe it should be a major part of the process. An educational leader's goal should be to constantly work to improve instruction and ultimately student success." Teacher 16 also stated: "The entire purpose of a school is to create successful students, so student achievement is essential and should be a large part of the process." Teacher 41 provided the best summary regarding the inclusion of student achievement in the principal evaluation process:

> A large majority of student achievement, mainly student progress and growth, should be a part of the principal evaluation process. Depending on school

populations, looking at growth and not just state assessment tests alone should be a factor. Over time state tests should improve over a period of 4-5 years, by this time the leader of school should have made relationships and hired and supported/placed effective teachers in positions of success.

While the majority of teachers indicated some measure of student achievement should be included in the principal evaluation process, six teachers did not agree. Teachers 21, 22, and 23 indicated "none" regarding the amount of emphasis the principal evaluation process should include student achievement. Teacher 15 explained: "None. They [principals] have no direct impact [on student achievement]. Teacher 67 agreed: "There should be no emphasis placed on it." Teacher 17 indicated the campus principal should not be held accountable for student achievement: "It is up to the students, teachers, and parents/guardians to [a] ensure child's success."

In addition to the extent the principal evaluation processes should include student achievement; six teachers also described the importance of the relationship between student achievement and campus leadership. For example, Teacher 1 explained, "Student achievement should have an effect or, in the least, be looked at when the principals are evaluated because they are the backbone of the school." Teacher 44 provided the following clarification:

> There are many factors that go into student achievement, and the principal's leadership is only one of those. While the student achievement should be a consideration, it should be of equal value in a pool of many areas of leadership.

Teacher 9 also provided a unique perspective regarding the use of student test scores in the principal evaluation process:

> A leader is only as good as the people they lead. That being said, the achievement of a campus should be a reflection of the leadership that is given. I think that the principal's actions are indirectly tied to student achievement. If a principal is not respected by his/her staff, the quality of education offered will reflect that. Conversely, if a staff is not respected by the principal, the quality of education

offered will be affected as well. Therefore, student achievement should be a large part of the principal evaluation, if for no other reason than to shed light on the often times unspoken issues or best practices.

Teachers 4, 6, 30 and 46 indicated the weight for student achievement in the principal evaluation process should correlate to teacher accountability for student achievement. Teachers 6 and 30 both stated: "[Student test scores] should play a role [in the principal evaluations] as much as it does for teacher [evaluations]." Similarly, Teacher 46 voiced: "They [principals] should be held as accountable as the districts and states are trying to hold teachers accountable."

According to Teachers 16, 55, and 61 principal evaluation processes should include statistical measures beyond student test scores. Teacher 16 provided sources of data other than student test scores to include the following: "The principal evaluation model would include statistics on state tests, improvements made to school organizations, data on increases in student activity and community involvement, and teacher surveys on support and environment." Teacher 61 also commented on the use of multiple sources of data in the principal evaluation process:

> I think it is important to recognize that achievement can be measured in multiple ways and in a variety of areas. I think it is important to [have] discussions on data measures with everyone. Student achievement is the biggest issue in any school and having a principal who approaches this issue in the right way is critical.

In addition, Teacher 55 agreed indicating multiple sources of data provides more in depth analysis of the principal's performance: "I would look at the principal's campus plan. I would use surveys from teachers, as well as students, because I feel you should have an overall view of principal not one sided."

Principal participant perceptions. Two principals also provided different perceptions regarding the use of data in the principal evaluation process. In terms of

determining areas of growth, Principal 4 explained: "By gathering data over the previous year, I can identify areas for needed growth." However, Principal 12 discussed the use of data discussions as an opportunity to define expectations for teacher instruction by the campus principal: "One of the biggest benefits is that it has made teachers stick with good teaching practices. When I walk in the classroom, they know what I expect and I know what I want to see from them - good teaching."

Participant groups indicated the use of multiple sources of data enhanced the evaluation process and potential effect on student achievement. District evaluators defined the data sources used in the evaluation process, while teachers indicated the use of data to develop improvement plans monitored during district evaluator conferences enhances principal effectiveness. Finally, principals specified the use of data assisted in producing defined instructional expectations and identification of areas for professional development.

Professional development. Based upon information collected during the data analysis phase, a key component of participant responses addressed the opportunity for the personal professional growth of the campus principal. Interestingly, each participant group expressed unique perspectives to include how professional development opportunities are presented to campus principals, the primary focus of principal professional development, and the impact the evaluation process has in the personal growth of the campus principal. The following are perceptions provided by district evaluator, teacher, and principal participants.

District evaluator participant perceptions. Eight District Evaluators indicated the processes within the principal evaluation allow for the identification of professional

development opportunities to enhance principal performance. District Evaluators 1 and 2 discussed how the identification of needed professional development are documented within the evaluation instrument. District Evaluator 1 explained: "There is a place in the instrument to document needed professional development determined by the overall evaluation." District Evaluator 2 elaborated on the documentation of professional development for campus principals: "They [principals] fill out the instrument by answering three to four questions to identify professional development needs and the reason for professional development. I may add to this based upon my observations. Then we provide the necessary training."

According to District Evaluators 2, 5, 6, 7, and 10, principal professional development aligns to identified district initiatives. District Evaluator 6 explained: "with the professional development... some of this is set at the district [level]... based upon the needs of the district... from the observations and data that you have collected over the year." District Evaluator 5 concurred: "Professional development is mostly related towards our district initiatives." In terms of district processes to monitor professional development, District Evaluator 7 offered: "We review district professional development data to monitor attendance and implementation. This is embedded in our monthly meetings."

Two district evaluators also provided unique perspectives regarding the alignment of professional development to identified weaknesses and the development of principal growth plans. According to District Evaluator 10, professional development aligns to areas of weaknesses identified in previous years' performance:

> I think we are pretty aligned because we have what is called tier training for our principals that they can select topic areas. There is a lot of times where the training is available is optional for them and [trainings] are selected by the

weaknesses we measure them the year before on evaluations. So each month we will have sessions set up based upon weaknesses from the year before and the principals can choose which areas they want to target in.

District Evaluator 2 provided the only perspective regarding how identified needs for professional development transform into individual growth plans designed to provide support:

Needs surface...if there are issues [at a campus] whatever they may be, whether it is a lack of leadership...or opportunities for parent engagement. Those things surface and leads to personal professional development. That leads to the growth plan...that leads to the deliverables...that leads to summaries of what they learned and the three or four things they are going to implement....[which identifies] the coaching and support they may need.

Teacher participant perceptions. Twenty-six teachers interpreted processes within the principal evaluation impacted professional development opportunities in three different ways. These topics include the importance for personal development in the areas of need; use of data to identify potential professional development topics; and alignment of professional development to teacher needs in order to increase their performance. Fourteen Teachers (2, 13, 16, 23, 24, 30, 31, 32, 37, 42, 43, 46, 49 and 51) suggested the principal evaluation process allows campus principals to identify areas of professional development to increase their performance. According to Teacher 16, principal professional development was important as it determined areas of need: "the evaluation process [determines] professional development decisions... it will allow the principal to see what areas need developed and what type of professional development to seek." Teacher 42 agreed: "The evaluation [process] can help the principal review what development she can work on and grow from that." Finally, Teacher 24 indicated the value of identification of professional growth opportunities: "The principal evaluation

process has positive effect on professional development decisions for the campus

principal. It is of great value in determining what is needed [for the principal]."

According to Teachers 13, 35, and 36 professional development needs are

identified through data analysis. Teacher 13 described the evaluation process provides an

opportunity to reflect on professional development needs based upon data:

> Again, the evaluation process should encourage growth as an educational leader. In knowing this, the evaluation process should help principals reflect on what professional development is most powerful to move the school in the direction that the principal and district desires based on data.

Similarly, Teacher 36 specified the use of current research to determine

professional development opportunities: "The principal evaluation process should include

a section on analyzing data and eventually inviting growth professionally. Part of

principal's responsibilities should be to be knowledgeable of current research and needs

related to professional development." Additionally, Teacher 35 explained principals use

data to judged needed professional development: "Principals can judge from

data/observations the need to attend specific professional learning."

Finally, nine teachers indicated principal professional development opportunities

should be aligned to meeting needs to facilitate teacher development. For example,

Teacher 8 explained the importance of alignment in principal professional development

and teacher growth: "The school principal should be able to support the staff in their

professional development endeavor therefore, it must align to what teachers need."

Teacher 20 provided the following suggestion: "Hopefully, the principal will see the

needs of the teachers and use that to direct the principal into his/her professional

development needs to better facilitate the teacher development." Teacher 39 also

expressed the importance of alignment between principal professional development and

teacher development: "They [principals] need for us [teachers] to grow and be successful for them [principals] to be successful." According to Teacher 63, the selection of principal professional development should align to improve the quality of teaching:

> I think it would be great and have a big impact if the principals received professional development on what the teachers have to be trained in and have knowledge of the curriculum of all grade levels from PK -6th. They should understand what is developmentally appropriate for one grade level isn't appropriate for all grade levels or students.

Teacher 11 agreed, indicating the influence on student performance as the primary goal for both principal and teacher professional development: "It would seem, to improve student performance, professional growth decisions should be based on what information the principal needs to take to the teachers so that kids will be successful."

Principal participant perceptions. In terms of the impact of selected professional development activities, eight of the principals indicated the evaluation process did little in improving performance through professional development. For example, according to Principal 6: "My evaluations have had no effect on my own professional development." Principal 1 agreed indicating the professional development portion of the evaluation process was "loosely associated" to increasing their leadership capacity and effecting student achievement. Principal 8 also indicated the principal evaluation process "held little relevancy" in determining professional development needs to enhance their performance. In terms of whom could best identify the professional development needs of campus leaders, Principal 9 added: "I am the one best equipped to determine my professional development needs."

Participant groups varied in their perceptions related to the impact of professional development opportunities for the campus principal in the evaluation process and

potential effect on student achievement. District evaluators indicated the selection of

principal professional development is a result of the evaluation process, specifically in

the areas of goal setting procedures and feedback opportunities based upon campus

observations. Teachers indicated principal professional development aligns to campus

needs as indicated through data analysis from multiple sources and should reflect areas to

enhance teacher development. Principals agreed the analysis of multiple sources of data

assisted in the identification of potential professional growth opportunities; however,

according to the principals, professional development aligned to district initiatives had

little relevance and no effect on their personal professional performance. The final phase

of the evaluation process occurs as the district evaluators rate the principal's performance

utilizing the district principal evaluation instrument.

Rating principal performance. The next thematic category was developed from

district evaluators and principal responses regarding the overall rating of a principal's

performance. District evaluators provided insights to both the utilization of rating

instruments and documentation of performance. They also indicated the use of a

checklist form aligned to expectations defined within the principal job description as a

means to measure principal performance. While district evaluators perceived the

checklist as a sufficient instrument to measure performance, principal participants did not

consider the instrument as a true measure of the quality of performance. In addition to

the rating instrument, both participant groups also provided perspectives regarding the

documentation of substandard performance. District evaluators indicated the processes

outlined in the principal evaluation process allow for the documentation of substandard

performance, when needed. Again, principals indicated performance evaluations were not

reflective of their perceived personal performance. Teacher responses were not recorded

for this section, as several participants indicated teachers do not participate in the principal evaluation process. For example, teacher 5 explained: "I have no idea about this, since I do not know what the process is." The following are examples of district evaluator and principal perceptions regarding the rating of principal performance within the evaluation process.

Rating Instruments. Both district evaluators and principals indicated the use of a checklist to rate principal performance within their district. District evaluators emphasized the checklist assists in the measurement of expected principal behaviors as defined in the principal job description. While principals confirmed the use of a checklist instrument within the evaluation process, most principals indicated the instrument did not reflect the nature of their work and was simply a scale score assigned by the evaluator.

District evaluator participant perceptions. In terms of the instrument utilized to determine the principal's final rating, nine of the district evaluators indicated the scoring of principal performance is aligned to a district designed checklist of desired behaviors. For example, District Evaluator 2 described the evaluation as "Simply a checklist to gauge performance." District Evaluator 6 defined the instrument as: "A checklist of things they [principals] are asked to do." District Evaluator 7 also described the instrument as: "a number system... it is a checklist for ...basic things we expect...such as walkthroughs and feedback. So the checklist will simply rate whether you are proficient, above or below." Similarly, District Evaluator 5 described the instrument as: "It's a simple google form that they have to submit that shows that they met and when they met and a general checklist of topics they discuss... everything you would want to see when you go to a campus. It's a checklist." Finally, District Evaluator 9 indicated the purpose

of the district checklist as: "Our checklist will simply rate you whether you are proficient, above, or below."

While nine district evaluators defined the rating instrument as a checklist of expectations, two of the district evaluators indicated the evaluation checklist instrument is aligned to the campus principal's job description. District Evaluator 8 described the process of rating the job performance expectations in their district's evaluation checklist:

> [The checklist] is based on their job description,... these are very generic administrator job descriptions... I'll rate them on a number scale on each one of the specific lines in that job description... how well they did. I schedule or I fill out their job description, I filled out the criteria and I rate them on each criterion.

District Evaluator 7 also described the job description as embedded into the principal evaluation checklist: "Another part [of the checklist] is using our job descriptions, with the list of things that we are going to evaluate."

Principal participant perceptions. Two principals interpreted the use of a checklist evaluation instrument in two unique ways. Principal 13 described the rating instrument as a checklist measurement: "[The checklist] is viewed mainly as a scale score simply filled out by the superintendent." According to Principal 6 there is no alignment between the instrument to rate principal performance and quality of work performed: "[the instrument] is not reflective of [my] work."

Documentation of substandard performance. Concerning the performance rating of campus principals and the potential effect on student achievement, further analysis regarding the identification of substandard performance regarding principal behaviors was necessary. While district evaluators indicated the use of the principal evaluation process as a means to document substandard performance and an avenue to

monitor principal growth, principals did not agree with the desired outcomes resulting

from documentation within the principal evaluation process.

