



University Faculty Perceptions of Teacher Evaluation Law in Indiana

Colleen E. Chesnut, Molly S. Stewart, and Anna Sera

November 2015

INTRODUCTION

In 2011, Public Law 90 (PL-90; Ind. Code 20-28-11.5, 2011) established new requirements for Indiana teacher evaluations including required annual evaluations for all teachers, post-evaluation conferences, linking student growth and performance data to evaluations, and sanctions for consistent negative evaluations. Under the new requirements, every teacher is assigned a rating on a four-point scale, ranging from ineffective (1), improvement necessary (2), effective (3), to highly effective (4). The law states that components of the evaluation include both classroom observations and “objective measures of student achievement and growth,” such as scores on statewide standardized tests or local assessments (Ind. Code 20-28-11.5-4(c)(2)). It also states that “a teacher who negatively affects student achievement and growth” may not receive a rating of highly effective (4) or effective (3) (Ind. Code 20-28-11.5-4(6)). Teachers who receive ratings of “improvement necessary” (2) or

KEY FINDINGS:

- Faculty members agreed that the new evaluation requirements could bring needed changes to teacher evaluation processes within Indiana, including increased rigor and accountability.
- Changes to Indiana’s teacher evaluation law have spurred education leadership faculty to heighten their focus on evaluation theory and various evaluation rubrics within their courses.
- Communication regarding teacher evaluation curricula changes varied considerably among institutions, with some faculty members reporting that decisions related to curricular changes were made on an individual basis.
- Faculty members were concerned that principals may experience difficulty with fully implementing new evaluation requirements due to lack of time and inadequate knowledge of how to incorporate data-based decisions.

DESCRIPTION OF PL-90

Signed into law in 2011, Indiana’s Public Law 90 establishes policies and procedures for teacher evaluation including annual evaluation of all teachers on a four-point scale, ranging from ineffective (1) to highly effective (4). Ratings are based on student growth and/or performance as well as classroom observations, conducted using a detailed rubric that may be selected or designed by each individual school district. School or district administrators conduct the evaluations and should receive training on evaluation processes, but the law does not mandate a certification to perform teacher evaluation. Related legislation (IC 20-28-6-7.5 and IC 20-28-6-8) ties evaluation results to teacher compensation and promotion.



“ineffective” (1) must work with their evaluators to develop and implement remediation plans (Ind. Code 20-28-11.5-6(b)). Furthermore, the law specifies that students should not be instructed for two consecutive years by teachers who have been rated as ineffective, and if this ban is not possible, parents must be notified.

While the law broadly outlines these requirements for evaluating teachers, Indiana PL-90 does not mandate a specific teacher evaluation model; instead, it allows local choice or development of an evaluation model. The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) has developed a model evaluation rubric (“RISE”¹) and modification guidelines that districts may choose to use (Indiana Department of Education, n.d.). In addition, PL-90 does not require special certification of school, district, or external administrators who will complete the evaluations, stating that individuals who evaluate teachers must have “received training and support in evaluation skills” (Ind. Code 20-28-11.5-5). Lack of certification requirements for evaluators is not uncommon; although most states, including Indiana, require that teacher evaluators receive related training, only 13 states and the District of Columbia mandate a certification process for teacher evaluators (Doherty & Jacobs, 2013).

In 2015, after three years of implementation and research on PL-90 requirements, we have a more

concrete picture of how change has taken place. Shortly after the passage of PL-90, the Center for Evaluation & Education Policy at Indiana University (CEEP) published an analysis of the new law, indicating that it demanded a major reorganization of administrative time and funds (Whiteman, Shi, & Plucker, 2011). Two research briefs issued by CEEP and the Center on Education and Lifelong Learning (CELL) at Indiana University surveyed superintendents’ initial perspectives and examined legal and policy implications of the new requirements for teacher evaluation (Cole, Murphy, Rogan, & Eckes, 2013; Cole, Robinson, Ansaldo, Whiteman, & Spradlin, 2012). The 2012 survey illustrated superintendents’ concerns about preparing evaluators and the lack of resources to do so effectively, despite their favorable opinions towards the new changes (Cole et al., 2012). Continuing the investigation of superintendent perceptions, CELL recently conducted another round of surveys comparing responses from the 2012 survey (Murphy, Cole, Ansaldo & Robinson, 2015; Murphy, Cole, Pike, Ansaldo & Robinson, 2014) and, in this iteration, included perspectives of teachers and principals (Murphy et al., 2014). The vast majority of respondents had the opinion that Indiana’s teacher evaluation processes prior to the new requirements needed improvement (Murphy et al., 2014).² Superintendents in both survey years continued to be positive about the teacher evaluation legislation (Murphy et al., 2015). In contrast to superintendents and principals, who had generally favorable views of the policy and confidence in the evaluation models and procedures, teachers were less confident in evaluators’ capabilities and the accuracy of the evaluation systems. To illustrate, whereas nearly all superintendents (97%) and a majority of principals (86%) agreed with a survey statement indicating that their districts’ evaluation plans provided for accurate and fair evaluations of instruction, less than half of teachers (44%) felt the same way (Murphy et al., 2014).

