Delaware Performance Appraisal System Second Edition (DPAS II)

Year 5 Report
June 2012

Submitted By:
Dr. Donald E. Beers
Principal Investigator

PROGRESS
Education Corporation

2021-A North Halsted Street
Chicago, IL 60614
www.progresseducation.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

The Delaware State Department of Education presented a very clear expectation for the evaluation of DPAS II. The stated goals of DPAS II are equally specific as stated on the Department of Education's web site,

> *The purpose of DPAS II is two-fold:*
>
> - *Quality assurance*
> - *Professional growth*
>
> *Quality assurance focuses on the collection of credible evidence about the performance of educators. Evaluators use this evidence to make important decisions: recognizing effective practice, recommending continued employment, recommending an improvement plan, or beginning dismissal proceedings.*
>
> *Professional growth focuses on enhancing the skills and knowledge of educators. Through self-assessment and goal-setting, working with colleagues, taking courses, attending workshops, designing new programs, piloting new programs or approaches, developing proficiency in test data analysis, and many other learning opportunities, educators improve their professional practice in ways that will contribute to improved student learning.*
>
> *Both purposes serve accountability: to assure that educators are performing at an acceptable level and to provide professional growth opportunities that improve skills and knowledge.*

The goal of this evaluation was to determine the reality of the current condition in meeting the stated goals.

The majority of the findings center on the practices and processes of DPAS II. The practices provide an understanding of the quality of training, manuals, forms, and general deployment. The processes stem from fundamental policies and underlying theory about performance appraisal.

This report is divided into four major sections: Executive Summary, Recommendations, Methods, and Results. Contained in these sections are the specific data collected and the methodologies used for analysis. The recommendations are very specific and tied to the major findings of the data collection process described under Results.

Summary of Survey Results - Key Findings 2011-2012

To show trends over time, the rankings of most desirable and least desirable responses without new items are provided. Then following those rankings, information on rankings of new items is presented.

Teachers

1) Among teachers, the items with the most desirable responses in 2008-2009 were:

   a) That they are able to provide evidence of practice through discussion.

   b) The five components used to evaluate performance are understandable.

   c) The written feedback is aligned with the five components.

   d) The feedback received is adequate.

   In 2009-2010, the items with the most desirable responses were:

   a) The five components used to evaluate performance are understandable.

   b) That they are able to provide evidence of practice through discussion.

   c) The oral feedback they receive is useful.

   d) The written feedback is aligned with the five components.

   e) The feedback received is adequate.

   In 2010-2011, the items with the most desirable responses were:

   a) That they are to provide evidence of my practice through discussion.

   b) The five components used to evaluate my performance are understandable.

   c) The criteria used to evaluate the instruction component can be accurately judged by the evaluator.

   d) The written feedback received is aligned with the five components.

   e) The feedback received is adequate.

   In 2011-2012, the items with the most desirable responses were:

   a) I am able to provide evidence of my practice through discussion.

   b) The four components used to evaluate my performance are understandable.

   c) The written feedback I receive is aligned with the four components.

   d) I am able to provide the evidence for him/her to accurately determine my effectiveness.

e) The oral feedback I receive is useful and applicable.

2) Among teachers, the items with the least desirable responses in 2008-2009 were:

a) That classroom level DSTP provides an accurate picture of students' progress.

b) That DSTP data helps adjust instruction for students.

c) Additional training would make them more competent in the process.

d) That there was congruence with the results of school level data and classroom level data.

In 2009-2010, the items with the least desirable responses were:

a) Applying all five components in my work is easy.

b) The criteria used to evaluate me for the student improvement component can be accurately judged by my evaluator.

c) The current DPAS evaluation system should be continued in its current form.

d) Additional training would make me feel more competent in the process.

e) The DPAS evaluation system needs improving.

In 2010-2011, the items with the least desirable responses were:

a) Additional training would make me feel more competent in the process.

b) The DPAS evaluation system needs improving.

c) The criteria used to evaluate me for the student improvement component can be accurately judged by my evaluator.

d) The current DPAS evaluation system should be continued in its current form.

e) Applying all five components in my work is easy.

In 2011-2012, the items with the least desirable responses were:

a) The forms make the process easy to implement.

b) The time it takes to complete the DPAS II paperwork requirements is reasonable.

c) The current DPAS II evaluation system should be continued in its current form.

d) The forms are easy to complete.

e) Additional training would make me feel more competent in the process.

New items that had high levels of positive responses and based on the weighted scores would have been in the rankings with the original items include:

    a)   Announced observations are valuable in the DPAS II process.

    b)   Building level administrators are valuable in the DPAS II process.