District evaluator participant perceptions. Six district evaluators indicated the use

of the principal evaluation process to document substandard performance. According to

District Evaluators 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 8, "yes" there are processes within the evaluation

process for documenting substandard principal performance. District Evaluator 3

described documentation of substandard performance as "part of the process." In

addition, District Evaluator 4 explained: "it is necessary, especially for renewal

purposes.' District Evaluator 8 elaborated on the documentation of substandard

performance of a campus principal:

> If there are substandard parts [performance areas related to] of the job description,
> those are definitely noted. In my personal observations, that's when I can make
> statements... [for example] this was this area where your leadership needs to
> improve, it was substandard this year. It needs to improve next year. That can
> be documented on paper. I haven't had to do that very much, but it can be. Most
> of the time those substandard... [areas] I bring up in the conference. If there's
> something that's substandard, I've generally dealt with earlier in the year.

District Evaluator 6 provided the only perception regarding the alignment

between documentation of substandard performance and development of principal

growth plans:

> [Based upon the rating instrument] any people that need to be on a growth plan...
> [we look at] what are we doing for them. Then by the spring, if they are not where
> they need to be... [we look at] what are we going to do for the next steps.

Principal participant perceptions. Principal responses regarding the

documentation of their performance as the campus leader varied among the participants.

Principals 1, 3 and 8 indicated the evaluation did not adequately document the quality of

their work. Principal 8 explained: "Evaluations have either made me feel that my

performance is inadequate or satisfactory." Principal 1 reflected: "My current evaluations do not indicate the quality of my work." Similarly, Principal 3 provided the following regarding the overall impact of the principal evaluation process related to documenting performance:

> However, my evaluations HAVE NOT reflected the amount of work I have done nor the quality. I have to believe in myself and value the work I have done without receiving the compliments or adequate evaluations from my superiors.

Throughout this study, participants have provided perceptions regarding the purpose of the principal evaluations process, measures to improve principal performance, and overall impact on the development of the campus principal to effect student achievement. As noted, perceptions were varied throughout the study. Finally, participants provided suggestions on ways to improve the evaluation process and potentially effect student achievement.

Improvements to the evaluation process. The final theme addresses perceptions from all participant groups regarding suggested improvements to the principal evaluation process and potentially increased effect on student achievement. District evaluators indicated the use of student achievement measures to enhance principal's performance, as well as improvements to the goal setting process. Teacher perceptions indicated the need to develop measures in terms of principal relationships and the inclusion of data from multiple stakeholders. Finally, principals indicated the evaluation process should include a systematic approach related to specific campus needs.

District evaluator participant perceptions. District Evaluator 1 2, 3, 4, 6, and 8, suggested a stronger emphasis on student test scores to improve the principal evaluation process. District Evaluators 1, 2, 3, 4, and 8 suggested the "inclusion of student test

scores" to determine the overall rating of the campus principal; however none of the district evaluators indicated the amount of impact student tests scores should influence the final rating of principal performance. District Evaluator 3 indicated that the district evaluation process should include "some testing data" in determining performance. In addition, District Evaluator 2 elaborated: "Right now were of focusing on test scores, but I think there are also other measures out there to look at." District Evaluator 6 agreed with the inclusion of student test scores in the evaluation process but limited the information to student growth measures as opposed to overall student achievement:

> I would include a system within itself [inclusive] of student growth. So I think that system is a lot better than what we are currently using. A couple of years ago we took place in a study in the VAL-ED that had the growth piece model. It actually did give them numbers that came back in growth and was very helpful.

District Evaluators 2, 9, and 10 also emphasized improvements in the area of goal focus to enhance principal performance. For example, District Evaluator 2 indicated: "The evaluation process should include data beyond student assessments [such as] stronger alignment to board goals."

In addition to improving the goal setting process, District Evaluator 9 indicated the need to develop processes to measure progress related to identified goals beyond a checklist of expectations:

> I like the idea of sitting down with the principal and establishing their goals; I would like to make a more concrete system for measuring progress towards those goals. Right now, we mark them or they mark them as either met, partially met, and or not met. You know, there is just so much more that goes into meeting goals than just a check box.

District Evaluator 10 agreed stating:

> I think more principal input throughout the course of the year where the principal is identifying the majority of the goals and areas that are going to be evaluated in so that the campuses focus on making improvements on those versus just the general compliance [checklist] that everybody is measured on.

Teacher participant perceptions. Teachers provided the most comprehensive data

regarding changes to the evaluation process to potentially effect student achievement

with 72 of the participants providing suggestions primarily centered on how the campus

principal impacts the overall culture and climate of the campus. The suggestions are

categorized as follows: (a) campus morale and support of instruction, and (b) inclusion of

multiple stakeholders in the evaluation process.

Campus morale and support of instruction. Teacher suggestions regarding

principal behaviors, which potentially influence student achievement, centered on the

principal's ability to improve campus morale and support instruction. Teachers 5, 31, 47,

49, 64, 66, and 67 each indicated the evaluation process should measure the principal's

ability to build relationships and increase staff morale. For example, Teacher 5

suggested: "[The principal evaluation process] should include measures to build morale

of the staff by motivating and encouraging staff." Teacher 31 also indicated the

importance of measuring staff morale:

> Teacher moral is a big deal to me. I believe that if you have happy and fulfilled
> teachers, your school will do better on achievement tests and [addressing] safety
> issues, etc. I   think that teacher happiness should be one area where principals
> are judged.

To enhance principal and teacher relationships, Teacher 47 stated: "I would

evaluate the principal's relationship with the staff. If the staff feels the principal is behind

them ...morale increases; the staff will work to insure students are learning to the best of

their abilities." Teacher 49 described the impact of low teacher morale and the need to

include such measures in the evaluation process:

> I believe staff morale and workplace environment should be afforded great weight
> in a principal evaluation model. If the masses do not feel welcomed and
> respected, the quality of the job will be greatly affected. If those that are led do

not feel comfortable with the leader, then fear is the driving force, not the desire to do well.

In terms of how to increase the morale of the campus staff, five teachers agreed the principal evaluation process should measure the amount of time the principal observed and documented classroom instruction as a key component to the success of the teachers and ultimately students. For example, Teacher 59 recommended the evaluation process should include: "The amount of time they have spent in the classroom actually observing and documenting what has happened." Teacher participant 27 noted: "[Include] the principal's role in a teacher's walkthroughs/observations. [When] principals make specific suggestions on improving teacher's lessons ... not just vague comments...instruction improves.

Teacher 36 extended the concept of measuring principals classroom observations to include teaching classes: "I would also include a day or two in which the principal is required to teach/lead a class and later reflect on that experience, especially the principals that have not led a classroom in a long time."

Inclusion of multiple stakeholders. Twelve teachers indicated inclusion of input from teachers, students, and parents in the evaluation process would positively influence principal performance. Nine teachers recommended teacher input as a component of measuring principal performance. For example, Teacher 46 provided the following recommendation: "I believe that teachers should be able to evaluate principal performance and have a safe avenue to do so." Teacher 11 also indicated the inclusion of teachers could enhance the principal evaluation process: "There needs to be a component that gives the staff some opportunity to say what they think is working and to rate the principal. Principals have great pressure from above and sometimes work to please

superiors at the expense of listening to teachers." In terms of including teachers in the evaluation process to enhance student achievement, Teacher 49 explained:

> Let teachers evaluate administration's performance. If given the opportunity to evaluate honestly without the fear of reprimand, there would be better communication and that would go a long way in influencing student achievement. If administration and teachers are a cohesive unit, the total atmosphere in the classroom would be influenced.

Three additional teachers extended the use of stakeholder input in the evaluation process to include student and parent perceptions regarding principal performance. Teacher 9 offered: "Anecdotal records produced by asking staff, students, and parents can offer candid and confidential responses about the principal as a leader." Teacher 57 agreed and provided the following recommendation: "I would include confidential teachers and staff input, student input, and of course parental input." Teacher 63 suggested the following areas for teachers, students, and parents to rate principal performance in the evaluation process: "[Include] surveys... of teachers, students, and parents... with questions about the principal's demeanor, communication skills, attitude, leading the organization and willingness to listen."

Principal participant perceptions. Three principals provided insight to overall perceptions regarding issues and recommendations for improvement to the principal evaluation process. Principal 11 and Principal 1 indicated the evaluation process is lacking in focus related to specific needs of the campus. Principal 11 indicated the evaluation process is limited to "district needs as a whole rather than [the] individual campus." Principal 1 also summarized the evaluation process as not reflecting "the big picture" in terms of campus performance. To make improvements to the principal evaluation process regarding an emphasis aligned to the needs of the campus, Principal

13 provided the following recommendation: "I believe a consistent system focused on campus performance and data could have a positive effect on pupil achievement."

Qualitative Conclusion

Grouping the large amounts of qualitative data into overarching themes that represented the perceptions of principals, district evaluators, and teachers revealed four key themes. Theme 1: Analysis of the data showed that each participant group indicated a positive relationship between the principal evaluation process and effect on student achievement. Findings indicate the district principal evaluators perceived a much stronger positive relationship (80%, $n = 8$) between the principal evaluation process and potential effect on student achievement than the principals (58.3%, $n = 7$) and teachers (55.2%, $n = 37$). Participants specified a positive relationship in terms of principal leadership capacity and impact to the overall culture and climate of the campus. All groups perceived the primary purpose of the principal evaluation process is to improve the leadership capacity of the campus principal. Improved leadership behaviors impact the quality of instructional programs, thus resulting in a positive effect on student achievement. Processes to enhance the leadership capacity of the campus principal centered on discussions related to individual strengths and weaknesses to determine specific professional goals for the academic school year. However, identified goals were more aligned to district centered initiatives as opposed to the unique needs of the individual campus. In addition to the development of professional goals, participants addressed the use of feedback regarding principal performance and the potential impact on student achievement. Varied views were presented from the different participation groups. District evaluators perceived feedback as a major strength in the evaluation

process, while teacher participants indicated feedback to principals needs to occur more frequently. However, principals specified that feedback regarding personal performance did not improve their leadership capacity and did not affect student achievement.

District evaluator and teacher participant groups also described the impact of leadership behaviors and their impact to the culture and climate at the campus level. Both groups indicated the collection of data regarding the culture and climate from multiple stakeholders is necessary to measure principal performance and impact on student achievement.

Theme 2: Measuring and improving principal performance was the second theme and encompassed both the use of multiple sources of data and professional development opportunities for the campus principal. In addition to student test scores, district evaluators indicated the analysis of data related to student attendance, positive behaviors supports, instructional interventions, staff attendance, discipline referrals, observations, campus improvement plans, as well as non-instructional strategies employed at the campus level. The findings indicate data analysis from multiple sources provided defined expectations for both principal and teacher behaviors to improve instruction and identify areas needed for personal growth. District evaluators defined the data sources utilized during the principal evaluation process, while teachers emphasized the use of data to develop campus improvement plans to monitor implementation strategies during the evaluation process. In terms of professional development, participant perceptions varied in regards to professional development identification, primary focus, and impact for personal growth of the campus principal. District evaluators indicated professional development is a key component in the growth of the campus principal, while teachers

suggested the focus of principal professional development should be aligned to meeting the needs of the teaching staff to positively affect student achievement. Principal participants expressed the evaluation process did not influence their personal professional development.

Theme 3: Rating of principal performance derived from participant insights regarding the rating instrument and documentation of performance. District evaluators and principals provided perceptions related to the instruments utilized to determine principal performance. District evaluators perceived the use of a checklist of expectations as a sufficient measure of principal performance; principals did not consider this as a true measure of the quality of their work. District evaluators and principals disagreed regarding the desired outcomes resulting from rating principal performance. Teacher responses were not recorded, as teachers indicated their input regarding principal performance was not a part of the evaluation process.

Theme 4: In terms of how to enhance the evaluation process to potentially effect student achievement, participants specified improvements are needed in the areas of: (a) alignment of professional goals and measures to monitor goal achievement; (b) improved coaching skills for campus principals to enhance teacher performance; (c) well developed instruments and processes that include support in the fidelity of the overall process; and (d) inclusion of data obtained from multiple stakeholders (teachers, students, and parents) in the final scoring of the principal's performance. Conclusions of the qualitative analysis indicate the perception that the principal evaluation process has a positive relationship to potentially affect student achievement. However, the implementation of the evaluation process is perceived to have varied effects on principal

leadership capacity and personal professional growth, thus improvements to the principal

evaluation process are necessary to achieve maximum impact on student achievement.

Summary of Findings

Analysis of both the qualitative and quantitative data in this body of research

indicates the quality of the principal evaluation instrument has no effect on student

achievement, as locally developed instruments tend to consist of a checklist of behavioral

requirements opposed to enhancing the leadership capacity of the principal to serve as an

instructional leader. In addition to the checklist instrument, principal participants

identified district evaluator observations and analysis of campus performance data as

additional measures within the evaluation process. While district evaluators presented a

more favorable impact regarding evaluation processes and effect on student achievement,

principals and teachers viewed the influence in marginal terms. For example, district

evaluators described the goal setting process and identification of professional

development opportunities as a major strength in the evaluation process. However,

principals described the focus on district initiatives within the evaluation process failed to

meet the unique contextual needs of their individual campus. Finally, teachers discussed

evaluation instruments and processes should align to measuring how principals support

teacher's professional growth to improve instructional strategies necessary to increase

student achievement

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, IMPLICATION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between school districts' principal evaluation instruments and processes and the potential impact on student achievement, specifically in the areas of reading and mathematics. Thirty years of research indicates that the campus principal is critical to school improvement and student achievement (Branch, Hanushek, & Rivkin, 2013; Leithwood et al., 2004; Marzano et al., 2005). Although many studies have been conducted in an effort to determine a relationship between principal behaviors and student achievement (Dean, 2012; Leithwood et al., 2009; Marzano, 2005), there is much less research on the specific relationship between the principal evaluation instruments and processes and the potential influence on student achievement. To examine principal evaluation instruments and processes as a factor affecting student achievement, this study investigated TEA AEIS student performance data in the areas of reading and mathematics for 41 elementary campuses in 27 different Texas school districts along with the different principal evaluation instruments utilized to rate principal performance. In addition, the study included survey and questionnaire responses from principals, interview transcripts from district evaluators responsible for conducting principal evaluations, and questionnaire responses from teachers at campuses in districts participating in the study. This chapter presents a detailed discussion of the findings, along with implications of these findings and future research recommendations.