¹Among the Indiana Department of Education resources we examined on RISE, we found no details on the meaning of the acronym. However, an interviewee commented that many aspects of Indiana’s RISE model had been adopted from a teacher evaluation rubric implemented in 2010-2011 in Pittsburgh Public Schools, where RISE stands for Research-based, Inclusive System of Evaluation (Pittsburgh Public Schools, 2013).

²Murphy et al. (2014) report that 88.8% of superintendents and 79.9% of principals strongly agreed, agreed, or somewhat agreed that “the teacher evaluation processes in Indiana needed improvement” (p. 18).

STUDY DESCRIPTION

This brief builds on this previous work by examining Indiana’s teacher evaluation requirements from the perspectives of university faculty responsible for school leadership preparation. These faculty members occupy a unique space in the policy environment concerning the new requirements for teacher evaluation; they are not directly accountable for implementation but are charged with preparing future school leaders to adhere to the law’s requirements (Levine, 2005). As already noted, the statute on teacher evaluation broadly states that evaluators must have “received training and support in evaluation skills,” but does not provide details on content or structure. However, the quality of principals’ training on teacher evaluation, which is broadly tasked to higher education faculty, will ultimately determine the success or failure of initiatives such as Indiana’s requirements (Orr & Orphanos, 2011). There is extensive literature about the knowledge, skills, and purpose of leadership preparation, but less is known about how program faculty design and teach leadership preparation curriculum (Osterman & Hafner, 2009). By considering the perspectives of faculty members providing foundational instruction and training for Indiana’s future principals, this study contributes to an understanding of how faculty members interpret the law’s requirements for conducting teacher evaluations. Specifically, our findings shed light on program faculty’s perceptions of the influence of PL-90 and how they have adapted their courses in response to the legal changes. These findings will be of interest to education leadership faculty and scholars, as well as to policymakers and policy researchers concerned with the interpretation and implementation of teacher evaluation policies. We acknowledge the limitations of this study, such as sample size and generalizability regarding the state of Indiana and beyond.

Employing in-depth semi-structured interviews

with key stakeholders in Indiana, this study examined perceptions of university-based education leadership preparation program faculty regarding Indiana’s revised policies on teacher evaluation and how they incorporate policy information into their curricula. The perspectives of this stakeholder group—those who prepare future principals—are key to understanding how future leaders receive information and/or practice regarding new policies and requirements. Core research questions of this study were:

- 1) As a result of the passage of PL-90, how do faculty members in Indiana education leadership programs perceive the changes to the legal landscape for teacher evaluation in Indiana?
- 2) As a result of the new law, how, or to what extent, have faculty members incorporated information about PL-90 or changed their curricula related to teacher evaluation?

In total, 12 interviews were conducted with faculty from four universities in Indiana with graduate programs in education leadership. These universities were license-granting institutions with relatively large numbers of students graduating from their programs.³ At each site, we recruited faculty members based on

³Based on public records obtained from IDOE, each of the four institutions selected were in the top ten for the number of administrative licenses granted in 2013-14 and 2014-15. In 2015, IDOE listed 19 institutions with approved programs for Building Level Administrator (P-12) licensure (<http://www.doe.in.gov/sites/default/files/licensing/approved-programs-july-2015.xlsx>). These 19 institutions employ approximately 55 faculty members in the field of educational leadership/principal preparation, based on publicly available information about the institutions. Thus, our sample represents approximately 22% of all relevant faculty in the state. Taken together, the four institutions granted 40% of administrative licenses in Indiana during 2013-14 and 2014-15.

their stated research interests, experience, and relevant offered courses, including courses on school law; the principalship or principal preparation; teacher evaluation/supervision; practicum or internship; human resources; and organizational management. The sample included one department chair, two program coordinators, and five former public school administrators, and was relatively balanced in terms of including both veteran and newer faculty members. Additionally, we collected documents from both publicly available sources and from interviewees. Publicly available sources included state statutes, state agency guidance, and evaluation rubrics. Documents retrieved from interviewees included course materials, such as syllabi, assignment guidelines, and PowerPoint presentations.