New items that had undesirable responses with weighted scores that would have been in the rankings with the original items include:

    a)   Administrator walk-throughs improve teaching more than announced observations.

    b)   Unannounced observations by an administrator improve teaching more than walk-throughs.

    c)   Walk-throughs should be part of a formative evaluation.

    d)   Prior to DPAS II, walk-throughs were conducted more frequently during the year.

    e)   Walk-throughs should be part of a summative evaluation.

    f)   District-level administrators are valuable in the DPAS II process.

    g)   Data coaches are valuable in the DPAS II process.

Specialists

To show trends over time, the rankings of most desirable and least desirable responses without new items are provided. Then following those rankings, information on rankings of new items where applicable is shown.

1)   Among specialists, the items with the most desirable responses in 2008-2009 were:

    a)   They are able to provide evidence of practice through discussion.

    b)   The evaluator completes paperwork in a reasonable time period.

    c)   The five components used to evaluate performance are understandable.

    d)   The evaluator handles the workload effectively.

    e)   The feedback received is adequate.

In 2009-2010, the items with the most desirable responses were:

    a)   They are able to provide evidence of practice through discussion.

    b)   The evaluator completes paperwork in a reasonable time period.

    c)   The oral feedback I receive is useful and applicable.

    d)   The feedback received is adequate.

e)   The evaluator handles the workload effectively.

In 2010-2011, the items with the most desirable responses from specialists were:

a)   I am able to provide evidence of my practice through discussion.

b)   The evaluator completes paperwork in a reasonable time period.

c)   The oral feedback I receive is useful and applicable.

d)   Overall, the feedback I receive is adequate.

e)   My evaluator(s) handle the workload effectively.

In 2011-2012, the items with the most desirable responses from specialists were:

a)   I am able to provide evidence of my practice through discussion.

b)   The oral feedback I receive is useful and applicable.

c)   The written feedback I receive is aligned with the four components.

d)   The oral feedback I receive is aligned with the four components.

e)   The feedback I receive is adequate.

2)   Among specialists, the items with the least desirable responses in 2008-2009 were:

a)   That DSTP data gives an accurate picture of their school's progress.

b)   DSTP data helps them adjust goals for students and the school.

c)   Additional training would make them feel more competent in the process.

d)   The evaluation system should continue in its current form.

In 2009-2010, the items with the least desirable responses were:

a)   Applying all five components in my work is easy.

b)   I believe the current DPAS evaluation system should be continued in its current form.

c)   Additional training would make me feel more competent in the process.

d)   The criteria used to evaluate me for the student improvement component can be accurately judged by my evaluator.

e)   The DPAS evaluation system needs improving.

In 2010-2011, the items with the least desirable responses were:

a)   I was able to complete the data documentation requirements without difficulty.

b)   There was enough training and/or support for me to accurately complete the forms related to student improvement.

    c)   Additional training would make me feel more competent in the process.

    d)   I believe the current DPAS evaluation system should be continued in its current form.

    e)   The criteria used to evaluate me for the student improvement component can be accurately judged by my evaluator.

In 2011-2012, the items with the least desirable responses were:

    a)   The DPAS II evaluation system needs improving.

    b)   Student data gives me an accurate picture of my school's progress.

    c)   I was able to complete the data documentation requirements without difficulty.

    d)   The time it takes to complete the DPAS II paperwork requirements is reasonable.

    e)   I believe the DPAS II evaluation system should be continued in its current form.

New items that had high levels of positive responses and based on the weighted scores would have been in the rankings with the standard items include:

    a)   Announced observations are valuable.

    b)   Understanding of the DPAS II process.

New items that had undesirable responses with weighted scores that would have been in the rankings with the standard items include:

    a)   District level administrators are valuable in the DPAS II process.

Administrators

To show trends over time, the rankings of most desirable and least desirable responses without new items are provided. Following those rankings, we provide information on rankings of new items where applicable are shown.

1)   Among administrators, the items with the most desirable responses in 2008-2009 were:

    a)   The five components used to evaluate my performance are understandable.

    b)   The guide is easy to understand.

    c)   The guide is helpful.

    d)   The training materials were helpful.

    e)   The five components used to evaluate performance are reasonable.

In 2009-2010, the items with the most desirable responses were:

a)   Student data helps me adjust goals for my school.

b)   The five components used to evaluate my performance are understandable.

c)   The oral feedback I receive is useful and applicable.

d)   I am able to provide the evidence and documentation needed by my evaluator for him/her to accurately determine my effectiveness.

e)   I have access to the information I need to complete the forms.

In 2010-2011, the items with the most desirable responses among administrators were:

a)   The oral feedback I receive is useful and applicable.

b)   The five components used to evaluate my performance are understandable.

c)   The written feedback I receive is aligned with the five components.

d)   The oral feedback I receive is aligned with the five components.

e)   Student data helps me adjust goals for my schools.

In 2011-2012, the items with the most desirable responses among administrators were:

a)   The five components used to evaluate my performance are understandable.

b)   The criteria used to evaluate me for the Management component are effective indicators of my performance.

c)   The criteria used to evaluate me for the Professional Responsibilities component are effective indicators of my performance.

d)   The oral feedback I receive is useful and applicable.

e)   The written feedback I receive is aligned with the five components.

f)   I was able to complete the data documentation requirements without difficulty.