Summary of Findings

For the first research question quantitative findings indicate a statistically significant relationship does not exist between district principal evaluation instrument ratings and student reading and mathematics scores. These results suggest the quality of the principal evaluation instrument has no effect on student achievement in reading and mathematics. Quantitative analysis of the second research question found the most widely used instrument to measure principal performance consisted of a checklist of requirements, coupled with supervisor observations and multiple sources of data to determine principal performance. Analysis of data indicated the superintendent, assistant superintendent, or other district level evaluators conducted the majority of principal evaluations. Findings also suggest the primary purpose of the evaluation process was to adhere to state requirements related to annual principal evaluations; to increase student test scores and overall student achievement, to document substandard performance, and to support various instructional programs.

In addressing the third, fourth, and fifth research questions, qualitative analysis of perceptions gathered from campus principals, district evaluators, and teachers indicated processes within the principal evaluation have the greatest potential to effect student achievement. In-depth analysis of participant responses regarding principal evaluation processes were categorized in four succinct themes: (a) effect on student achievement, (b) measuring and improving principal performance, (c) rating principal performance, and (d) potential improvements to the evaluation process. Findings indicated that the

evaluation process has the potential to build principal leadership capacity through the development of annual personal professional goals and improved instructional strategies resulting from principal coaching support and use of effective feedback to enhance their performance. In addition, the evaluation process allows the opportunity for principals to encourage stakeholder involvement and uphold a campus-wide instructional focus to improve the overall culture and climate of the school.

In terms of measuring and improving principal performance, participants indicated the need to utilize multiple sources of data to strengthen classroom instruction and identify areas of potential professional development for the campus principal. Findings also indicated the principal's performance rating aligned to expectations identified in the principal job descriptions and served as a means to document substandard performance when necessary.

Finally, participants provided suggestions to the evaluation process to incorporate student achievement measures, improve goal setting processes, include stakeholder perceptions within the evaluation process, and develop systematic approaches related to specific campus needs. While all participant groups agreed that the principal evaluation process influences, to some extent, student achievement perceptions varied regarding the impact of specific steps within the process as a whole.

Research Question 1

To answer Research Question (RQ#1), *Is there a relationship between principal evaluation instruments and school-level performance on state assessments in reading and mathematics?*, quantitative data was analyzed by conducting a Pearson's product moment

correlation (*r*) to assess whether a relationship existed between district evaluation

instrument scores assigned by the PEIR rating team and campus passing rates on state

assessments in reading and mathematics. Combined analysis of district evaluation

instruments classifications and student achievement on the Texas Assessment of

Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) in reading (*p* >.05) and mathematics scores (*p* > .05)

suggested no relationship exists between the PEIR score for district evaluation

instruments and student achievement. Utilizing the Principal Evaluation Instrument

Rubric (PEIR), expert raters in this study found the evaluation instruments developed at a

local level meet, at minimum, basic requirements regarding state performance standards

for campus principals. Findings from the qualitative portion of the study also concluded

principals perceived the use of locally developed instruments consisted of merely a

checklist of expectations versus actual measures of a principal's performance, thus had

little influence on student achievement

These findings corroborate those from Catano and Stronge (2006) and Derrington

and Sharratt (2008) suggesting an alignment to both state and professional standards

embedded in the evaluation instrument provide clarity regarding principal behaviors

necessary to influence student achievement. Additional studies criticize principal

evaluation instruments due to vagueness, lack of validity and psychometric qualities,

absence of alignment to professional standards, and inconsistencies due to the limited

amount of research to determine the influence of principal evaluation instruments and

effect on student achievement (Amsterdam et al., 2005; Contano & Stronge, 2006;

Derrington & Sharratt, 2008; Goldring et al., 2009a; Heck & Marcoulides, 1992; Kimball

et al., 2009; Tschannen-Moran & Garcia, 2004). Given that findings from this study

conclude principal evaluation instruments have no effect on student achievement, it was necessary to investigate practices within the evaluation process that may potentially effect student achievement.

Research Question 2

To answer Research Question (RQ#2), *What, if any, are commonly employed processes (objectives, methods, frequency of feedback) districts utilize for principal evaluations?*, data was analyzed by calculating percentages and frequencies based on principal responses to the PEAFP survey. The purpose of this survey was to: (a) identify various methods used to evaluate the performance level of campus principals, and (b) determine the frequency of principal evaluation. Principal participants reported the three most widely utilized methods to evaluate principal performance consisted of checklist/rating systems, use of data, and supervisor observations for determining a principal's evaluation rating. These findings support previous research regarding principal evaluation instruments indicating the measure of principal performance consisted of locally developed checklist rating instruments (Yavuz, 2010). Tschannen-Moran and Garcia (2004) suggested due to the limited amount of available research regarding the assessment of principal practices and effect on student achievement districts have little guidance to create effective locally developed evaluation instruments. Yavuz (2010) agreed locally developed principal evaluation instruments lack a focus on principal behaviors that affect student achievement. Given the creation of locally developed instruments is absent of input from campus principals and alignment to researched based methodology, there is little evidence to support the instruments validity or reliability. Goldring et al.'s (2009a) study regarding the assessment of leadership

behaviors and connections to professional standards determined that to produce valid and reliable results, evaluation instruments must align to theory and produce consistent results over a period of time.

Principals in this study indicated in addition to checklist evaluation instruments, other methods of evaluating principal behaviors included the use of multiple sources of data and observations by the locally assigned district evaluator. Thomas et al.'s (2000) study of policies and practices in the evaluation of school principals also supported the use of data, such as checklists and observations, collected by principal evaluators to determine principal competency. Ginsberg and Berry (1990) identified sources of data to include various evaluation instrument supporting documents, as well as self-evaluation reflections. While the findings of this study corroborate the use of district evaluator observations as a primary measure to evaluate principal performance, previous studies indicate that due to the professional demands of district evaluators, they often struggle to complete evaluations consistently or with fidelity (Goldring et al., 2009a). Principals in this study indicated the purpose of the evaluation process was to adhere to state requirements related to annual principal evaluations, increase student test scores and overall student achievement, support various instructional programs, and document substandard performance. Findings from this body of research support previous research of Dean (2012), Kimball, et al. (2009), Leithwood, Patten, and Jantzi (2009), and Marzano et al., (2005) confirming principal evaluation processes link student achievement to principal performance. Given that campus principals have the opportunity to influence a large number of students, they can affect student achievement more than four times that of the highly effective teacher (Dean, 2012). Sergiovanni (1995)

emphasized principal evaluations, in order to influence student achievement, should reflect the instructional leadership practices of the campus principal as they are responsible for monitoring instruction and learning, conducting teacher evaluations, and interacting with key stakeholders.

In terms of documenting substandard performance, this finding supports negative perception of principals regarding the evaluation process and impact on personal performance regarding overall expectancy (Davis & Hensley, 1999; Kimball & Pantsch, 2008; Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbech, 2000; Tschannen-Moran & Garcia, 2004). Six of the thirteen principal responses to open ended questions in the PEAFP survey indicated principals felt the current evaluation processes failed to measure the quality of their job performance. Principals referenced the failure of the evaluation process to measure the amount of time necessary for successful performance and the evaluation process often makes them feel inadequate regarding the quality of their performance. Such conclusions mirror influences of Vroom's Expectancy Theory (Vroom, 1964) indicating motivation in the work place is an estimate of a person's ability to fulfill job expectations, link expectations and outcomes, and identify rewards based upon performance. Therefore, the principal evaluation processes should encompass "how" the evaluation measures and monitors principal performance necessary to influence student achievement.

Research Question Three, Four and Five

To answer the third research question, *How do campus principals perceive the principal evaluation process and potential effect on student achievement?* (RQ#3), the fourth research question, *How do district principal evaluators perceive the principal*

evaluation process and potential effect on student achievement?(RQ#4), and the fifth

research question, *What, if any, are the principal behaviors teachers perceive as having*

a positive impact on student achievement?(RQ#5), interviews and questionnaires were

conducted. The quantitative data suggests that while district evaluators, teachers, and

principals indicated some principal evaluation processes have the potential to effect

student achievement, perceptions varied regarding the overall impact on improving

principal performance. Similar to the results section of this paper, research questions 3, 4,

and 5 are being combined because similar results emerged out of the interviews and

questionnaires from the district evaluators, teachers, and principal participants. Four

important themes emerged out of the analysis of the qualitative data. These include: the

principal evaluation process and effect on student achievement, measuring and improving

principal performance, rating principal effectiveness, and suggestions for improvements

to the evaluation process.

Effect on student achievement. This theme will discuss two important aspects of

the perceived outcomes of the principal evaluation process: (a) leadership capacity and

(b) campus culture and climate. Reeves (2004) asserts that leadership matters as a single

leader has enormous impact on the entire organization. Several studies conclude that the

leadership capacity of the principal is critical to influence student achievement (Branch,

Hanushek, & Rivkin, 2013; Leithwood et al., 2004: Marzano et al., 2005). Conclusions

from this study support previous research indicating the primary purpose of the principal

evaluation process is to improve the leadership capacity of the campus principal

(Goldring et al. (2009a). District evaluators indicated the building of leadership capacity

occurs when districts analyze multiple sources of data to identify specific goals for the

academic year aligned to both district and campus initiatives. In addition, all groups specified improvements to instructional strategies as a necessary component to influence student achievement. Developing principal instructional coaching skills and providing feedback related to principal effectiveness, as indicated by district evaluators, can potentially influence student achievement. Additional analysis of data related to the evaluation process and effect on student achievement found that leadership capacity of the campus principal is supported through the identification of individual strengths and weaknesses to develop professional goals for the academic school year. This is consistent with conclusions and findings from previous studies identifying the development of performance goals and required outcomes as a critical component for evaluating principal effectiveness (Glassman & Heck, 1992; Johnson, 1989; Murphy & Pimentel, 1996; Reeves, 2004; Rinehart & Russo, 1995; Stufflebeam & Nevo, 1993).

While the Kimball, et al., (2009) study of principal evaluations found that quality feedback to campus principals had a positive effect on their performance, principal perceptions from this study indicate evaluator feedback did not influence their performance or impact student achievement. Although district evaluators perceived feedback as a major strength in the evaluation process, teacher participants indicated feedback to principals needs to occur more frequently. Interestingly, principals perceived feedback provided from district evaluators as too infrequent, did not improve their leadership capacity, or effect student achievement. Similar conflicting perceptions are noted in the works of Davis and Hensley's (1999) study of superintendent and principal perceptions of the evaluation process. Superintendents in this body of research as well as the Davis and Hensley study, felt that the evaluation processes including feedback were

well developed; however, principals indicated little impact in shaping or changing behaviors. Due to "overload" and time constraints to meet evaluation process requirements, principals reported inconsistencies in the fidelity of implementation to perceive the approach as helpful (Davis & Hensley, 1999; Derrington & Sherratt, 20008; Kimball et al., 2009). In this study as well as similar research, principals have reported that district evaluators spend little time on their campus observing leadership behaviors and they lack training in effective evaluation techniques necessary to provide quality feedback (Brady, 2012; Davis & Hensley, 1999; Johnson, 1998; Yavuz, 2010).

In addition to building leadership capacity of the principal, district evaluators and teachers discussed the importance of a positive campus culture and climate as a necessary component to effect student achievement. District evaluators described the collection of data assessing the overall culture and climate through the use of surveys completed by teachers, staff, parents and community members. Teachers found measurement of school climate factors should also include specific principal behaviors such as building relationships, monitoring academics, and increasing staff and student motivation.

This is consistent with findings from prior research concluding that principals in high performing schools collaboratively collect data, such as climate surveys, to shape principal and teacher behaviors necessary to increase student achievement (Glassman, 1992; Goldring et al., 2009a). This occurs when the campus principal supports school change by providing teachers with the opportunity to take risks for innovative instructional strategies and increase morale through support in areas such as classroom management and student discipline (Berebitsky, Goodard, & Carlisle, 2014; Williams, 2009). Nettles and Herrington (2007) outlined the critical factors that influence the

culture and climate of the school: (a) a safe and orderly environment, (b) support the vision and mission of the school, (c) incorporate stakeholder involvement, (d) monitor student performance, (e) uphold the instructional focus and maintain high expectations, and (f) providing and participating in professional development. Thus, quality principal evaluation systems must include components that measure principal effectiveness in all of these areas (Glassman, 1992; Glassman & Heck, 1992; Goldring et al, 2009a; Hallinger & Murphy, 1985; Johnson, 1989; Leithwood, Patten, & Jantzi, 2009; Murphy & Pimentel, 1996; Rinehart & Russo, 1995; Thomas et al., 2000). Processes within the evaluation system provide principals with the opportunity to build leadership capacity and implement strategies to enhance the overall culture and climate of the school. To determine the effectiveness of these practices, it is necessary to identify how the principal is measured for identified areas of growth to influence student achievement.

Measuring and improving principal performance. Two emerging concepts found to be recurrent in this study were the use of multiple sources of data to determine principal performance and the identification of professional development opportunities for the campus principal. It became clear that, in addition to student test scores, analysis of data related to student attendance, positive behaviors supports, instructional interventions, staff attendance, discipline referrals, observations, campus improvement plans, as well as non-instructional strategies employed at the campus level provided insights to principal performance. Goldring et al. (2009a) and Heck and Marcoulide (1996) found that, to increase leadership capacity, principal evaluation processes must include the use of valid and reliable data to identify potential professional development opportunities for the campus principal. Previous studies conducted by Catano and

Stronge (2006) and Sun and Young (2009) indicate that principals and district evaluators perceive that the evaluation process provides the opportunity to promote personal professional development, however, results from this body of research found that participants provided different conclusions. For example, district evaluators indicated that professional development is key to the growth of the campus principal and a necessary component of the evaluation process. However, principals expressed that the evaluation process did little to influence their personal professional development. This result is aligned to other research studies indicating that the principal evaluation process lacks connections to principal professional development opportunities, a critical element for increasing leadership capacity regarding school climate and organizational operations (Condon, 2009; Davis & Hensley, 1999).