FINDINGS

Two topics predominant across all 12 interviews—changes to curriculum and instruction and faculty perceptions—are described and discussed below.

Changes to Curriculum and Instruction

Curriculum and instruction changes varied to some extent both within and across sites. The two most prevalent patterns regarding changes in leadership curriculum included a heightened focus on evaluation theory and practice and integration of comparative, critical analyses of evaluation plan designs (e.g., rubrics). The most predominant pattern of variation among sites, according to the faculty member interviews, was the degree to which department faculty internally discuss their curriculum changes around teacher evaluation requirements. The following section provides examples of each of these patterns.

Evaluation theory and practice. The inclusion of evaluation requirements in the state statute provided an impetus for faculty to include

conversations about evaluation theory in their courses; eleven out of twelve faculty covered such theories in their courses (cited works included Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Downey, Steffy, English, Frase, & Poston, 2004; Marzano & Toth, 2013). One interviewee stated that, for courses already addressing evaluation in depth, the law gave these course discussions more credibility with students.

While most faculty members mentioned including evaluation theory in their courses, the major focus was on practice, such as providing students with opportunities to both observe and participate in the evaluation process with administrators. Nine interviewees discussed both translating theoretical ideas into best practice as well as integrating best practices with the law's requirements. As one faculty member described:

“I try to fit it into what these leaders are going to need to know when they go out in the field. [...] The curriculum and the syllabi are going to change depending on what is going on and what the needs are.”

Additional faculty members provided examples of how they incorporated advice regarding best practices for evaluating teachers within the parameters of the law's requirements. These examples included lessons on collaborating with teachers to gain their buy-in on evaluation requirements, or conducting efficient and effective walk-through observations (i.e., meeting requirements while substantially building relationships and giving constructive, supportive feedback to teachers).

A significant focus across sites regarding evaluation preparation was a program's internship or practicum portion. At least one faculty member from each site (five total) specifically mentioned this experience as significant in preparing principals to bridge the

gap between teacher evaluation theory and practice. Consistent with recent research on leadership preparation internships, both in Indiana (Lehman, 2013) and elsewhere (Anast-May, Buckner, & Geer, 2011; Geer, Anast-May, & Gurley, 2014), the internship, in all programs, was designed to include simulated evaluation exercises, such as evaluating student teachers. However, faculty members at two sites also mentioned that the quality of the mentors (i.e., principals supervising student interns in their schools) and their willingness to include interns in evaluation processes influenced the interns' "hands-on" learning experience. Faculty members from three out of the four institutions pointed out that internship experiences could vary among their students; for interns who did not have a meaningful learning experience, faculty members needed to provide additional guidance on teacher evaluation.

Rubrics. Given the law's flexibility regarding school district choice of evaluation plan (Ind. Code 20-28-11.5-4, 2011), interviewees' use of teacher evaluation rubrics in their curriculum was unsurprising. Six interviewees, representing all four sites, focused on comparing rubrics, either those used in students' current districts and/or the array of commonly used, standard rubrics (such as the RISE or modified RISE rubric). According to five of these six faculty members, such comparisons primarily served to systematically demonstrate to students the differences in practical teacher evaluation requirements. An additional purpose, mentioned by four participants representing two sites, was to help students critically analyze differences in existing rubrics as well as the potential benefits and drawbacks of a district-adapted plan. These faculty accounts illustrate a shared belief that critical analysis can help future leaders understand how evaluation plan design and policy implementation help or hinder district goals. In the words of one faculty member, critical analysis is key in the principal preparation process:

“What we can offer [education leadership students] is [to] get them thinking about where do these policies come from, how do you interpret them into action as a principal, and what are the various issues and dimensions of implementing policies like that in terms of effective leadership?”

Program faculty sometimes used critical analyses of teacher evaluation policy implementation to illustrate other education policy implementation issues.