2)   Among administrators, the items with the least desirable responses in 2008-2009 were:

a)   DSTP gives an accurate picture of my school's progress.

b)   That the time it takes to complete the DPAS II paperwork is reasonable.

c)   Additional training would make them feel more competent in the process.

d)   The current DPAS evaluation system should continue in its current form.

In 2009-2010, the items with the least desirable responses were:

a)   Applying all five components in my work is easy.

b)   That the time it takes to complete the DPAS II paperwork is reasonable.

c)   The current DPAS evaluation system should continue in its current form.

d)   Additional training would make them feel more competent in the process.

e)   The DPAS evaluation system needs improving.

In 2010-2011, the items with the least desirable responses among administrators were:

a)   I am able to complete paperwork in a reasonable time period.

b)   The time it takes to complete the DPAS II paperwork requirements is reasonable.

c)   The workload is manageable.

d)   I believe the current DPAS evaluation system should be continued in its current form.

e)   The time it takes to complete the DPAS II paperwork requirements is reasonable.

In 2011-2012, the items with the least desirable responses among administrators were:

a)   The DPAS II evaluation system needs improving.

b)   The forms make the process easy to implement.

c)   The forms are easy to complete.

d)   I believe the current DPAS evaluation system should be continued in its current form.

e)   The time it takes to complete the DPAS II paperwork requirements is reasonable.

New items that had high levels of positive responses and based on the weighted scores would have been in the rankings with the standard items include:

a)   The level of impact unannounced walk-throughs has on improving performance.

b)   The level of impact unannounced observations have on improving performance.

c)   The level of impact peer observations has on increasing effective conversations about performance.

d)   The level of impact the Management component has on improving performance.

e)   The level of impact the Culture of Learning component has on improving performance.

f)   The level of impact DPAS II has on improving performance.

g)   Understanding of the DPAS II process.

h)   Understanding of the DPAS II rubrics.

i)   Understanding of the DPAS II expectations.

j)   Understanding of the commendations.

k)   Understanding of the announced observations.

l)   Understanding of the unannounced observations.

There were no new items that had undesirable responses with weighted scores that would have been in the rankings with the standard items.

General Findings

1)   The majority of teachers, specialists, and administrators gave the DPAS II system a grade of "B." There was very little difference in the grades between 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 among teachers and specialists. However, among all groups, there was an increase in the percent who gave the system a grade of "C" and a decrease in those that gave a grade of "B."

2)   Among teachers, the best indicator of performance was Instruction. Among administrators it was Management and Culture of Performance. Professional Practice and Delivery of Service was seen as the best indicator of performance among specialists.

3)   Teachers and specialists appear to want more oral communication and discussions about observation findings. The walk-through rubrics are perceived by teachers as checklists that do not allow for in-depth feedback. In all data collection procedures, discussion came up as one of the most valuable aspects of the process.

4)   There was conflicting information gathered about unannounced and announced observations. Some teachers felt that announced observations were contrived and were not that valuable to improving their teaching. However, the survey results indicate that the majority of teachers find value in them. It is possible that the perception of announced versus unannounced observations is based on the discussions that follow from school administration. Also, depending on the purpose of the observation by administration (feedback versus evaluative) could

contribute to the disparate findings. In several instances the perception of trust, or a lack thereof, was reflected in the comments.

5)   Among administrators and evaluators of teachers, unannounced walk-throughs and unannounced observations were seen as more valuable than announced.

6)   According to the survey results, there was a wide variation in the number of walk-throughs conducted because of DPAS II. This could contribute to the findings where walk-throughs were viewed as less valuable overall than observations among teachers and specialists. However, in the interviews, it appears that teachers wanted more walk-throughs if they were going to be used in a summative evaluation. Many stated that the few walk-throughs that were conducted did not provide a complete picture of their teaching, especially when not coupled with discussion and oral feedback.

7)   Forms were seen as not difficult to complete, but in several instances were viewed as duplicative. Approximately 65% of administrators responded on the disagree end of the scale when asked if the time it takes to complete the paperwork was reasonable. For teachers and specialists, this result was around 50%. The amount of time spent on DPAS II paperwork by the majority of administrators was over 20 hours. Conversely, the amount of time spent on paperwork by the majority of teachers and specialists was 0 – 5 hours.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the evaluation of the DPAS II was to collect and compile data in order to make recommendations relating to the effectiveness and usability of the DPAS II process. The 2011-2012 school year was the fourth year of statewide implementation for DPAS II. Progress Education Corporation was contracted by the Delaware Department of Education as a third-party evaluator to conduct all aspects of the evaluation. Upon receiving notification of being selected as the evaluator, the staff at Progress Education Corporation immediately began gathering contextual information, studying current manuals, and researching historical documents. Additionally, key staff members of the evaluation team visited the Delaware Department of Education to gain further insight into the DPAS II system and discuss any new expectations for the evaluation.