Unique to this study of the principal evaluation process and effect on student achievement is the perception of teachers suggesting the focus of principal professional development should be aligned to meeting the needs of the teaching staff to positively effect student achievement. These findings support Berbitsky, Goodard, and Carlisle's (2014) study of Title I schools in Michigan which also revealed that teachers perceived the opportunity to improve instruction resulted from collaboration and communication with the campus principals regarding the ability to influence teacher performance. Hence, these findings provide implications to shifting the focus of principal professional development from leadership skills to building the instructional capacity of teachers.

Rating principal performance. Stufflebeam and Nevo (1993) argued the principal evaluation process serves three primary purposes: (a) to determine the principal's aptitude and competency; (b) determine if the principal's leadership skill

matches the unique needs of the campus; and (c) to determine if the principal meets the

district's expectations. Results of this research indicate conflicting perceptions regarding

the rating of principal expectations among district evaluators and campus principals.

Again, district evaluators indicated a locally developed checklist of performance

expectations provided adequate information regarding the opportunity to determine a

principal's performance. However, principals indicated this was not a true measure of the

quality of their work. This aligns to findings of previous research indicating that locally

developed systems lack continuity among practices or valid and reliable measures of

principal performances (Ginsberginsberg & Berry, 1990; Rinehart & Russo, 1995).

Criticisms of the evaluation process stems from a lack of clarity related to the

communication of expectations (McAdams & Barilla, 2003; Thomas et al., 2000). While

this study supports this notion, and the theoretical framework regarding expectancy, the

findings indicate communication between district evaluators and principals regarding

expectations of performance is convoluted. To achieve high levels of expectancy in the

evaluation process, principals similar to teachers, must take control over individual

performance and outcomes (Schumacher, 2010). While this study did not reveal any new

insights related to the overall rating and use of the evaluation instrument, it did support

prior research indicating principals' perceptions regarding the lack of consistency and

often punitive use of the instrument in documenting substandard performance (Kimball &

Pantsch, 2008).

Throughout this study, participants provided perceptions regarding the purpose of

the principal evaluation process, measures to improve principal performance, and overall

impact on the development of the campus principal to effect student achievement. As

noted, perceptions were varied throughout the study. Finally, participants provided

suggestions on ways to improve the evaluation process and potentially effect student

achievement.

Improvements to the evaluation process. While quantitative results from this

study concluded principal evaluation instruments do not influence student achievement,

results from the qualitative portion indicated it is the processes within the principal

evaluation that have the potential influence student achievement. Given that processes

within the principal evaluation are perceived to have varied effects on principal

leadership capacity and personal professional growth, improvements to the principal

evaluation process are necessary to achieve maximum impact on student achievement.

District evaluators indicated the evaluation process allowed for the development of

professional goals; however, inclusion of measures to monitor goal achievement within

the evaluation process is needed. While district evaluators indicated professional goals

aligned to district initiatives, principals indicated they did not take into consideration the

unique needs of the campus. This is consistent with findings from Brady's (2012) study

of principal perceptions of the evaluation process that also found principals identified the

lack of alignment to the development of goals specific to campus needs. This may be

rectified through the use of standards-based evaluation instruments which are aligned to

both district and campus goals to provide consistency and clarity for evaluation criteria

(Derrington & Sharratt, 2008).

All participant groups indicated a critical component of the evaluation process

included some measure of developing the principal's skill as an instructional coach. In

this study, teachers expressed the need to include the amount of time principals spent in

the classroom and the quality of principal feedback to teachers regarding the effectiveness of classroom instruction. This finding supports Grigsby, et al.'s, (2010) research confirming principal perceptions regarding the role of an instructional leader to improve teaching and learning by providing professional development to teachers. This aligns to additional research conducted by Goldring et al., (2009a) which found that to meet increasing accountability standards, principal evaluation processes must measure the extent the campus principal promotes high expectations for student learning and levels of instruction necessary to address the rigor of high stakes curriculum and assessments.

Criticisms of current evaluation instruments and processes include the lack of fidelity regarding the implementation of a defined set of protocols to ensure accurate representation of principal's work (Goldring & Berry, 1990). This body of research supports the criticisms indicated in previous studies as district evaluators indicated processes within the principal evaluation promoted the fidelity of implementation, while principals disagreed. Principals identified the need for a systematic approach to the evaluation process that includes both the "big picture" regarding the direction of the district, yet provides flexibility in addressing the needs of the individual campuses. Previous studies by Brady (2012), Johnson (1989), and Yavus (2010) also confirm the lack of flexibility regarding the contextual needs of the campus.

Analysis of district evaluation instruments and student achievement in reading and mathematics, coupled with perceptions from district evaluators, teachers, and principals found that the implementation of   processes within the principal evaluation, not instrumentation, which has the greatest potential to effect student achievement. The

implementation of the evaluation process is perceived to have varied effects on principal leadership capacity and personal professional growth. Therefore, the qualitative portion of this study provided improvements to the principal evaluation process necessary to achieve maximum impact on student achievement. In addition to the identification of "what" principal evaluation processes should measure, greater focus on the implementation practices in the evaluation process may provide stronger alignment to optimize student performance.

Implications

For effective principal evaluations, instruments should be standardized, research-based, and aligned to state standards. Canto and Stronge (2006) also found that when evaluation instruments align to standards, principal behavior aligns to student achievement. However, contradictory findings indicate principal standards in an evaluation instrument do not cover behaviors to ensure a rigorous curriculum or quality instruction, both of which are necessary components to enhance student achievement (Goldring et al., 2009a). Most districts utilize locally developed instruments to measure principal performance (Brady, 2012). However, these consisted primarily of checklists measuring expected principal behaviors and have little influence regarding student achievement. Findings from this study concluded that perceptions related to the use of checklists as an evaluation measure varied among district evaluators, principals, and teachers. District evaluators indicated checklists provided an overall view of principal behaviors aligned to district expectations, while principals suggested district aligned checklists did not take into consideration the unique contextual needs of their campus. In a similar study, Yavuz (2010) also concluded evaluation instruments aligned more to

performance checklists, as opposed to a focus on behaviors that affect student achievement. Because local school districts tend to develop principal evaluation instruments with little input from the campus principal, instruments used for appraisal purposes traditionally lack a published or tested research base, which brings into question an instrument's validity and reliability (Goldring et al, 2009a). Therefore, if the quality of principal evaluation instruments is poor, improvements to the development of evaluation instruments are critical in the creation of a comprehensive principal evaluation system.

 Findings from this study concluded that the implementation of the principal evaluation process as the most critical factor to effect student achievement. However, there is much room for improvement. For example, , emphasis should be placed on the training of the principal evaluator, inner rater reliability practices across the district to provide consistent results over a period of time to produce valid and reliable measures resulting in fidelity of implementing evaluation processes.

 Perceptions from district evaluators, principal and teachers concluded the primary purpose of the principal evaluation process is to enhance the leadership capacity of the campus principal to influence the overall culture and climate of the school. This occurs through the development of annual professional goals and feedback provided to principals during the evaluation process. However, findings indicate the application of professional goals for the campus principal do not align to the specific needs of the campus or enhance the quality of instruction necessary to increase student achievement. Previous studies have also found evaluation processes lack connections to personal professional growth opportunities, a necessary component for increasing leadership abilities in the areas of school climate and organizational operations (Condon, 2009;

Davis & Hensley, 1999). While considerable research of effective practices for school

principals exists, little evidence is available for models that allow evaluators to judge

effective principal behaviors given the unique contextual needs and cultural

characteristics of individual school circumstances (Brady, 2012; Hallinger & Murphy,

1985; Rinehart & Russo, 1995; Thomas et al., 2000).

District evaluators' specified feedback provided to the principal regarding

performance as a major strength within the evaluation process. Yet, principals described

little confidence pertaining to the motives or intentions of the district office evaluators.

This was specifically true in medium and small districts where evaluators are responsible

for multiple district responsibilities in addition to principal evaluations. Additional

research suggests evaluators whose conflict of interest, district policies, and positioning

of power tend to guide performance evaluations rather than focusing on specific actions

necessary for the principal to increase student achievement (Smylie & Crowson, 1993).

Other studies concluded district evaluators experience "overload" due additional job

duties, and time constraints in meeting the evaluation requirements. As a result, the

inconsistency in the evaluation process compromises the degree to which principals

perceive the approach as helpful 9Davis & Hensley, 1999; Derrington & Sharratt, 2008;

Kimball et al., 2009).

A major strength of this study is the inclusion of teacher perceptions regarding

principal evaluations as currently no studies have incorporated teacher perceptions as a

component in the development of principal evaluation processes (Leithwood, Patten, &

Jantzi 2009). Teachers indicated the principal evaluation process should measure the

principal effectiveness in the area of the instructional leader to influence student

achievement. This includes evaluations instruments and processes that include the ability of the campus principal to build relationships with all stakeholders, the frequency of the principal in monitoring classroom instruction, and techniques to increase staff and student motivation. For example, teachers indicated that principals should be held accountable for the analysis of multiple sources of data to determine the instructional needs of the campus. In addition, the evaluation process should include the opportunity for teachers and other stakeholders to provide input regarding the implementation of effective instructional strategies necessary to increase student achievement. A specific example outlined in this study described the importance of the principal's involvement in teacher staff development necessary to monitor the implementation of training and ability to evaluate the impact on student learning.

Finally, to meet the demands of federal requirements, states must ensure development of principal evaluation systems that include an in-depth study of implementation practices and instrumentation design, resulting in both fidelity and validity within the evaluation process. Findings from this study suggest principal evaluation processes must be developed from the bottom up, meaning the emphasis is on how the campus principal influences the daily instruction in the classroom opposed to how they meet expectations aligned to district initiatives that may or may not meet the needs of the campus. According to Snyder and Ebmeier (1992), a link exists between principal evaluations, teacher quality, and instructional practices. However, documenting a direct link to student performance is difficult. The researchers argue that school districts could hold principals accountable for the achievement, provided they had more control over variables such as teacher selection and school budgets. In order for

principals to influence student achievement, school districts must implement effective

evaluation instruments and procedures. However, Hart (1993) found common evaluation

processes focus on principal processes such as student behaviors and communication.

Because the principal is also responsible for monitoring instruction and learning via

classroom observations, teacher evaluations, and interactions with key stakeholders,

evaluation procedures should emphasize these areas to support student achievement

(Sergiovanni, 1995).

Recommendations for Future Research

This study provided results that may influence the future development of principal

evaluation instruments and processes. Since the data collected came from the State of

Texas' previous student assessment achievement results (TAKS), it may be necessary to

replicate the study with the current student achievement results on the State of Texas

Assessment of Academic Readiness (STAAR) to determine if a correlation may now

exist between evaluation instruments and student performance. In addition, after state

implementation of a new evaluation instrument, which is not locally developed, future

research may reveal a new set of findings that may align to higher student achievement as

a result of the evaluation process. Given that the implementation of the STAAR

assessment that began in 2012, has been highly inconsistent in the reporting of student

achievement, additional research of this nature may need to be delayed until the

development of an entirely new assessment system for Texas.

Most research studies indicate the classroom teacher has the greatest impact on

student achievement. Given that the principal indirectly influences teacher quality, an

area of future research may include a study of principal evaluation processes that incorporate teacher perceptions regarding principal practices that support their efforts in the classroom to increase student achievement. This information may provide possible areas to measure principal effectiveness aligned to student achievement. Additional information regarding the preparation and implementation of principal evaluation processes may be helpful in developing evaluation methods aligned to state requirements to provide more valid and reliable results regarding the influence on student achievement.

Conclusion

In support of the findings from this research, principals, district evaluators, and teachers identified the evaluation process, not the evaluation instrument, as having the greatest potential to influence principal behaviors and positively effect student achievement. Due to federal programs such as *NCLB* legislation and *Race to the Top Funding*, which highlight the roles and responsibilities for campus principals, the need to improve principal evaluation processes has emerged as a primary function in the education reform movement.

Regarding principal evaluation processes and potential influence on student achievement, factors that influence expectancy include the principal's individual belief regarding personal skills and knowledge, a clear understanding of expectations and the ability to perform at the required level of expectations, and substantial support mechanisms to enhance performance (Mohrman & Lawler, 1996). In terms of expectancy theory, principal evaluations should emphasize areas to influence a principal's motivation to include: (a) the principal's perceived ability to complete

required expectations within the evaluation instrument, (b) documentation between expected behaviors and desired outcomes, and (c) valence, that is, perceived rewards based upon performance (Lewis, Goodman, & Fandt, 1995; Vroom, 1964).

This study investigated the following perceptions of the evaluation process: principal accountability, overall performance, and leadership behaviors. Findings indicate that participants perceived a positive relationship within the evaluation process and influence on student achievement, as long as processes enhance the development of leadership capacity including instructional support to improve the culture and climate of the school. This finding mirrors results from Condon (2009), Hallinger and Heck (1998), Leithwood et al. (2000), Sergiovanni (1995), Sun and Young (2009), and Valentine and Prater (2011) whose research found the campus principal impacts as much as 25% of the overall effect on student achievement through instructional leadership practices such as monitoring teacher performance and student learning. The findings also support similar research conducted by Goldring et al., (2009a) signifying the evaluation process as a key strategy for improving schools and ultimately improving student achievement as a result of refining the leadership capacity of the campus principal.