Communication around the requirements and curricular decisions. Three faculty, across two sites, reported that they and/or their colleagues had received formal training on specific evaluation rubrics (i.e., provided by the Indiana Department of Education or other related state or district agency). This number represents half of the sites and less than half of the interviewees, even though receiving training on the law's requirements and common rubrics could be argued as a minimum standard for university faculty responsible for training future principals. Thus, in two of the sites, no faculty members interviewed indicated having received specific training on the law or on existing rubrics. Furthermore, there is an apparent scarcity of communication within departments; faculty at one of the sites described little or no communication with their fellow faculty members about curricular changes, and two faculty members representing two different institutions collaborated on professional scholarship regarding the changes, but did not discuss communicating about these topics with their own colleagues. Overall, interviewees did not specifically mention that they talked with colleagues regarding teacher evaluation course curricula. For example, in response to a question

about faculty conversations regarding changes to the teacher evaluation law, one interviewee stated,

“I cannot say that we’ve had an explicit discussion about this policy as a faculty, but I would say that I have talked with some people in teacher [education], more informally at this point.”

Other interviewees made similar statements, indicating that they had not discussed changing their teacher evaluation curricula with their colleagues. Based on this evidence, it is apparent that faculty communication about teacher evaluation curriculum, both within and across sites, is infrequent.

This observed absence of discussion of curriculum related to teacher evaluation within education leadership departments may be related to the specific positions and courses of interviewees. The absence of discussion may also reflect the U.S. academic norm of individual, professional expectations—that each faculty member has the professional capacity to make his or her own decisions about how to discuss teacher evaluation policy (see, for example, Prestine, 1989). However, while this norm may isolate faculty members as they plan for and teach their courses, there does appear to be some convergence regarding curriculum decisions. Based on faculty member descriptions of course design, curricula, and instruction, our study indicates a shared focus on practicality, attention to the quality of mentoring, and belief in the importance of critical analytical skills. This convergence is probably best attributed to a combination of faculty members’ understandings of the practical needs of their students and dominant patterns in the research literature. Document analysis revealed that, regarding teacher evaluation, course syllabi refer to state standards (511 Ind. Admin. Code 13-1-1(e); Indiana Department of Education, 2012) and/or

federal standards (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2015; National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2011), which points to a degree of alignment with professional standards. However, neither set of standards is explicitly aligned to PL-90 requirements, underscoring the possibility that educational administrators are receiving inconsistent evaluation training, even though they must all abide by the same legal requirements. Considering the law’s flexibility regarding local adaptation, this unevenness may not be problematic, but it is certainly an outcome worthy of our attention. Will Indiana administrators feel adequately and similarly prepared to implement evaluation requirements?

Faculty Perceptions

Faculty members discussed the 2011 changes to Indiana’s law on teacher evaluation, and shared not only their perceptions of the law and its requirements, but also their opinions on evaluation in general and the role of a principal as an evaluator.

Welcome changes. Most interviewees welcomed the changes to the law. Interviewees stated that, prior to the implementation of the new teacher evaluation policies and rubrics, “there was no accountability” for teacher evaluation, and that it occurred “haphazardly,” as teachers were not evaluated on a yearly basis. As one faculty member remarked,

“I don’t think there was really an established, well-understood procedure for doing [evaluation...] the quality of the feedback varied and the quality of the observation itself varied.”

Faculty from all four institutions shared similar opinions on this matter—teacher evaluation requirements in Indiana were in need

of a change, and the passage of PL-90 facilitated some of these changes. At least one interviewee from each institution favorably viewed the increased time principals would spend on classroom observations. Five faculty members mentioned that increased observation time could enhance quality of instruction, because PL-90 required principals to provide more comprehensive and frequent feedback to teachers, and observation rubrics allowed for more objectivity in the process. These responses are consistent with the literature that advocates for principals to act as instructional leaders (DeBevoise 1984; Hallinger & Murphy, 1987). One interviewee from each institution also remarked that the increased accountability for teacher evaluation under PL-90 was a key factor in sparking district- and school-level conversations around teacher evaluation and teacher quality. Going forward, half of all interviewees, representing all institutions, were hopeful that superintendents and principals could begin to use data from teacher evaluations to plan for more targeted staff professional development.

While nearly all interviewees (11) believed that some aspects of the new evaluation law could help principals and teachers enhance quality of instruction, they also identified two specific ways in which the new requirements could create difficulties for principals as their roles shifted. Four faculty members from two institutions perceived that, under the new law, among their many existing tasks, principals would have to learn to prioritize time spent on teacher evaluation. Two more interviewees mentioned that principals would also need a better understanding of the connection of student growth and performance to teacher evaluation.

Time constraints. One chief concern among all interviewees was the increased time principals would need to spend on evaluation processes. All twelve faculty members identified the time spent on evaluation as a constraint to implementation.

As one interviewee remarked,

“The way the law is written is probably not doable. I mean, if you really look at how many teachers you have and how much time is required to do the process well, it’s probably not doable.”