Building upon the work that had already been done by the 1998 DPAS Revision Task Force and the DPAS II Advisory Committee, and following the evaluation questions as written in the DPAS II evaluation RFP, Progress Education Corporation developed and administered surveys, conducted interviews, and facilitated focus groups for teachers, specialists, administrators, and evaluators. All data collection forms (i.e. surveys, interview guides, and focus group questions) were created to provide ample information related to the DPAS II system. This included gathering qualitative and quantitative data on the criteria used in the DPAS II system; the forms for evaluating teachers, specialists and administrators; the manageability of the total system; the accuracy and reliability of the data being used in the system; usefulness of the training sessions and manuals; needed modifications; and the efficacy of the DPAS II program in achieving quality assurance and professional growth. More specifically, detailed survey, interview, and focus group items were generated to respond to 26 questions that were specified in the RFP.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations for the 2012 report are captured in three categories, teachers, specialists, and administrators. The recommendations are based on the information derived from the surveys and interviews. The focus groups, as in past years, contributed significantly to the final recommendations outlined in this report. The surveys provide a statistical basis for the invaluable clarity provided by the interviews and focus groups. The Student Achievement Component remains a significant topic of conversation and concern. It is very likely that these concerns contaminate the survey and interview results. Teachers and specialists believe test data may be used to unfairly judge their productivity. They believe that student progress is a function of many variables and that it does "take a village" to raise and educate a child. Their fear that they alone will be burdened with the success or failure of a student is reflected in this year's report. It is also clear that, unlike any previous year, teachers describe DPAS II as an evaluation, rather than reflective practice and growth. It is apparent that a combination of actions has contributed to the lack of authenticity and a return to a checklist approach.

Teachers

Teachers overwhelmingly believe in the effectiveness of walkthrough observations. Many voiced the reality that the announced, formal observation was not authentic. The teachers had to "perform" for the administrator in order to demonstrate all parts of a lesson. This demonstration did not reflect the normal flow of their classroom, and because it was contrived they believe the feedback to be on behaviors and activities that were not authentic and not on how they really teach. Teachers indicated requiring evidence that was not part of the normal day suggested a "lack of trust" and possibly encouraged "dishonest behavior" on the part of some.

When asked how to strengthen this part of the process, teachers listed several suggestions.

1. Increase the amount of unannounced observations as long as the discussion and oral feedback are coupled with the increase.

2. Increase walkthrough observations for some as long as the discussion and oral feedback are coupled with the increase.

3. Have a select group of individuals that are agreed upon by the administrator and teacher provide feedback. Teachers want to be viewed through more than one lens.

4. May include peer visitation and observation.

5. Walkthrough observations (multiple) should be the basis of the experienced teacher's yearly reflection.

6. Make evidence authentic, part of the normal routine, not a collection of artifacts.

7. Make use of technology to provide feedback after walkthrough observations.

8. Provide brief conferencing after walkthrough observations.

9. Eliminate formal announced observations for prepared (as agreed upon by the teacher and principal) teachers and replace with walkthrough observations.

10. Expand some form of mentoring for experienced teachers.

11. Continue training focusing on observation and feedback techniques for evaluators and peer observers.

12. Remove the word "Evaluator" from DPAS II. Choose another term such as "Reflective Practitioner" to refer to the person supporting and facilitating a teacher's reflective practice.

The fear mentioned last year that DPAS II could become routine in the future and thus lose the leverage it enjoyed is now happening. Teachers believe they are returning to the checklists of years past. They believe that feedback and conversation make a difference. Teacher perception is that the rubrics are being turned into checklists. The mountain of paperwork required to do one formal observation is such that it is all one can do and must be made routine to survive. Teachers state that DPASII has become impersonal and less authentic. They also believe training must be continued and become more sophisticated. This is in contrast to the survey that indicates teachers no longer need training. When discussing training, teachers do not need more training on the basics of DPAS II but they do want additional discussion and communication to improve reflective practice. Late programmatic changes caused confusion and concern about how the program would operate in 2011-2012. The following suggestions are continued from last year. There can never be enough emphasis placed on the communication needs of teachers.

1. Create additional vehicles for conversations and communication for teachers.

2. Use the Internet to share information and ideas.

3. Build in refresher training for all teachers to reconnect with the philosophy of reflective practice.

4. No changes in DPAS II once the school year begins.

5. Eliminate the routine questions contained in Professional Responsibilities.

6. Train teachers with the same information given to evaluators. "It was more insightful."

7. Make certain emphasis on goal setting and sharing extends to areas like parent communication.

Specialists

Specialists remain cautious about the value of DPASII. This year many voiced concern about whether they were really a specialist or a teacher. They would like to have a review of their classification. They strongly believe walkthroughs with multiple observers is important, especially if one of the observers is familiar with their field. Like teachers, specialists are concerned about the rubrics and returning to a checklist mentality. They would like to see more use of the variety of association standards used in their reflective practice. They believe the increase in walkthroughs would have a very positive impact on discipline in the schools because of the increased visibility of administrators and visitors. They also voiced that teacher morale would be positively impacted with increased observations and authentic feedback.