Analysis of participant perceptions revealed district evaluators perceived a stronger relationship between the principal evaluation process and effect on student achievement than those presented by principals and teachers. While the overall perception related to the principal evaluation processes and effect on student achievement was positive, variations regarding actual principal performance in the areas of personal professional development and total impact on personal performance occurred among the participants in the study. This finding also supports similar research conducted by Davis

and Hensley (1999), Harrison and Peterson (1986) and Thomas et al., (2000) indicating a critical pitfall in principal evaluations may result from widespread diversity regarding differences in perceptions as to the usefulness and importance of the principal evaluation process.

Several studies have addressed the identification of principal behaviors that influence student achievement within the principal evaluation process (Catano & Stronge, 2006; Davis & Hensley, 1999; Goldring et al., 2009a; Thomas et al., 2000). Lacking in previous research is the inclusion of teacher perceptions related to principal behaviors that influence student achievement which may enhance the principal evaluation processes. Teachers in this study indicate that professional growth opportunities for the campus principal should focus on school-wide improvements, not necessarily personal principal development. Teachers found effective principals implement classroom-coaching strategies to improve instruction, outline expectations, and mandate needed professional growth individualized for optimal teacher performance. Thus, effective principals align professional development identified through the analysis of multiple sources of data and relate those findings to specific areas of teacher professional growth. Critical in this process is the amount of time principals spend observing classroom instruction and providing effective feedback to classroom teachers. Therefore, principal evaluation processes must accurately measure these areas to reflect the true measure of the principal's performance.

In addition, teacher participants identified potential measures that reflect the overall culture and climate of the campus to positively effect student achievement. Findings from this study indicated effective principals spend extensive amounts of time

building staff relationships and increasing motivation, therefore, these should be reflected

in the principal evaluation process. Given that district evaluators have limited time to

observe principal performance, teacher input in the evaluation process is critical.

REFERENCES

Amsterdam. C., Johnson, T., Morand, M., & Tonnsen, S. (2005). A collaborative approach to the development and validation of a principal evaluation system: A case study. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation, 17*(3), 221-242.

Berebitsky, D., Goddard, R. D., & Carlisle, J. F. (2014). An examination of teachers' perceptions of principal support for change and teachers' collaboration and communication around literacy instruction in reading first schools. *Teachers College Record*, *116*(4), 1.

Blasé, J., & Blasé, J. (1998). Principals' instructional leadership and teacher development: Teachers' perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *35*(3), 349-378.

Brady. L. (2012). *Principal evaluation: A descriptive study of current practices.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). San Diego State University, San Diego, CA.

Branch, G. F., Hanushek, E. A., & Rivkin, S. G. (2013). School leaders matter: Measuring the impact of effective principals. *Education Next, 13*(1), 62-69.

Catano, N., & Stronge, J. H. (2006). What are principals expected to do? Congruence between principal evaluation and performance standards. *NASSP Bulletin*, *90*(3), 221-237.

Center for Public Education. (2012). *The principal perspective: Full report*. Retrieved from http://www.centerforpubliceducation.org/principal-perspective

Checkley, K. (2000). The contemporary principal: New skills for a new age. *Education Update, 42*(3), 1–6.

Clifford, M., Behrstock-Sheratt, E., & Fetters, J. (2012a). *The ripple effect: A synthesis of research in principal influence to inform performance evaluation design*. Naperville, IL: American Institute for Research.

Clifford, M., Hansen, U., & Wraight, S. (2012b). *A practical guide to designing comprehensive principal evaluation systems: A tool to assist in the development of principal evaluation systems*. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED532778

Clifford, M., Menon, R., Condon, C., & Hornung, K. (2012c). *Measuring school climate for gauging principal performance.* Washington, D.C.: American Institute For Research.

Clifford, M., & Ross, S. (2012). *Rethinking principal evaluation: A new paradigm informed by research and practice*. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Elementary School Principals and National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Condon, E. J. (2009). Principal evaluation and student achievement: A study of public elementary schools in Dupage, Will, and Lake Counties, Illinois. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Loyola University, Chicago, IL.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (2008). *Educational leadership policy standards: ISLLC 2008 as adopted by the national policy board for educational administration.* Retrieved from http://www.ccso.org/Documents/2008/Educational_Policy_Standards_2008.pdf

Davis, S. H., & Hensley, P. A. (1999). The politics of principal evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, *13*(4), 383-403.

Dean, J. (2012). *Leadership where it matters: Principal effectiveness and equity in Wisconsin.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AK.

Derrington, M. L., & Sharratt, G. (2008). Evaluation of school principals using interstate school leaders licensure consortium (ISLLC) standards. *AASA Journal of Scholarship & Practice*, *5*(3), 20-29.

Drury, W. R. (1993). The principal's role in site-based management. *Principal*, *73*(1), 16–19.

Edmonds, R. (1980). *Search for effective schools*. Retrieved from http://library.calstate.edu/sandiego/metasearch/results/006988/099880

Edwards, J. R., Caplan, R. D., & Van Harrison, R. (1998). Person-environment fit theory. *Theories of organizational stress*, *28*, 28-67.

Elmore, R. F. (2000). *Building a new structure for school leadership*. Retrieved from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/ download?doi=10.1.1.103.7688&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Ginsberg, R., & Berry, B. (1990). The folklore of principal evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 3*, 205-230.

Ginsberg, R., & Thompson, T. (1992). Dilemmas and solutions regarding principal evaluation. *Peabody Journal of Education, 68*(1), 58-74.

Glassman, N. S. (1992). Toward assessing test score-related actions of principals. *Peabody Journal of Education, 68*(1), 108-123.

Glassman, N. S., & Heck, R. H. (1992). The changing leadership role of the principal: Implications for principal assessment. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *68*(1), 5-24.

Glassman, N. S., & Martens, P. A. (1993). Personnel evaluation standards: Their use in principal assessment systems. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *68*(2), 47-63.

Goldring, E., Porter, A., Murphy, J., Elliott, S. N., & Cravens, X. (2009b). Assessing learning-centered leadership: Connections to research, professional standards, and current practices. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *8*(1), 1-36.

Goldring, E., Cravens, X., Murphy, J., Porter, A. C., Elliott, S. N., & Carson, B. (2009a). The evaluation of principals: What and how do states and urban districts assess leadership? *The Elementary School Journal, 110*(1), 19-39.

Gravetter, F., & Wallnau, L. (2009). *Statistics for the behavioral sciences*, (9th Ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Grigsby, B., Schumacher, G., Decman, J., & Simieou III, F. (2010). A principal's dilemma: Instructional leader or manager. *Academic Leadership*, *8*(3), 3-8.

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1998). Exploring the principal's contribution to school effectiveness: 1980-1995, *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 9*(2), 157-191.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *The Elementary School Journal, 86*(2), 217-247.

Harrison, W. C., & Peterson, K. D. (1986). Pitfalls in the evaluation of principals. *Urban Review, 18*(4), 221-235.

Hart, A. W. (1993). The social and organizational influences of principals: Evaluating principals in context. *Peabody Journal of Education, 68(*2), 37-57.

Heck, R. H., & Marcoulides, G. A. (1996). The assessment of principal performance: A multileveled evaluation approach. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 10,* 11-28.

Jacobson, D. (1987). A personological study of the job insecurity experience. *Social Behavior 2*, 143-155.

Johnson, N. A. (1989). Criteria for assessing the effectiveness of schools and principals. *Education Canada, 29*(2), 14-19.

Johnson, R. B., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Turner, L. A. (2007). Toward a definition of mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 1*(2), 123.

Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. (2008). *Personnel evaluation standards*. Retrieved from http://www.jcsee.org/personnel-evaluation-standards

Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J. D., & Rosenthal, R. A. (1964). *Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity.* New York: Wiley.

Kegan, R., & Lahey, L. L. (2001). *How the way we talk can change the way we work: Seven languages for transformation*. New York, NY: Wiley

Kimball, S. M., Heneman III, H. G., & Milanowski, A. (2007). Performance evaluation and compensation for public school principals, *ERS Spectrum, 25*(4), 11-21.

Kimball, S. M., Milanowski, A., & McKinney, S.A. (2009). Assessing the promise of standards-based performance evaluation for principals: Results from a randomized trial. *Leadership in Policy in Schools, 8*(3), 233-263.

Kimball, S. M., & Pautsch, C.A. (2008) *Principal evaluation and support in two school districts using new leadership standards: A cross section comparison.* Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin-Madison, Wisconsin Center for Education Research.

Lashway, L. (2003). *ERIC - Improving principal evaluation.* Retrieved from

http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED482347

Lawler, E. E. (1973). *Motivation in work organization*. New York: Brooks Cole.

Leithwood, K., Begley, P., & Cousins, J. B., (1994). *Developing expert leadership for

future schools*. London: Falmer Press.

Leithwood, K., Steinbach, R., & Jantzi, D. (2002). School leadership and teachers'

motivation to implement accountability policies. *Educational Administration

Quarterly, 38*(1), 94-119.

Leithwood, K., Seashore Louise, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How

leadership influences student learning*. Toronto, Canada: Center for Applied

Research and Educational Improvement & Ontario Institute for Studies in

Education; Wallace Foundation.

Leithwood, K., Patten, S., & Jantzi, D. (2009). Testing a conception of how school

leadership influences student learning. *Education Administration Quarterly.

46*(5)*,* 671-706.

Lewis, P. S., Goodman, S. H., & Fandt, P.M. (1995). *Management challenges in the 21ˢᵗ

century.* New York: West Publishing.

Lezotte, L. W. (1992). "Principal" insights from effective schools. *Education

Digest, 58*(3), 14-17.

Lipham, J. M., Rankin, R. E., & Hoeh, J. A. Jr. (1986). *The principalship: Concepts,

competencies, and cases.* White Plains, NY: Longman.

Mace-Matluck, B. (1987). *The effective schools movement: Its history and context: An

SEDL monograph. Retrieved from

http://eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/custom/portlets/recordDetails/

detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_&ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=ED304781&ERI

CExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=ED304781

Martin, W. J., & Willower, D. J. (1981). The managerial behavior of high school

principals. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *17*(1), 69-90.

Marzano, R., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. (2005). *School leadership that works: From

research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum

 Development.

McAdams, R. P., & Barilla, M.A. (2003). Theory and practice in performance appraisal

of school administrators. *Research for Educational Reform, 8,* 19-35.

Milanowski, T., Kimball, S. M., & Pautsch, C. (2008). *Study of Milwaukee Public

Schools principal evaluation system: Summary of preliminary findings*. Madison,

WI: University of Wisconsin, Wisconsin Center for Education Research.

Miles, M., & Huberman, A. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded source book.

2nd edition.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Miles, J., & Gilbert, P. (2005). *A handbook of research methods for clinical and health

psychology*. Oxford University Press on Demand.

Mohrman, S. A., & Lawler, E. E. (1996). *Motivation for school reform. Rewards and

reform: Creating educational incentives that work*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-

Bass Publishers.

Murphy, J. A., & Pimentel, S. (1996). Grading principals: Administrator evaluations

come of age. *Phi Delta Kappan, 78*(1), 74-81.

National Conference of State Legislatures (2013). *Evaluating school principals: A legislative approach*. Retrieved from http://www.ncsl.org/documents/educ/SchoolPrincipals.pdf

Nettles, S. M., & Herrington, C. (2007). Revisiting the importance of the direct effects of school leadership on student achievement: The implications for school improvement policy. *Peabody Journal of Education, 82*(4), 724-736.

New Leaders. (2013). *Leadership matters.* Retrieved from http://www.newleaders.org/impact/leadership-matters/

Osborn, R. N., & Hunt, J. G. (1975). An adaptive-reactive theory of leadership: The role of macro variables in leadership research. *Leadership Frontiers*, *27*, 44-73.

Pearce, J. L. (1981). Bringing some clarity to role ambiguity research. *Academy of Management Review*, *6*(4), 665-674.

Piro, J., Wiemers, R., & Shutt, T. (2011). Using student achievement data in teacher and principal evaluations: A policy study. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, *6*(4), 4-12.

Portin, B. S., Feldman, S., & Knapp, M. S. (2006). *Purpose, uses, and practices of leadership assessment in education*. Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, University of Washington.

Rinehart, J. S., & Russo, C. J. (1995). The Kentucky education reform act and the evaluation of school principals. *International Journal of Educational Reform, 4*(1), 51-60.

Reeves, D. B. (2004). *Assessing educational leaders: Evaluating performance for improved individual and organizational Results*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Schumacher, G. (2010). Complex teacher evaluation systems can produce negative perceptions. *ERS Spectrum, 28*(2), 27-36.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1995). *The principalship: A Reflective practice perspective* (3rd Ed). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Shrout, P., & Fleiss, J. (1979). Intraclass correlations: Uses in assessing rater reliability. *Psychological Bulletin, 86*(2), 420-428.

Smylie, M. A., & Crowson, R. L. (1993). Principal assessment under restructured governance. *Peabody Journal of Education, 68*(2), 64-84

Snyder, J., & Ebmeier, H. (1992). Empirical linkages among principal behaviors and intermediate outcomes: Implications for principal evaluation. *Peabody Journal of Education, 68*(1), 75-107.

State Consortium on Educator Effectiveness. (2014). *Evaluating school principal effectiveness.* Retrieved from: http://scee.groupsite.com/page/webinars.

Stronge, J. H., Richard, H. B., & Catano N. (2008). *Qualities of effective principals*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Stufflebeam, D., & Nevo, D. (1993). New ways to evaluate the performance of school principals. *Peabody Journal of Education, 68*(2), 24-46.

Sun, M., & Youngs, P. (2009). How does district principal evaluation affect learning-centered principal leadership? Evidence from Michigan school districts. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *8*(4), 411-445.

Texas Education Agency. (2007, March). *TAKS information booklet- mathematics*.

Retrieved from http://www.tea.state.tx.us/student.assessment/taks/

Texas Education Agency. (2010). *Systems used to evaluate principal performance*.