A faculty member from another institution pointed out that the new teacher evaluation law had “increased [principals’] workloads,” and that “nothing was taken off [principals’] plates.” With regard to evaluating teachers with the same frequency (i.e., allowing for more extensive evaluation of new or struggling teachers while spending less time on evaluation of the more experienced and highly effective teachers), two more interviewees noted that perhaps there should be more flexibility in implementation. This finding is consistent with recent research on school administrators implementing similar teacher evaluation models in Arizona and Tennessee, where administrators identified time as a significant challenge in conducting quality teacher evaluations (Ruffini, Makkonen, Tejwani, & Diaz, 2014; Tennessee Department of Education, 2012).

Effective and efficient preparation. Faculty also mentioned uncertainty regarding the effectiveness of their instruction and strategies. Did their programs and courses prepare future school leaders to effectively and efficiently fulfill the law’s requirements? Interviewees described the importance of preparing their students to prioritize their time because, as future principals, they would be legally bound to conduct teacher evaluations and would be held accountable for the processes outlined by PL-90. Three interviewees from three different institutions described helping their students think through evaluation strategies that could meet the legal requirement as well as provide high-quality feedback to teachers; two more described discussing with students how to

prevent the negative effects of increased evaluation scrutiny on their school communities while still meeting the policy’s minimum requirements. However, other than student feedback, these faculty members did not have a way to check that their instruction and curricula were meeting the students’ needs.

Data. According to the requirements under PL-90, student performance on state and local assessments is to be factored into teacher evaluations. Faculty members at three out of the four institutions expressed concerns around the inclusion of student performance data as a component of teacher evaluations; one interviewee worried that the new evaluation rubrics prioritized academic performance data over the “human element of teaching.” Another perceived that there was not enough guidance on weighting of student growth measures in a teacher’s evaluation rating, while a third mentioned that issues may arise regarding the validity of student growth measures used in various districts. One interviewee shared concerns around school equity especially when the new teacher evaluation law requires tying evaluation results (including student performance measures) to teacher compensation.⁴

Interviewees did not discuss including specific lessons on data-based decision-making, assessment validity, weighting student growth measures, or other data-related issues in their teacher evaluation courses. Faculty concerns related to the use of student performance data in teacher evaluation reflected their perceptions of the law itself. Several interviewees did not agree with the inclusion of these data in teachers’ evaluations and did not have recommendations for their students for complying with this requirement. Somewhat distinct from previous

findings is a trending concern among faculty members regarding how student performance data should be used in teacher evaluations. In two rounds of surveys of Indiana’s superintendents in 2012 and 2014, nearly 90% of respondents agreed that teacher evaluation should be linked to student growth, although specific measures of student growth were not included (Murphy et al., 2015). In 2014, principals and teachers were asked to rate their levels of agreement with the same statement; nearly three-quarters of principals and only one-third of teachers agreed that teacher evaluation should be linked to student growth (Murphy et al., 2014). Faculty members’ concerns about using student performance data for teacher evaluation may not be similar to superintendents’ and principals’ beliefs about this practice, but may reflect teachers’ concerns. The interviews illustrated that the use of performance data in evaluation is relatively new not only to teachers and principals, but for faculty members in principal preparation programs. Thus, the decision to focus less on the data-use requirement may be due to either faculty beliefs about data use and/or (lack of) faculty knowledge on how to accurately use data for evaluation.

These findings suggest that when faculty made changes to their course curricula, the changes involved heightened focus on evaluation theory, evaluation practice, and/or comparative evaluation options. Some faculty made changes to coursework on an individual basis, and others were members of departments that took organization-wide steps to revise curricula and/or instruction. Interviewees mainly viewed their role as helping students to think critically about their future roles as school leaders and the impact of legal requirements on organizational goals, plan design, and leadership implementation. Despite the positive perceptions of PL-90, faculty reiterated two major concerns with the new requirements: 1) the increased burden of time required for school leaders to observe teachers in classrooms, and 2) the required linkage of

⁴For a discussion of concerns about the use of student data for teacher evaluation purposes, see, for example, American Educational Research Association, 2015.

student test data to teacher evaluations. Faculty recommendations for improvement are discussed in more detail below.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSION

Since Indiana's new teacher evaluation requirements are still in the initial years of implementation, implications for and impacts on both K-12 schools and higher education are now emerging. Faculty from education leadership preparation programs are not directly accountable for implementation, but they have direct contact with and professional responsibility for training those who will evaluate teachers. Given their professional involvement in policy research and practical training, university program faculty are well-situated to suggest improvements to these new requirements.