1.   Use walkthroughs with several different observers.

2.   Use peer evaluation.

3.   Tie goals and expectations to national standards from the various professional associations.

4.   Increase training for evaluators on specialist DPAS II.

5.   Review current classification to assure correct instrument is being used, teacher versus specialist.

6.   Customize rubrics and forms by specialty.

Administrators

Administrators provided the most dynamic change in the conversation this year. They reflected the same concerns as teachers and specialists; DPAS II is an "evaluation" program. Reflective practice and growth was not mentioned unless prodded in the discussions. Administrators feel they are trapped in a system that requires shortcuts and checklists to survive. They are determined to help teachers but the system does set up contrived performances by teachers and specialists. They realize that their feedback is not reflective of daily behavior. They support the concept of walkthroughs with several sets of eyes at different times throughout the day and year. They believe new teachers require early structure, but can be moved to a system of walkthroughs when comfortable.   There is concern that working with teachers requiring formal intervention as part of a DPASSII improvement plan is distracting.

1.   Use walkthroughs on a regular basis.

2.   Create opportunities for several individuals to participate at different times in walkthroughs. Do not invade the classroom with more than one observer at a time.

3.   Gather observations from walkthroughs for the purpose of reflective feedback at the end of the year.

4.   Use announced, formal observations and walkthroughs for new teachers.

5.   Improve and customize rubrics and forms for specialists.

6.   Continuation training for reflective practice conferences.

7.   Find a way to increase unannounced observations, the best part of DPAS II.

8.   Separate formal Improvement Process actions from the DPAS II program.

9.   Summative conversations should be as much about the future as the past.

METHODS

Methodology

Surveys, interview protocols, and focus group items were created for teachers, specialists, and administrators. Quantitative results were obtained via an on-line survey administered by K-12 Insight. The response rates for the teacher, specialist, and administrator surveys were 43% (43% in 2010-2011), 43% (42% in 2010-2011), and 44% (51% in 2010-2011) respectively. Out of 8011 delivered teacher email invitations, 3401 teachers responded; out of 1093 specialists, 473 responded; and out of 506 administrators 223 responded.

Qualitative information was obtained through interviews and focus groups. Four hundred eighty three total interviews were conducted with teachers, specialists, and administrators.

	Teachers	Administrators	Specialists
Region 1	205	14	33
Region 2	87	6	12
Region 3	76	5	12
Region 4	29	1	3
Total	**397**	**26**	**60**

Six focus groups were conducted in Woodbridge and Christina school districts. Teachers, specialists, and administrators were divided into the six focus groups. The focus groups consisted of 10 teachers, 13 specialists, and 13 administrators. Their purpose was to help expand the ideas generated by the surveys and interviews conducted by Progress Education.

Questions

The questions presented to the teachers, specialists, and administrators during the individual interviews were:

<u>Administrator Questions</u>

1.   DPASS II has undergone significant revisions.

   a.   Rate the training you received.

   b.   What could have been done to improve the communication and training this year?

2.   28% of administrators feel applying all four components (vision goals, culture, management, professional responsibilities) in my work is difficult. How could that rating be improved?

3.   43% respond the forms make the process difficult to implement. How can that response be improved?

4.   A large majority of administrators believe unannounced observations and walk - throughs are valuable and should be part of the formative evaluation.

    a.   What are the barriers to this change?

    b.   How can we lower the barriers?

Teacher Questions

1.   Professional responsibilities is seen by 25% of the respondents as not a good indicator of performance.

    a.   Why?

    b.   How can that view be improved?

2.   DPASS II has undergone significant revisions.

    a.   Rate the training you received.

    b.   What could have been done to improve the communication and training this year?

3.   30% of teachers believe applying all four components (Planning and Preparation, Classroom Environment, Instruction, Professional Responsibilities) is difficult. How could that rating be improved?

4.   35% of the teachers believe the forms are difficult to complete. How could that response be improved?

5.   45% disagree that DPAS II should continue in its current form. What is one change you would like to see in the process?

6.   Roughly 70% of teachers see value in walk-throughs, but 50% do not think it should be part of the summative evaluation. Why?

Specialist Questions

1.   30% of Specialists believe their evaluators lack the ability to use the criteria to judge them on the four components (Planning and Prep., Professional Practice and Delivery of Service, Professional Collaboration and Consultation, and Professional Responsibilities) in DPAS II.

a. Why?

b. What are some strategies that can fix this perception or reality?