Retrieved from

http://search.tea.state.tx.us/search?access=p&entqr=0&output=xml_no_dtd&sort=

date%3AD%3AL%3Ad1&ud=1&client=default_frontend&oe=UTF-8&ie=UTF-

8&proxystylesheet=default_frontend&site=default_collection&q=principal%20ev

aluatio n%20systems

Texas Education Agency. (2011a). *Principal evaluations including student performance.*

Retrieved from

tea.texas.gov/WorkArea/linkit.aspx?LinkIdentifier=id&ItemID=2147502756&libI

D=2147502750

Texas Education Agency. (2011b). *AYP guide.* Retrieved from

http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/ayp/2011/index.html

Texas Education Agency. (2011c). *2011 Title I School Improvement List.* Retrieved from

http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/ayp/2011/index.html

Texas Education Agency. (2011d). *2011 Campus Comparison Group*, Retrieved from

http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/cgi/sas/broker

Texas Education Agency. (2015). *TAKS Resources*. Retrieved from

http://www.tea.state.tx.us/student.assessment/taks/

Texas Education Agency. (2012a). *Update on the progress of the Texas high

performance   schools consortium*. Retrieved from

file:///C:/Users/mmcmahon/Downloads/FinalReportFromTxHighPerformanceSch
oolsConsortium.pdf

Texas Education Agency. (2012b). *Enrollment in Texas public schools 2010-11*.

Retrieved from http://www.tea.state.tx.us/acctres/Enroll_2010-11.pdf

Thomas, D. W., Holdaway, E. A., & Ward, K. L. (2000). Policies and practices in the

evaluation of school principals. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education,
14*(3), 215-240.

Torrence, V. D. (2002). *Principals' use of data: A national perspective* (Doctoral

dissertation), Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Va.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Garcia, C. R. (2004). Principals' sense of efficacy: Assessing a

promising construct. *Journal of Educational Administration, 42*(5), 573-585.

U.S. Department of Education. (2011). *Federal Register*, 76(174).. Retrieved from

http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2011-09-08/html/2011- 23011.htm

U.S. Department of Education. (2009). *Race to the top executive summary*. Retrieved

from http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/executive-summary.pdf

U.S. Department of Education. (2014). *Definitions*. Retrieved from

http://www.ed.gov/race-top/district-competition/definitions

U.S. Legal Definitions. (2014a). *The American recovery and reinvestment act of 2009

law & legal definition*. Retrieved from http:/ defintions.uslegal.com/t/the-

American-recovery-and-reinvestment-act-of 2009

U.S. Legal Definitions. (2014b). *No child left behind act law & legal definition*.

Retrieved from http://definitions.uslegal.com/n/no-child-left-behind-act/

Valentine, J. W., & Prater, M. (2011). Instructional, transformational, and managerial leadership and student achievement: High school principals make a difference. *NASSP Bulletin*, *95*(1), 5-30.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Williams, E. (2009). Evaluation of a school systems plan to utilize teachers' perceptions of principal leadership to improve student achievement. *Challenge (1077193X)*, *15*(1), 15-32.

Wise, A. E., & Verstegen, D. A. (2000). Arthur E. Wise and the promise of equal educational opportunity. *Journal of Education Finance*, *25*(Spring), 583-596.

Witziers, B., Bosker, R. J., & Krüger, M. L. (2003). Educational leadership and student achievement: The elusive search for an association. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *39*(3), 398-425.

Yavuz, M. (2010). Effectiveness of supervisions conducted by primary education supervisors according to school principals' evaluations. *Journal of Educational Research*, *103*(6), 371-378.

APPENDIX A

PRINCIPAL EVALUATION ATTRIBUTES, FEEDBACK AND PERCEPTION

SURVEY

APPENDIX A

PRINCIPAL EVALUATION ATTRIBUTES, FEEDBACK AND PERCEPTION

SURVEY

Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability:

Question 1

1. Is this the first year in which you have served as principal at the school where you are

currently employed?

• Yes

• No

Questions 2 –11 (*Randomly presented in the survey driv*er)

To what extent, if at all, have the following methods been used to formally evaluate your

performance as principal?

	Not At All			Neutral		Very Much	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2. Narrative self-evaluation

3. Portfolio/dossier

4. Checklist/rating system

5. Supervisor observation

6. Narrative evaluation by supervisor

7. Data-based evaluation

8. Survey data from teachers, parents, or students

9. Peer supervision/review

10. Anecdotal evidence

11. Perception feedback from stakeholders

Question 12

How frequently are you evaluated in your current role as principal? Please check the most

appropriate response.

• Monthly

• Quarterly

• Semi-annually

• Annually

• Every other year

• Every three years

• Sporadically

• Never

Question 13-23 (*Randomly presented in the survey driver*)

To what extent, if at all, do you perceive principal evaluation accomplishing the

following objectives?

Not At All		Neutral		Very Much	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

13. Satisfy district accountability requirements

14. Increase standardized assessment scores

15. Provide principals with professional growth

16. Document sub-standard principal performance

17. Identify the needs for principal professional development

18. Provide incentive for performance improvement

19. Reward exemplary principal performance

20. Ensure adherence to policies and procedures

21. Support the maintenance of the instructional program

22. Improve pupil achievement

23. Foster positive school climate

Question 24

To what extent does you district incorporate student achievement to the final rating of the

principal evaluation? Please check the most appropriate response.

- None

- 1-10%

- 11-20%

- 21-30%

- 31-40%

- 41-50%

- More than 50%

Some ideas do not lend themselves to check box format. I would greatly appreciate if you

would respond to the following four questions with your thoughts.

Question 25

What effect, if any, has your experience with evaluation had on your beliefs about

principal performance? Please explain.

Question 26

What effect, if any, has your experience with evaluation had on your beliefs about your

own professional development? Please explain.

Question 27

Do you believe that the principal evaluation process has an impact on pupil performance?

Please explain.

Question 28

Do you believe that the principal evaluation process has an impact on your own

professional development? Please explain.

Question 29

Please indicate the school structure that best describes the environment in which you

work.

Grades:

•PreK-8

•K-3

•K-4

•K-5

•K-6

•K-8

•1-3

•1-5

•2-5

•3-5

•4-5

•5-6

•5-8

•6-8

•7-8

•9

•9-10

•11-12

•9-12

Question 30

Please indicate the number of years for which you have served as principal at the school

where you are presently employed.

　　Number of years: (*open field*)

Question 31

Please indicate the total number of years for which you have served as a school principal.

　　Number of years: (open field)

Question 32

How many schools are in the district in which you are employed?

Number of schools:

• 1-3

• 4-6

• 7-9

• 10-15

• 15 or more

Question 33

Please indicate the title that best describes the supervisor who is responsible for

evaluating you.

Title:

• Superintendent

• Deputy Superintendent

• Assistant Superintendent

• Director

• Other (open field)

Question 34

Please indicate the county in which you are presently employed. (*open field*)

APPENDIX B

PRINCIPAL EVALUATION INSTRUMENT RUBRIC AND SCORING SHEET

APPENDIX B

PRINCIPAL EVALUATION INSTRUMENT RUBRIC AND SCORING SHEET

Descriptors	Unsatisfactory 0	Basic 1	Proficient 2	Exceeds Expectation 3
1. §150.1021 requires principal's to be evaluated on 9 Performance Domains	Not all of the 9 performance domains are present in the evaluation instrument	Addresses all 9 performance domains in the evaluation instrument	All 9 performance domains and descriptors are present in the evaluation instrument.	All 9 performance domains and descriptors are present in the evaluation instrument and evidence of performance is required to award credit.
I. Instructional Management				
1. Monitoring Student Achievement	Does not address the principal's role in the use of data to evaluate instruction or to identify trends and prioritize needs	Addresses the principal's role in the use of data to evaluate instruction or to identify trends and prioritize needs	Evaluates the principal's ability to use multiple sources of data to monitor instruction, identify trends, prioritize needs and creates a system for data monitoring to inform continuous improvement	Requires the principal to use multiple sources of quantitative and qualitative data to assess and monitor instruction; identifies systems for consistent monitoring and frequent collection of data and uses the data appropriately to identify student outcomes, trends, prioritize needs, and drive continuous improvement
2. Diagnosing Student Needs	Does not address the principal's role in ensuring instructional strategies to support student learning	Addresses the principal's role in holding teachers accountable for analyzing student work and learning data	Evaluates the principal's ability to hold teachers accountable for analyzing student work and learning data and the implementation of structured data meetings	Requires the principal to build their capacity to hold teachers accountable for analyzing student work and learning data, and builds the capacity of the staff to create structured data meetings

3. Helping Teachers Design Learning Experiences for Students	Does not address the principal's role in supporting the staff in the use of lessons and units connected to year end goals and/or the district's curriculum	Addresses the principal's role in supporting the staff in the use of lessons and units connected to year end goals and/or the district's curriculum	Evaluates the principal's ability to lead analysis of standards, curricula, and aligned assessments to develop and implement lessons and units linked to year end goals and/or the district's curriculum; oversees revisions to units and lessons based on student outcomes	Requires the principal to build the capacity of the staff to analyze standards, curricula, and aligned assessments to develop and implement lessons and units linked to year end goals and/or the district's curriculum; implement ongoing systems to review and improve units and lessons based on student outcomes
4. Encourages the development and piloting of innovative instructional programs	Does not address the principal's role in encouraging the development and piloting of innovative instructional programs	Addresses the principal's role in encouraging the development and piloting of innovative instructional programs to meet the diverse student learning needs, especially for diverse socio economic backgrounds and low performance	Evaluates the principal's ability to actively work with teachers to implement a system of individual learning plans for all students and adults based on formative and summative assessments, using collaboration to develop innovative and flexible instructional practices	Requires the principal to build the capacity of stakeholders to evaluate learning plans and innovative programs, and make revisions and adjustments based on student performance.

Descriptors	Unsatisfactory 0	Basic 1	Proficient 2	Exceeds Expectation 3
II. School Morale				
1. Assesses and plans for improvement of the school and community environment	Does not address the principal's role in assessing and planning for improvement of the school and community environment	Addresses the principal's role in assessing and planning for improvement of the school and community environment by conferring with a subset of stakeholders to review summative student achievement data results and selected school practices	Evaluates the principal's ability to engage staff in a comprehensive diagnosis of the school's strengths and growth areas by analyzing student outcomes and school practices to inform decision-making processes	Requires the principal to build the capacity of the staff to collaboratively and continuously analyze summative and interim student learning outcomes, predictive indicators, and school practices to diagnose the current state of the school and community environment to inform the decision-making process
2. Reinforces excellence	Does not address the principal's role in reinforcing excellence	Addresses the principal's role in reinforcing excellence by providing leadership opportunities to teachers who express interest; attempts to support the development in leading other adults	Evaluates the principal's ability to identify effective teachers and provides them with leadership opportunities; supports the development of teacher leaders and leadership team members	Requires the principal to actively provide meaningful leadership opportunities to effective teachers; mentors and supports teacher leaders and leadership team members in leading other adults; communicates a clear leadership trajectory to those teachers with the most leadership potential
3. Promotes a positive, caring climate of learning	Does not address the principal's role in promoting a positive, caring climate of learning	Addresses the principal's role in promoting a positive, caring climate of learning by providing some supports for students' social and emotional development, supports for meaningful connections between students and adults; manages a school environment that is safe	Evaluates the principal's ability to work with staff to support student's social and emotional development; respects and values each student in the school and fosters strong connections among students and adults by ensuring that every student has at least one trusting and supportive adult connection; ensures the school environment is safe and secure	Requires the principal to build the capacity of staff to support and enhance students' social and emotional development; ensures that each student is valued through systems that foster and facilitate strong connections with other students and adults; continually assesses systems and procedures to ensure the school environment is safe and secure

4. Uses effective communication skills	Does not address the principal's role in using effective communication skills	Addresses the principal's role in using effective communication skills by developing systems to share information with stakeholders; hosts conversations with stakeholders about school goals; supports staff in developing their communication skills	Evaluates the principal's ability to conduct and support effective two-way communication with all stakeholders; strategically engages stakeholders in conversations about school goals and values; works with the leadership team to lead conversations and tailor messages to the intended audience	Requires the principal to implement effective two-way communication structures with district/system managers and all stakeholders; strategically focuses conversation on school goals and values; builds the capacity of staff to lead and participate in conversations and to tailor messages to the intended audience

Descriptors	Unsatisfactory 0	Basic 1	Proficient 2	Exceeds Expectation 3
III. School Improvement				
1. Collaborating in the development and articulation of a common vision of improvement	Does not address the principal's role in collaborating in the development and articulation of a common vision of improvement	Addresses the principal's role in developing a school vision for high student achievement and provides some opportunities for staff and students to provide input on the school vision	Evaluates the principal's ability to engage stakeholders in developing a vision for high student achievement	Requires the principal to engage stakeholders in the collaborative development of a vision for high student achievement
2. Encouraging appropriate risk-taking	Does not address the principal's role in encouraging appropriate risk-taking	Addresses the principal's role in encouraging appropriate risk-taking via minimal sharing of knowledge and resources through formal networks. These networks are connected to requirements of local, state, national or federal mandates	Evaluates the principal's ability to regularly encourage teachers and other adults to connect and share knowledge, skills, and diverse resources by building relationships and networks through existing learning communities within the school, district, and nation	Requires the principal to engage all teachers and some stakeholders to create, lead, participate in, and sustain local, state, and national networks as a key strategy for accessing new knowledge and diverse resources to increase student and adult performance.
3. Ensuring continuous renewal of curriculum, policies, and methods	Does not address the principal's role in ensuring continuous renewal of curriculum, policies, and methods	Addresses the principal's role in ensuring continuous renewal of curriculum, policies, and methods via joint planning and reflection to satisfy local, state, and national or federal mandates	Evaluates the principal's ability to engage the teachers in participating and supporting multiple ongoing internal professional learning communities that reflect on current practices and examine performance data to reach collective agreements on needed interventions and changes in instructional practices	Requires the principal to sustain the learning culture by consistently managing collaborative structures to address the changing learning needs of both students and adults. By including stakeholders, the principal encourages individual leadership to enhance planning, reflection and work of the school