Professional Development

Faculty from all institutions recommended that the connection between teacher evaluation results and school-level professional development should be clarified and strengthened within the policy. Half of interviewees, representing faculty from all four institutions, expressed the opinion that school leaders should be required to use teacher evaluation data to plan professional development and inform school improvement efforts. Scholarship on education leadership and teacher evaluation also indicates that teacher evaluation should be tightly aligned with professional development and capacity building (Darling-Hammond, Amrein-Beardsley, Haertel, & Rothstein, 2012; Donaldson, 2013; Goldring et al., 2015). To prevent the evaluation process from being experienced as an isolated event, using teacher evaluation data for professional development and capacity building would ensure ongoing support for targeted teacher growth

(Callahan & Sadeghi, 2015; Hamilton et al., 2014).

Rubrics

Three faculty suggested that school and district administrators should give teachers more agency in selecting or designing evaluation plans and rubrics. As written, the law does not specify teachers' roles in designing local evaluation systems. These three interviewees recommended that faculty and/or state-level guidance should encourage administrators to allow teachers more input into evaluation processes; this input would enhance teacher buy-in and overall effectiveness of the policy. In the related literature, findings and trends indicate that teacher evaluation should be an ongoing, collective process (e.g., Aseltine, Faryniarz, & Rigazio-DiGilio, 2006; Kimball, 2002).

All interviewees recommended a clarified and strengthened relationship between professional development and teacher evaluation results. These recommendations, while focused on a specific set of stakeholders, complement previous recommendations focused on different policy actors. Previous policy briefs and reports written on this legislation focus on the importance of capacity building for successful implementation of teacher evaluation across the state (Murphy et al., 2014; Murphy et al., 2015). Ensuring equitable and accurate evaluation by competent evaluators are strategies repeatedly recommended in these reports as well as in the larger literature on teacher evaluation (Harris, Ingle, & Rutledge, 2014; Herlihy et al., 2014; Kimball & Milanowski, 2009; Rockoff & Speroni, 2010; Taylor & Tyler, 2012). Fostering stakeholder consensus and collaboration, one of interviewees' repeated recommendations, is not a focus widely found in the literature on teacher evaluation specifically, but is a central focus of evaluation best practices generally (e.g., Cousins, 1992; Toal, 2009), and is a recommendation found in school culture and

staff development literature (e.g., Bredeson, 2000; Fullan, 2007) and organizational change literature (e.g., Bolman & Deal, 2008; Fullan, 2014).

This study indicates a need for building capacity in education leadership preparation programs (i.e., training faculty on existing rubrics, intentionally aligning curricula with state and professional standards, and facilitating faculty communication within and across departments). This capacity building could be facilitated by the departments themselves, by the state department of education, or by a professional association.

Examining the changes in Indiana’s legal landscape for teacher evaluation from the perspectives of university faculty in education leadership programs illustrated common trends among individuals and across institutions. The most prevalent trends were the increased focus on teacher evaluation theory and practice in education leadership curricula and the shared perception that the new law would enhance the utility and rigor of Indiana’s teacher evaluation processes. Across the four institutions, discussions among faculty members regarding curricular changes due to the new teacher evaluation requirements occurred inconsistently. Our research reveals that faculty members share the concern that their students—future school administrators—will face difficulties in implementing the revised teacher evaluation processes in Indiana, simply because they will lack sufficient time or organizational capacity to do so.

Suggested citation

Chesnut, C. E., Stewart, M. S., & Sera, A. (2015). *University faculty perceptions of teacher evaluation law in Indiana: Issue brief*. Bloomington, IN: Center for Evaluation & Education Policy, Indiana University.

Author Information

Colleen E. Chesnut, Ph.D., is a Research Associate at the Center for Evaluation and Education Policy. Her research focuses on policy implementation for stakeholders across the P-16 spectrum, education leadership, issues of equity for English language learners, and school law.

Molly S. Stewart, Ph.D., is also a Research Associate at the Center for Evaluation and Education Policy. Her research interests include markets and choice in education, public policy design and implementation, and school law and finance issues.