2. 36% of respondents find it difficult to apply all four components. How can this rating be improved?

3. 27% believe the forms completed after a conference are not valuable. How can this rating be improved?

4. 30% of specialists believe the DPAS II is not fair and equitable. How can this rating be improved?

The focus groups dealt with essentially the same questions though the conversations were not restricted by topic. The two areas of interest were:

1. Teachers, specialists, and administrators believe walkthroughs positively impact instruction. Can they be increased? What are the barriers to using them as part of DPAS II. How can the barriers be overcome?

2. The language of all DPAS II participants has changed from one of "reflective practice and growth" to "evaluation". What do you believe has caused this change? What changes could be implemented to change the conversation back to one of reflective practice?

All six focus groups were actively engaged in discussions of the two questions. The groups provided a variety of ideas about the strengths and improvements needed in DPAS II.

For all groups (teachers, specialists, and administrators), the online survey items were similar and followed the same pattern; however, some items were reworded specifically for each type of respondent. The first item of all the surveys assessed perceptions of each component of the DPAS II system–5 components for teachers, specialists, and administrators. These items were intended to gauge the participant's perceptions of the criteria in each component. The 5 middle sections of the survey were made up of Likert items with a 4-point response scale ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree. The Likert items were categorized into sections entitled: Evaluation Criteria, Documentation, Feedback, System Related Items, Data Related Items, and Department of Education website.

New items were added this year:

- In the first construct, that assesses whether the criteria can be accurately judged by an evaluator, additional items were added that ask whether the criteria for each component is an effective indicator. For example, for teachers, prior to asking whether the Planning and Preparation component can be accurately judged by their evaluator, they were asked to respond to whether the criteria used to evaluate them in the Planning and Preparation component were effective

indicators of their performance. This occurred for teachers, specialists, and administrators on all components of their evaluations.

- The 2nd set of new items asked "How valuable were the following in the DPAS II process?"
  a)   Announced observations

  b)   Unannounced observations

  c)   Announced walk-throughs

  d)   Unannounced walk-throughs

  e)   Peer observations

  f)   Use rubrics

  g)   Mentoring

  h)   Professional Learning Communities

  i)   Data Coaches

  j)   Building level administrators

  k)   District level administrators

- The 3rd set of new items asked respondents to "Indicate your level of understanding of the following:"
  a)   DPAS II rubrics
  b)   DPAS II process
  c)   DPAS II expectations
  d)   Commendations

- Lastly, the fourth set of new items asked respondents to "Indicate the level of impact for each of the following:"
  a)   Use of the rubrics on positive reinforcement

  b)   DPAS II overall on improving performance

  c)   _____ component on improving performance (components were listed specific to each job role.

  d)   Unannounced observations on improving performance

  e)   Announced observations on improving performance

  f)   Unannounced walk-throughs on improving performance

  g)   Announced walk-throughs on improving performance

  h)   Peer observations on increasing effective conversations about performance

- The end of the survey consisted of a series of demographic questions.

Statistical Analysis

Psychometric testing was conducted on the survey in 2006-2007, 2007-2008, and 2008-2009. After the first year of testing, the estimates remained stable and consistent. Construct validity and factor reliability is presented below. Constructs were established based on the highest factor loading for each item. Constructs were created if items loaded at a .4 factor level or higher; no item had a factor loading less than .5. There were 2 constructs that had items that formed separate constructs; however, the factor loadings were in the appropriate range to justify reporting them as one (for ease of interpretation).

Reliability estimates were determined for each construct. With the exception of one construct, all reliability estimates were outstanding, at α=.8 or higher. The one exception was a construct with the following items: "The training was timely," "Training in the process was adequate," and "Additional training would make me feel more competent in the process."

The constructs and corresponding estimates are presented below:

Construct 1 α = .90
The five components used to evaluate my performance are understandable.
The five components used to evaluate my performance are reasonable indicators of my effectiveness.
The criteria used to evaluate me for the planning and preparation component can be accurately judged by my evaluator.
The criteria used to evaluate me for the classroom environment component can be accurately judged by my evaluator.
The criteria used to evaluate me for the instruction component can be accurately judged by my evaluator.
The criteria used to evaluate me for the professional responsibilities component can be accurately judged by my evaluator.
The criteria used to evaluate me for the student improvement component can be accurately judged by my evaluator.
Applying all five components in my work is easy.
The written feedback I receive is aligned with the five components.
The oral feedback I receive is aligned with the five components.

Construct 2 α = .90
The forms play an important role in the overall evaluation.
I am able to provide the evidence and documentation needed by my evaluator for him/her to accurately determine my effectiveness.
I am able to provide evidence of my practice through artifact.
The time it takes to complete the DPAS II paperwork requirements is reasonable.
The forms are easy to complete.
I have access to the information I need to complete the forms.
The forms make the process easy to implement.
The information on the forms is consistent with determining the outcome of the evaluation.
The required paperwork is relevant to the evaluation.