Descriptors	Unsatisfactory 0	Basic 1	Proficient 2	Exceeds Expectation 3
IV. Personnel Management				
1. Delegating appropriately	Does not address the principal's role in delegating appropriately	Addresses the principal's role in delegating appropriately by allowing the leadership of others to satisfy state, local, national or federal program requirements	Evaluates the principal's ability to utilize key leaders to model collaborative leadership by engaging the leadership skills of others to develop and advance learning community efforts to improve practices to attain the school vision	Requires the principal to build the capacity of all stakeholders to develop a shared leadership culture that builds on the alignment of everyone's leadership style, skill and experience, based on the work to be done. Shared leadership creates shared responsibility for implementation and accountability for learning results
2. Recognizing exemplary performance of teachers and staff	Does not address the principal's role in recognizing exemplary performance of teachers and staff	Addresses the principal's role in recognizing exemplary performance of teachers and staff by occasionally celebrating adult achievement	Evaluates the principal's ability to collaborate with stakeholders to ensure the exemplary performance of teachers and staff are celebrated on a regular basis	Requires the principal to build the capacity of all stakeholders to create a school culture where the celebration of exemplary performance of teachers and staff occur on a daily basis
3. Encouraging personal and professional growth and leadership among the staff	Does not address the principal's role in encouraging personal and professional growth and leadership among the staff	Addresses the principal's role in providing professional development experiences that are connected or embedded in teaching and learning experiences	Evaluates the principal's ability to collaborate with key stakeholders to use student performance to weed out professional development investments where there is no evidence of direct connections to student learning needs	Requires the principal to build the capacity of all teachers to ensure that all professional development models quality teaching practices and produces measurable change in teaching and learning
4. Complying with applicable personnel policies and rules	Does not address the principal's role in complying with applicable personnel policies and rules	Addresses the principal's role in complying with applicable personnel policies and rules as outlined in district board policy	Evaluates the principal's ability to work collaboratively with the leadership team to complying with applicable personnel policies and rules as outlined in district board policy	Requires the principal to build the capacity of school leaders to assist with the compliance of applicable personnel policies and rules as outlined in district board policy
5. Securing the necessary personnel resources to meet objectives	Does not address the principal's role in securing the necessary personnel resources to meet	Addresses the principal's role in securing the necessary personnel by	Evaluates the principal's ability to identify recruits within and beyond the district, develops	Requires the principal to identify multiple pipelines within and beyond the district for high

	objectives	utilizing district resources to identify high quality resources to meet objectives	clear selection criteria and hiring practices and involves teacher leaders in the selection, hiring, and induction process.	quality recruits, engages all staff in developing and implementing clear, specific selection criteria and hiring processes, builds the capacity of the staff to lead and participate in selection, hiring, and induction processes
6. Evaluating the job performance of assigned personnel	Does not address the principal's role in evaluating the job performance of assigned personnel	Addresses the principal's role in evaluating the job performance of assigned personnel by conducting observations to gather evidence of acceptable practices	Evaluates the principal's ability to conduct frequent formal and informal observations to collect evidence of teacher and staff practices and tailors observations based on individual needs	Requires the principal to build and develop the capacity of the leadership team to conduct frequent formal and informal observations to collect evidence of teacher and staff practices and tailors these observations on individual needs and to school-wide initiatives

Descriptors	Unsatisfactory 0	Basic 1	Proficient 2	Exceeds Expectation 3
V. Management of Administrative, Fiscal, and Facilities Functions				
1. Obtaining broad-based input for fiscal or financial analysis	Does not address the principal's role in obtaining broad-based input for fiscal or financial analysis	Addresses the principal's role in obtaining broad-based input for fiscal or financial analysis based on criteria and requirements by local, state, national or federal requirements with limited input from teachers, staff, students or community members	Evaluates the principal's ability to engage faculty and some community members to align the allocation of school and community resources based on group and individual student learning needs	Requires the principal to build the capacity of teachers, staff, students and stakeholders to ensure financial allocations are equitable and determined by the changing learning needs of students, adults, and the school community.
2. Compiling reasonable budgets and cost estimates	Does not address the principal's role in compiling reasonable budgets and cost estimates	Addresses the principal's role in compiling reasonable budgets and cost estimates by distributing the school's resources based on campus priorities	Evaluates the principal's ability to allocate all resources in alignment with school priorities and seeks external resources to fill any existing gaps	Requires the principal to build the capacity of key stakeholders to creatively leverage and maximize school and district resources, and is relentless in actively accessing additional resources that align to strategic priorities
3. Ensuring that facilities are maintained and upgraded as necessary	Does not address the principal's role in ensuring that facilities are maintained and upgraded as necessary	Addresses the principal's role in ensuring that facilities are maintained and upgraded as necessary through effective communication with campus and district personnel	Evaluates the principal's ability to collaborate with stakeholders to develop processes that ensure facilities are maintained and upgraded as necessary	Requires the principal to build the capacity of the leadership team in the implementation of processes that ensure facilities are maintained and upgraded as necessary
4. Managing a broad range of school operations (attendance, accounting, payroll, transportation).	Does not address the principal's role in managing a broad range of school operations (attendance, accounting, payroll, transportation).	Addresses the principal's role in managing a broad range of school operations (attendance, accounting, payroll, transportation) by developing routines that connect to student achievement and make transitions efficient	Evaluates the principal's ability to implement routines to maximize instructional time, support smooth transitions and maintain a focus on achieving the school's vision	Requires the principal to build the capacity of staff to implement school-wide routines to maximize instructional time, ensure seamless transitions, and maintain focus on achieving the school's vision

Descriptors	Unsatisfactory 0	Basic 1	Proficient 2	Exceeds Expectation 3
VI. Student Management				
1. Helps students to build a sense of self-worth	Does not address the principal's role in helping students to build a sense of self-worth	Addresses the principal's role in helping students to build a sense of self-worth through the creation of innovative programs that impact the unique needs of the student population	Evaluates the principal's ability to collaborate with key stakeholders to analyze the unique needs of the student population and implement innovative programs that meet those needs within the school day	Requires the principal to build the capacity of teachers, staff, and community members to identify and implement researched-based innovative programs that meet the unique needs of the student population both during and beyond the traditional school day setting
2. Develops and communicates guidelines for student conduct	Does not address the principal's role in developing and communicating guidelines for student conduct	Addresses the principal's role in developing and communicating guidelines for student conduct	Evaluates the principal's ability to translate the schools values into specific expectations for adults and students	Requires the principal to build the capacity of staff and students to translate the school's values into specific expectations for adults and students
3. Ensures rules are observed with uniformity	Does not address the principal's role in ensuring rules are observed with uniformity	Addresses the principal's role in ensuring rules are observed with uniformity	Evaluates the principal's ability to ensure staff explicitly teaches expectations to students	Requires the principal to consistently models and teaches the schools' values and ensures the staff explicitly teaches expectations to students
4. Disciplines students for misconduct in an effective and fair manner	Does not address the principal's role in disciplining students for misconduct in an effective and fair manner	Addresses the principal's role in disciplining students for misconduct in an effective and fair manner by applying positive and negative consequences	Evaluates the principal's ability to implement systems to ensure the code of conduct and positive and negative consequences are consistently and fairly implemented	Requires the principal to build the capacity of the leadership team to implement systems to ensure the code of conduct is consistently and fairly implemented, tracks discipline data to ensure equitable application of positive and negative consequences
5. Supports collaboration by working with the faculty	Does not address the principal's role in supporting collaboration by working with the faculty	Addresses the principal's role in supporting collaboration by working	Evaluates the principal's ability to support teaching and learning by creating a flexible schedule that	Requires the principal to include all staff in participating in and supporting multiple ongoing

		with the faculty in some joint planning and reflection to satisfy requirements of local, state, national or federal mandates	provides time and space for joint planning, work, and reflection to better support individual learning and group needs	internal professional learning communities that are led by teachers or instructional leaders
6. Encourages the participation of students and parents	Does not address the principal's role in encouraging the participation of students and parents	Addresses the principal's role in encouraging the participation of students and parents by maintaining a variety of data required by local, state, national or federal mandates that is seldom shared with the school community in the decision making process	Evaluates the principal's ability to collaborate with teachers, some students, parents and community partners to analyze data regularly to monitor the effectiveness of their work and make decisions about changes to improve learning	Requires the principal to include teachers, students and stakeholders in actions that regularly engage them in data gathering and analysis and view data as fundamental in guiding decisions and creating systematic interventions to improve student, adult and school performance

Descriptors	Unsatisfactory 0	Basic 1	Proficient 2	Exceeds Expectation 3
VII. School or Community Relations				
1. Fosters collaborative educational efforts among members of the total school community	Does not address the principal's role in fostering collaborative educational efforts among members of the total school community	Addresses the principal's role in fostering collaborative educational efforts among members of the total school community by including parents from diverse backgrounds involved in the school through formal structures required by local, state, national or federal mandates	Evaluates the principal's ability to collaborate with teachers to seek input from all parents and families to create meaningful engagement that supports student performance.	Requires the principal to build the capacity of teachers and school leaders to involve volunteers that are regularly engaged with all stakeholders to expand relationships and participation that support school performance
2. Articulates the school mission and needs to the community seeking support for school programs	Does not address the principal's role in articulating the school mission and needs to the community seeking support for school programs	Addresses the principal's role in articulating the school mission and needs to the community seeking support for school programs by broadly communicating the mission to adults and students in the school community	Evaluates the principal's ability to collaborate with stakeholders to support adults and students in the school community in taking ownership of the missions; work with the leadership team to implement effective instructional strategies to achieve the mission and makes decisions aligned to and in support of the mission of the school	Requires the principal to build the capacity of the staff to inspire all adults and students in the learning community to adopt and enact the school mission along with the capacity of the staff to implement effective instructional strategies to achieve the mission and ensures all decisions are aligned to and support the mission of the school
3. Is involved in community activities that foster rapport between the school, district and larger community	Does not address the principal's role in involving community activities that foster rapport between the school, district and larger community	Addresses the principal's role in involving community activities that foster rapport between the school, district and larger community through the development of a few school and community partnerships that exist due to local, state, national or federal mandates	Evaluates the principal's ability to collaborate with teachers regularly to scan the interests and resources of different sectors of the community to establish learning partnerships explicitly aligned with the learning needs of students with an increased emphasis on out-of-school experiences.	Requires the principal to build the capacity of the teachers and staff to work collaboratively with the community to create, align, and sustain a partnership system of in-school and out-of-school learning experiences for all students

Descriptors	Unsatisfactory 0	Basic 1	Proficient 2	Exceeds Expectation 3
VIII. Professional Growth and Development				
1. Participate actively in professional organizations	Does not address the principal's role in participating actively in professional organizations	Addresses the principal's enrollment in professional organizations	Evaluates the principal's ability to support various professional organizations through active participation in meetings and conferences	Requires the principal to enhance the mission of various professional organizations by holding office or presenting information at meetings or state conferences
2. Acts in an ethical and professional manner	Does not address the principal's role in acting in an ethical and professional manner	Addresses the principal's adherence to the Texas Educators Code of ethics	Evaluates the principal's ability to collaborate with staff members to develop ongoing discussions on the importance of all staff adhering to the Texas Educators Code of Ethics	Requires the principal to build the capacity of school leaders in training and modeling for the school community the importance of and possible negative consequences for not adhering to the Texas Educators Code of Ethics
3. Disseminates ideas and information to other professionals	Does not address the principal's role in disseminating ideas and information to other professionals	Addresses the principal's role in disseminating ideas and information to other professionals by notifying peers of new programs and results as required by local, state, national or federal mandates	Evaluates the principal's ability to collaborate with counselors and teachers to market and explain the school's unique learning opportunities to peers within the profession	Requires the principal to build the capacity of counselors, teachers, students and parents to market the school and its uniqueness to the professional community
4. Seeks and uses information for improvement of performance	Does not address the principal's role in seeking and using information for improvement of performance	Addresses the principal's role in seeking and using information for improvement of performance by listening to the diverse perspective of peers, but makes limited connection to the school vision and mission	Evaluates the principal's ability to collaborate with peers that incorporates diverse perspectives, identifies key messages from stakeholders to gather information that will impact student performance based upon the unique needs of the campus	Requires the principal to build their capacity to network with other principals with similar demographics that have success in gains in student performance and can build their capacity of the leadership staff to implement new strategies that would increase student performance for their specific campus

IX. Academic Excellence Indicators and Campus Performance Objectives				
1. Promotes improvement of the students on the campus by comparing disaggregated performance results to the state accountability standards and to the prior year performance	Does not address the principal's role in promoting improvement of the students on the campus by comparing disaggregated performance results to the state accountability standards and to the prior year performance	Addresses the principal's role in promoting improvement of the students on the campus by comparing disaggregated performance results to the state accountability standards and to the prior year performance	Evaluates the principal's ability to collaborate with the teaching staff to develop and implement a campus improvement plan based upon disaggregated performance results to the state accountability standards and to the prior year performance	Requires the principal to build the capacity of the staff, students, parents and key community stakeholders to develop, implement, and evaluate on a regular basis a campus improvement plan based upon comparing disaggregated performance results to the state accountability standards and to the prior year performance