Anna Sera is a Ph.D. student in Education Policy Studies at Indiana University Bloomington. She is a volunteer Graduate Research Assistant for the Center for Evaluation and Education Policy. Her research interests include teacher and principal training, educational equity, and international comparative education.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Anne-Maree Ruddy, Director of Education Policy and Senior Research Associate at the Center for Evaluation & Education Policy, and John Hitchcock, Director of the Center for Evaluation & Education Policy, for their support of this project and for assistance with reviews and final editing. We are grateful for help from additional CEEP staff in preparing this brief for release, including Cate Racek, Rebekah Sindors, and Jeff DeWitt. We would also like to thank the following individuals for their thorough reviews and helpful feedback: Bradley Carl, Associate Director and Researcher at the Value-Added Research Center, Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison; Chad Lochmiller, Assistant Professor in Education Leadership & Policy Studies, Indiana University; and Julie Mead, Professor in Educational Leadership & Policy Analysis, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

REFERENCES

- 511 Ind. Admin. Code 13-1-1. (2015).
- American Educational Research Association. (2015, November 10). AERA statement on use of value-added models (VAM) for the evaluation of educators and educator preparation programs. AERA official document. Retrieved from <http://edr.sagepub.com/content/early/2015/11/10/0013189X15618385.full.pdf+html>.
- Anast-May, L., Buckner, B., & Geer, G. (2011). Redesigning principal internships: Practicing principals' perspectives. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 6(1).
- Aseltine, J. M., Faryniarz, J. O., & Rigazio-DiGilio, A. J. (2006). *Supervision for learning: A performance-based approach to teacher development and school improvement*. Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2008). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice and leadership*. (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bredeson, P. (2000). The school principal's role in teacher professional development. *Journal of In-Service Education*, 26(2), 385-401.
- Callahan, K., & Sadeghi, L. (2015). Teacher perceptions of the value of teacher evaluations: New Jersey's ACHIEVE NJ. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 10(1), 46-59.
- Cole, S., Murphy, H., Rogan, P., & Eckes, S. (2013). *Education policy brief: Indiana's teacher evaluation legislation: Implications and challenges for policy, higher education and professional development*. Bloomington, IN: Center for Evaluation & Education Policy, Indiana University.
- Cole, C. M., Robinson, J. N., Ansaldo, J., Whiteman, R. S., & Spradlin, T. E. (2012). *Education policy brief: Overhauling Indiana teacher evaluation systems: Examining planning and implementation issues of school districts*. Bloomington, IN: Center for Evaluation & Education Policy, Indiana University.
- Council of Chief State School Officers. (2015). ISLLC 2015: Model policy standards for educational leaders [working document]. Retrieved from <http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2015/RevisedDraftISLLCStandards2015.pdf>
- Cousins, J. B. (1992). The case for participatory evaluation. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 14(4), 397-418.
- Danielson, C., & McGreal, T. (2000). *Teacher evaluation to enhance professional practice*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Amrein-Beardsley, A., Haertel, E., & Rothstein, J. (2012). Evaluating teacher evaluation. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 93(6), 8-15. doi: 10.2307/41497541

- DeBevoise, W. (1984). Synthesis of research on the principal as instructional leader. *Educational Leadership*, 41(5), 14-20.
- Doherty, K. M., & Jacobs, S. (2013). *State of the states 2013: Connect the dots: Using evaluations of teacher effectiveness to inform policy and practice*. Washington, DC: National Council on Teacher Quality.
- Donaldson, M. L. (2013). Principals' approaches to cultivating teacher effectiveness: Constraints and opportunities in hiring, assigning, evaluating, and developing teachers. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 49(5), 838-882.
- Downey, C. J., Steffy, B. E., English, F. W., Frase, L. E., & Poston, W. K. (2004). *The three-minute classroom walk-through: Changing school supervisory practice one teacher at a time*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change*. (4th ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Fullan, M. (2014). *The principal: Three keys to maximizing impact*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Geer, G. C., Anast-May, L., & Gurley, D. K. (2014). Interns' perceptions of administrative internships: Do principals provide internship activities in areas they deem important? *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 9(1).
- Goldring, E., Grissom, J. A., Rubin, M., Neumerski, C. M., Cannata, M., Drake, T., & Scheurmann, P. (2015). Make room value added: Principals' human capital decisions and the emergence of teacher observation data. *Educational Researcher*, 44(2), 96-104.
- Hallinger, P. & Murphy, J. (1987). Instructional leadership in the school context. In W. Greenfield (Ed.), *Instructional leadership: Concepts, issues, and controversies* (pp. 179-203). Newton, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Hamilton, L. S., Steiner, E. D., Holtzman, D., Fulbeck, E. S., Robyn, A., Poirier, J., & O'Neil, C. (2014). *Using teacher evaluation data to inform professional development in the intensive partnership sites*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation. Retrieved from http://www.rand.org/pubs/working_papers/WR1033
- Harris, D. N., Ingle, W. K., & Rutledge, S. A. (2014). How teacher evaluation methods matter for accountability: A comparative analysis of teacher effectiveness ratings by principals and teacher value-added measures. *American Educational Research Journal*, 51(1), 73-112.
- Herlihy, C., Karger, E., Pollard, C., Hill, H. C., Kraft, M. A., Williams, M., & Howard, S. (2014). State and local efforts to investigate validity and reliability of scores from teacher evaluation systems. *Teachers College Record*, 116(1), 1-28.
- Ind. Code §20-28-11.5. (2011).