Construct 3 α = .94
My evaluator completes paperwork in a reasonable time period.
My evaluator handles the workload effectively.
Overall, the feedback I receive is adequate.
The oral feedback I receive is useful and applicable.
The written feedback I receive is useful and applicable.
In general, the conferences are valuable.
The forms completed after conferences are valuable.
I am able to provide evidence of my practice through discussion.
The timing of the conferences is good.
The number of conferences/conversations with my evaluator is adequate.

Construct 4 α = .85
The system overall is easy to follow.
The evaluation process (observations, documentation, and conferences) provides adequate evidence of my teaching.
The evaluation process (observations, documentation, and conferences) provides an accurate picture of my teaching.
The DPAS II system provides a better picture of my teaching versus the DPAS I system.
The Guide is helpful.
The Guide is easy to understand.
The evaluation did NOT interfere with my duties.
I perceive the system to be fair and equitable.
The DPAS evaluation system needs improving.
I believe the DPAS evaluation system works as intended.
I believe the current DPAS evaluation system should be continued in its current form.

Construct 5 α = .83
I was able to complete the data documentation requirements without difficulty.
There was enough training and/or support for me to accurately complete the forms related to student improvement.
There was congruence with the results of school level data and my classroom data.

Construct 6 α = .75
Administrator walk-throughs improve teaching more than announced observations.
Unannounced observations by an administrator improve teaching more than walk-throughs.
Prior to DPAS II, walk-throughs were conducted more frequently during the year.
Walk-throughs should be part of a formative evaluation.
Walk-throughs should be part of a summative evaluation.

Construct 7 α = .83
Announced observations
Unannounced observations
Announced walk-throughs
Unannounced walk-throughs
Peer observations
Use of rubrics
Mentoring
Professional Learning Communities
Data Coaches
Building Level Administrators
District Level Administrators

Construct 8 α = .90
Understanding of rubrics
Understanding of the DPAS II process
Understanding of expectations
Understanding of commendations

Construct 9 α = .93
What level of impact does the use of rubrics have on positive reinforcement?
What level of impact does DPAS II overall have on improving my teaching?
What level of impact does the Planning and Preparation component have on improving my teaching?
What level of impact does the Classroom Environment component have on improving my teaching?
What level of impact does the Instruction component have on improving my teaching?
What level of impact does the Professional Responsibilities component have on improving my teaching?
What level of impact do unannounced observations have on improving my teaching?
What level of impact do announced observations have on improving my teaching?
What level of impact do unannounced walk-throughs have on improving my teaching?
What level of impact does announced walk-throughs have on improving my teaching?
What level of impact does peer observations have on increasing effective conversations about teaching?

RESULTS

Indicators of Performance (Q1)

Q1) Are the proposed criteria the best indicators of Effective Performance? Needs Improvement Performance? Ineffective Performance?

Teachers

To answer this research question, teachers were asked, "Of the 4 major components (as defined in the DPAS II Guide) used in teacher evaluations, which do you believe are good indicators of performance? "Instruction" has consistently received the highest level of support for being a good indicator of performance. "Professional Responsibilities" has consistently been selected as the least indicative. There is relatively little change in the results from 2009-2010 to the present.

Q1. Of the 4 major components (as defined in the DPAS II Guide) used in teacher evaluations, which do you believe are good indicators of performance? (check all that apply)			
Responses	**Count**	**%**	**Percentage of total respondents**
Planning and Preparation	2637	73.05%	
Classroom Environment	2760	76.45%	
Instruction	3195	88.50%	
Professional Responsibilities	1565	43.35%	
(Did not answer)	230	6.37%	
Total Responses	**10387**		20% 40% 60% 80% 100%
Multiple answers per participant possible. Percentages added may exceed 100 since a participant may select more than one answer for this question.			

Good Indicators of Performance – Teachers 10-11

Teachers					
Of the 5 major components (as defined in the DPAS II Guide) used in teacher evaluations, which do you believe are good indicators of performance (check all that apply)?					
	Planning and Preparation	Classroom Environment	Instruction	Professional Responsibilities	Did not answer	**Total**
2007/2008	77.24%	80.06%	91.60%	44.03%	1.18%	1274
2008/2009	73.90%	77.09%	90.28%	44.22%	1%	3268
2009/2010	73.46%	77.11%	88.87%	44.14%	1.59%	4614
2010/2011	73.68%	78.77%	90.87%	44.25%	1.96%	3670
2011/2012	73.05%	76.45%	88.5%	43.35%	6.37%	3610

Note: Multiple answers per participant possible. Percentages added will not sum to 100 since a participant may select more than one answer for this question.

Based on comments during interviews, the general consensus is that the Professional Responsibilities component is a valid indicator of performance. However, also suggested several times was a request for more clarity on what this component is looking for; in other words, more points on what is specifically required to meet this objective.