Principal Evaluation Instrument Rubric Scoring Sheet		
District 1		
Descriptors	**Score 0-3**	**Notes**
1. All 9 Performance Domains		
I. Instructional Management		
1. Monitoring Students		
2. Diagnosing Needs		
3. Teachers Design Experiences		
4. Innovative Instructional Programs		
II. School Morale		
1. Assess and Plan for Improvement		
2. Reinforces Excellence		
3. Positive School Climate		
4. Effective Communication		
III. School Improvement		
1. Develop and Articulate School Vision		
2. Engages in Risk-Taking		
3. Renewal of Curriculum, Policies and Methods		
IV. Personnel Management		
1. Delegates Appropriately		
2. Recognizes Exemplary Performance		
3. Encourages Professional Growth		
4. Complies with Personnel Policies		
5. Secures Personnel Resources		
6. Evaluates Job Performance		
V. Management of Admin, Fiscal and Facilities		
1. Input for Fiscal Analysis		
2. Compiles Budgets		
3. Facilities are Maintained and Upgraded		
4. Broad Range of School Operations		
VI. Student Management		
1. Student Self- Worth		
2. Guidelines for Student Code of Conduct		
3. Rules Observed with Uniformity		
4. Disciplines Effectively		
5. Supports Collaboration with Faculty		
6. Encourages Participation of Other		
VII. School or Community Relations		
1. Fosters Collaboration of the School Community		
2. Articulates the school mission		
3. Fosters Rapport Between the School and Community		
VIII. Professional Growth and Development		
1. Participates in Professional Organizations		
2. Acts in an Ethical Manner		
3. Disseminates Ideas to Other Professional		
4. Uses Information to Improve Performance		
IX. Academic Excellence Indicators and Campus Performance		
1. Disaggregates Performance Results to the Accountability System		

APPENDIX C

PRINCIPAL SURVEY E-MAIL

APPENDIX C

PRINCIPAL SURVEY E-MAIL

September1, 2013

Dear Principal:

Greetings! You are being solicited to complete the *Principal Evaluation Attributes, Feedback and Perception* survey. The purpose of this survey is to examine method and feedback frequency of principal evaluations and their potential impact on student achievement. The survey is available today by clicking the following link: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/PrincipalEvaluations. This survey will be available until September 18, 2013. Please try to answer all the questions. Filling out the attached survey is entirely voluntary, but answering each response will make the survey most useful. Your participation in the survey indicates your consent to participate in the collection of this data. This survey will take approximately 5-10 minutes to complete, and all of your responses will be kept completely confidential. No obvious undue risks will be endured, and you may stop your participation at any time. In addition, you will also not benefit directly from your participation in the study.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated, and your willingness to participate in this study is implied if you proceed with completing the survey. Your completion of the *Principal Evaluation and Student Achievement* survey is not only appreciated, but invaluable. If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me (mmcmahon@esc4.net). Thank you for your support.

Sincerely,

Marcia McMahon
Education Specialist
Region 4 Education Service Center
mmcmahon@esc4.net

APPENDIX D

PRINCIPAL SURVEY REMINDER EMAIL

APPENDIX D

PRINCIPAL SURVEY REMINDER E-MAIL

September 15, 2013

Dear Principal:

This is a reminder the *Principal Evaluation Attributes, Feedback and Perception* survey will close on September 18, 2013. The purpose of this survey is to examine method and feedback frequency of principal evaluations and their potential impact on student achievement. The survey is available by clicking the following link: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/PrincipalEvaluations. Please try to answer all the questions. Filling out the attached survey is entirely voluntary, but answering each response will make the survey most useful. Your participation in the survey indicates your consent to participate in the collection of this data. This survey will take approximately 5-10 minutes to complete, and all of your responses will be kept completely confidential. No obvious undue risks will be endured, and you may stop your participation at any time. In addition, you will also not benefit directly from your participation in the study.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated, and your willingness to participate in this study is implied if you proceed with completing the survey. Your completion of the *Principal Evaluation and Student Achievement* survey is not only appreciated, but invaluable. If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me (mmcmahon@esc4.net). Thank you for your support.

Sincerely,

Marcia McMahon
Education Specialist
Region 4 Education Service Center
mmcmahon@esc4.net

APPENDIX E

CENTRAL OFFICE INTERVIEW GUIDE

APPENDIX E

CENTRAL OFFICE INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. Describe the primary purpose for conducting an annual principal evaluation in your

district.

2. To what extent, if at all, does your district utilize the following measures to formally

evaluate principal performance?

Narrative self-evaluation

Portfolio/dossier

Checklist/rating system

Supervisor observation

Narrative evaluation by supervisor

Data-based evaluation

Survey data from teachers, parents, or students

Peer supervision/review

Anecdotal evidence

Perception feedback from stakeholders

3. To what extent, if at all, do you feel your district's principal evaluation processes

influences student achievement?   Please explain.

4. What changes do you perceive are necessary to improve principal evaluation process in

a manner that positively influences student achievement in your district?

5. To what extent, if any, does the principal evaluation process align to professional

development planning for the campus principal in your district?

APPENDIX F

CENTRAL OFFICE INTERVIEW INFORMED CONSENT FORM

APPENDIX F

CENTRAL OFFICE INTERVIEW INFORMED CONSENT FORM

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 be otherwise 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: PRINCIPAL EVALUATION AND STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Student Investigator(s): Marcia McMahon
Faculty Sponsor: Michelle Peters, Ed.D.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY
The purpose of this research is to investigate the relationship between the attributes and feedback frequency in the evaluation of school principals and their impact in increasing student achievement.
PROCEDURES
The research procedures are as follows: Collecting and analyzing survey data.

EXPECTED DURATION
The total anticipated time commitment will be approximately 20-30 minutes.

RISKS OF PARTICIPATION
There are no anticipated risks associated with participation in this project.

BENEFITS TO THE SUBJECT
There is no direct benefit received from your participation in this study, but your participation will help the investigator(s) better understand how/if principal evaluation methods impact student achievement.

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 for a minimum of three years after completion of the study. After that time, the participant's documentation may be destroyed.

FINANCIAL 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
If you have additional questions during the course of this study about the research or any related problem, you may contact the Student Researcher, Marcia McMahon, at phone number 713-459-5532 or by email at marciamcmahon29@yahoo.com. The Faculty Sponsor Michelle Peters, Ed.D., may be contacted at phone number 281-283-3565 or by email at petersm@uhcl.edu.

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 Principal 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

TEACHER ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE GUIDE

APPENDIX G

TEACHER ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Were you a teacher at this campus during the 2010-2011 academic year?

   (Teachers not at this campus during this time will not be allowed to

   continue with the interview)

2. What effect, if any, do you perceive the principal evaluation process as influencing

   student achievement? Please explain

3. What effect, if any, do you perceive the principal evaluation process as influencing

   professional growth decisions for the campus principal? Please explain.

4. How much, if any, emphasis should be placed on student achievement in the principal

   evaluation process? Please explain.

5. Given the opportunity, what measures would you include in a principal evaluation

   model to assess principal performance and potential influence on student

   achievement? Please explain.

APPENDIX H

TEACHER ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE INTRODUCTORY EMAIL

APPENDIX H

TEACHER ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE INTRODUCTORY EMAIL

University
of Houston
Clear Lake

May 1, 2015

TO THE TEACHER ADDRESSED:

Subject: Teacher Interview -Principal Impact on Student Achievement

Senate Bill 1383 was enacted by the Texas legislature in 2011 and codified as

TEC 21.3541: Appraisal and Professional Development Systems for Principals. This bill

directs the Commissioner of Education to establish and administer a comprehensive

appraisal and professional development system for public school principals.

You have been selected to participate in an online interview regarding principal

evaluation processes and potential influence on student achievement.

To access this interview please click the following link:

Teacher Perception of Principal Behaviors Impacting Student Achievement

The survey will open May 1, 2015 and remain open until May 30, 2015.

Please try to answer all the questions. Filling out the attached interview is entirely

voluntary, but answering each response will make the interview most useful. Your

participation in the interview indicates your consent to participate in the collection of this

data. This interview will take approximately 5-10 minutes to complete, and all of your

responses will be kept completely confidential. No obvious undue risks will be endured,

and you may stop your participation at any time. In addition, you will also not benefit

directly from your participation in the study.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated and your willingness to participate in this

study is implied if you proceed with completing the interview. Your participation is not

only greatly appreciated, but invaluable. If you have any further questions, please feel

free to contact me (marciamcmahon29@yahoo.com). Thank you!

Sincerely,

Marcia McMahon

Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum

La Marque Independent School District

Marciamcmahon29@yahoo.com

APPENDIX I

TEACHER ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE REMINDER EMAIL

APPENDIX I

TEACHER ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE REMINDER EMAIL

May 15, 2015

Dear Teachers,

This a reminder the Principal Evaluation and Student Achievement Interview will close on May 30. It is important to understand the interview does not ask you to rate your current principal. The purpose of the interview is to collect the perceptions of teachers regarding principal behaviors that may impact student achievement. Therefore; local districts, the state, and the U.S. Department of Education can develop future principal evaluation instruments to measure these types of behaviors. Your voice in this body of research is critical. Please take the time to complete the interview. Thank you to those who have already responded. We appreciate your support.

To access this interview please click the following link:

Teacher Perception of Principal Behaviors Impacting Student Achievement

TO THE TEACHER ADDRESSED:

Subject: Teacher Interview -Principal Impact on Student Achievement

Senate Bill 1383 was enacted by the Texas legislature in 2011 and codified as TEC 21.3541: Appraisal and Professional Development Systems for Principals. This bill

directs the Commissioner of Education to establish and administer a comprehensive appraisal and professional development system for public school principals.

You have been selected to participate in an online interview regarding principal evaluation processes and potential influence on student achievement.

To access this interview please click the following link:

[Teacher Perception of Principal Behaviors Impacting Student Achievement](#)

The survey will open May 1, 2015 and remain open until May 30, 2015. Please try to answer all the questions. Filling out the attached interview is entirely voluntary, but answering each response will make the interview most useful. Your participation in the interview indicates your consent to participate in the collection of this data. This interview will take approximately 5-10 minutes to complete, and all of your responses will be kept completely confidential. No obvious undue risks will be endured, and you may stop your participation at any time. In addition, you will also not benefit directly from your participation in the study.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated and your willingness to participate in this study is implied if you proceed with completing the interview. Your participation is not only greatly appreciated, but invaluable. If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me (marciamcmahon29@yahoo.com). Thank you!

Sincerely,

Marcia McMahon

Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum

La Marque Independent School District

Marciamcmahon29@yahoo.com

APPENDIX J

TEACHER ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE CLOSING EMAIL

APPENDIX J

TEACHER ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE CLOSING EMAIL

University
of Houston
Clear Lake

May 28, 2015

Dear Teachers,

This a reminder the Principal Evaluation and Student Achievement Interview will

close on June 30. It is important to understand the interview does not ask you to rate

your current principal. The purpose of the interview is to collect the perceptions of

teachers regarding principal behaviors that may impact student achievement. Therefore

local districts, the state, and the U.S. Department of Education can develop future

principal evaluation instruments to measure these types of behaviors. Your voice in this

body of research is critical. Please take the time to complete the interview. Thank you to

those who have already responded. We appreciate your support.

To access this interview please click the following link:

Teacher Perception of Principal Behaviors Impacting Student Achievement

TO THE TEACHER ADDRESSED:

Subject: Teacher Interview -Principal Impact on Student Achievement

Senate Bill 1383 was enacted by the Texas legislature in 2011 and codified as

TEC 21.3541: Appraisal and Professional Development Systems for Principals. This bill

directs the Commissioner of Education to establish and administer a comprehensive appraisal and professional development system for public school principals.

You have been selected to participate in an online interview regarding principal evaluation processes and potential influence on student achievement.

To access this interview please click the following link:

[Teacher Perception of Principal Behaviors Impacting Student Achievement](#)

The survey will open May 1, 2015 and remain open until May 30, 2015. Please try to answer all the questions. Filling out the attached interview is entirely voluntary, but answering each response will make the interview most useful. Your participation in the interview indicates your consent to participate in the collection of this data. This interview will take approximately 5-10 minutes to complete, and all of your responses will be kept completely confidential. No obvious undue risks will be endured, and you may stop your participation at any time. In addition, you will also not benefit directly from your participation in the study.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated and your willingness to participate in this study is implied if you proceed with completing the interview. Your participation is not only greatly appreciated, but invaluable. If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me (marciamcmahon29@yahoo.com). Thank you!

Sincerely,

Marcia McMahon

Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum

La Marque Independent School District

Marciamcmahon29@yahoo.com

Marcia McMahon

EDUCATION

University of Houston at Clear Lake, Houston, TX   May 2016 Ed.D. Educational Leadership

University of Houston at Clear Lake, Houston, TX   1994 M.S. Educational Management

Mississippi State University, Starkville, MS   1984 B.S. Secondary Education, Social Studies

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE

2014-	***Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum- La Marque ISD***
2009-2014	***Education Specialist- Region 4 Education Service Center***
2006-2009	***Director of Assessment and Evaluation- Galveston ISD***
2003-2006	***Principal, K.E. Little Elementary, Dickinson ISD***
2000-2003	***Principal, Highlands Elementary, La Marque ISD***
1997-2000	***Asst. Principal/Dean of Instruction, La Marque Middle School, La Marque ISD***
1992-1997	***History Department Chair, League City Intermediate, Clear Creek ISD***

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

- 1989-1992   6/7th Grade Social Studies Teacher, Clear Lake Intermediate, Clear Creek ISD
- 1988-1989   6th Grade Social Studies Teacher, Baker Junior High, LaPorte ISD
- 1985-1988   6/7th Grade Social Studies Teacher, Spring Woods Junior High, Spring Branch ISD

SPECIAL ACHIEVEMENTS

- ❖ Publications:
  McMahon, M., Peters, M. L., & Schumacher, G. (2014). The principal evaluation process and its relationship to student achievement. *Board of Editors*, 34, American Association of School Administrators.
- ❖ Guest Panelist to Senators and Representatives, "Texas Accountability" Dec. 2014
- ❖ National Principal Mentor Certification, NAESP 2011
- ❖ LoTi (Level of Technology Instruction) Mentor Certification, to be completed April 2012
- ❖ Quality Matters Curriculum Design Reviewer
- ❖ Presenter:

  - o Southwest Education Research Association, "Principal Evaluation and Student Achievement", February, 2014
  - o Critical Issues in Education Research, October 2013
  - o ASE Resources- TAKS Playbook (Using data for campus planning), June 2006
  - o TEPSA Summer Conference (Making the Leap), June 2006