- Indiana Department of Education. (n.d.). *RISE evaluation and development system: Evaluator and teacher handbook version 2.0*. Retrieved from <http://www.doe.in.gov/sites/default/files/evaluations/rise-handbook-2-0-final.pdf>
- Indiana Department of Education. (2012). Indiana CORE Assessments for educator licensure. Field 039: School administrator--building level. Assessment blueprint. Retrieved from http://www.in.nesinc.com/Content/Docs/IN039_Blueprint.pdf
- Kimball, S. M. (2002). Analysis of feedback, enabling conditions and fairness perceptions of teachers in three school districts with new standards-based evaluation systems. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 16(4), 241-268.
- Kimball, S. M., & Milanowski, A. (2009). Examining teacher evaluation validity and leadership decision making within a standards-based evaluation system. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45(1), 34-70.
- Lehman, L. (2013). Principal internships in Indiana: A promising or perilous experience? *NCPEA International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 8(1), 121-139.
- Levine, A. (2005). *Educating school leaders*. Retrieved from https://www.soe.vt.edu/highered/files/Perspectives_PolicyNews/05-07/EducatingSchoolLeaders.pdf
- Marzano, R. J., & Toth, M. D. (2013). *Teacher evaluation that makes a difference: A new model for teacher growth and student achievement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Murphy, H., Cole, C., Ansaldo, J., & Robinson, J. (2015). *Education policy brief: Indiana superintendents' perceptions of Indiana's teacher evaluation law: A new perspective*. Bloomington, IN: Center on Education and Lifelong Learning, Indiana University.
- Murphy, H., Cole, C., Pike, G., Ansaldo, J., & Robinson, J. (2014). *Education policy brief: Indiana teacher evaluation: At the crossroads of implementation*. Bloomington, IN: Center on Education and Lifelong Learning, Indiana University.
- National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (2011, November). Educational leadership program recognition standards: Building level. Retrieved from <http://www.ncate.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=zRZI73R0nOQ%3D&tabid=676>
- Orr, M. T., & Orphanos, S. (2011). How graduate-level preparation influences the effectiveness of school leaders: A comparison of the outcomes of exemplary and conventional leadership preparation programs for principals. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(1), 18-70.

- Osterman, K. F., & Hafner, M. M. (2009). Curriculum in leadership preparation: Understanding where we have been in order to know where we might go. In M. D. Young, G. M. Crow, J. Murphy, & R. T. Ogawa (Eds.), *Handbook of research on the education of school leaders* (pp. 269-317). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Pittsburgh Public Schools. (2013). *Education Committee Update: Empowering effective teachers*. Retrieved from https://www.pps.k12.pa.us/cms/lib07/PA01000449/Centricity/domain/19/committees/education/2013/01/121227_-_EET_EduCom_Final.pdf
- Prestine, N. A. (1989). The struggle for control of teacher education: A case study. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 11(3), 285-300.
- Rockoff, J. E., & Speroni, C. (2010). Subjective and objective evaluations of teacher effectiveness. *American Economic Review*, 100(2), 261-266.
- Ruffini, S., Makkonen, R., Tejwani, J., & Diaz, M. (2014). *Principal and teacher perceptions of implementation of multiple-measure teacher evaluation systems in Arizona* (REL 2015-062). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory West.
- Taylor, E. S., & Tyler, J. H. (2012). The effect of teacher evaluation on performance. *American Economic Review*, 102(7), 3628-3651.
- Tennessee Department of Education. (2012). *Teacher evaluation in Tennessee: A report on year 1 implementation*. Nashville, TN: Author.
- Toal, S. A. (2009). The validation of the Evaluation Involvement Scale for use in multisite settings. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 30(3), 349-362.
- Whiteman, R. S., Shi, D., & Plucker, J. D. (2011). *Education policy brief: Revamping the teacher evaluation process*. Bloomington, IN: Center for Evaluation & Education Policy, Indiana University.