Specialists

Among specialists, "Professional Practice and Delivery of Service" was the only indicator with strong support of being a good indicator of performance. "Planning and Preparation" was selected the least. However, the remaining two categories did not receive strong support.

Q1. Of the 4 major components (as defined in the DPAS II Guide) used in specialist evaluations, which do you believe are good indicators of performance?			
Responses	Count	%	Percentage of total respondents
Planning and Preparation	234	46.71%	
Professional Practice and Delivery of Service	411	82.04%	
Professional Collaboration and Consultation	281	56.09%	
Professional Responsibilities	270	53.89%	
(Did not answer)	44	8.78%	
Total Responses	1240		20% 40% 60% 80% 100%
Note: Multiple answers per participant possible. Percentages added may exceed 100 since a participant may select more than one answer for this question.			

Good Indicators of Performance – Specialists 10-11

Specialists						
Of the 5 major components (as defined in the DPAS II Guide) used in specialist evaluations, which do you believe are good indicators of performance?						
	Planning and Preparation	Professional Practice and Delivery of Service	Professional Collaboration and Consultation	Professional Responsibilities	Did not answer	Total
2007/2008	70.73%	90.73%	76.10%	73.66%	1.95%	205
2008/2009	68.05%	87.86%	69.01%	68.69%	1%	313
2009/2010	61.65%	87.71%	65.25%	67.37%	2.54%	472
2010-2011	60.29%	88.98%	68.40%	67.15%	2.29%	481
2011-2012	46.71%	82.04%	56.09%	53.89%	8.78%	501
Note: Multiple answers per participant possible. Percentages added may exceed 100 since a participant may select more than one answer for this question.						

Administrators

Among administrators, the components selected the most for being a good indicator of performance was "Culture of Learning" and "Management." The component with least support from administrators was the "Professional Responsibilities" component. These results reflect the same trend from past years.

Q1. Of the 4 major components (as defined in the DPAS II Guide) used in administrator evaluations, which do you believe are good indicators of performance?			
Responses	**Count**	**%**	**Percentage of total respondents**
Component 1 - Vision and Goals	165	66.53%	
Component 2 - Culture of Learning	197	79.44%	
Component 3 - Management	195	78.63%	
Component 4 - Professional Responsibilities	139	56.05%	
(Did not answer)	15	6.05%	
Total Responses	**711**		20% 40% 60% 80% 100%
Note: Multiple answers per participant possible. Percentages added may exceed 100 since a participant may select more than one answer for this question.			

Good Indicators of Performance – Administrators 10-11

Administrator Of the 5 major components (as defined in the DPAS II Guide) used in administrator evaluations, which do you believe are good indicators of performance?						
	Vision and Goals	Culture of Learning	Management	Professional Responsibilities	Did not answer	**Total**
2007/2008	70.59%	78.43%	74.51%	60.78%	5.88%	51
2008/2009	68.04%	81.96%	81.44%	62.37%	2%	194
2009/2010	62.07%	78.37%	74.61%	58.31%	4.7%	319
2010/2011	57.09%	71.27%	71.27%	52.24%	5.22%	268
2011/2012	66.53%	79.44%	78.63%	56.05%	6.05%	248

Note: Multiple answers per participant possible. Percentages added may exceed 100 since a participant may select more than one answer for this question.

Evaluation Criteria Items (Q3)

Q3) Overall, is the system realistic?

Teachers

New items were developed which ask whether the listed component is a reasonable indicator of effectiveness.

Among teachers, the highest rated item was, "The four components used to evaluate my performance are understandable." This result has remained in the 90% range since 2007-2008 (92%), 95% in 2008-2009, 96% in 2009-2010, and 94% in 2010-2011.

Weighted score results (average of responses) are also presented where Strongly Agree = 4, Agree = 3, Disagree = 2, and Strongly Disagree = 1. In 2008-2009, 6 out of the 10 items in this survey section were in the positive side of the response scale (60%); in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011, results from 8 out of the 10 items were on the positive end of the scale (80%). Of the 13 items in 2011-1012, 8 were on the positive end of the scale (62%).

Teachers
Evaluation Criteria Items
Please indicate your level of agreement with each statement based on your belief of being a good indicator of performance

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Weighted Score
(a) The four components used to evaluate my performance are understandable.	22.64%	70.73%	5.82%	0.81%	3.15
(b) The four components used to evaluate my performance are reasonable indicators of my effectiveness.	17.27%	68.70%	12.21%	1.82%	3.01
(c) The criteria used to evaluate me for the Planning and Preparation component are effective indicators of my performance.	18.01%	68.23%	12.16%	1.60%	3.03
(d) The criteria used to evaluate me for the Planning and Preparation component can be accurately judged by my evaluator.	15.29%	64.94%	17.32%	2.45%	2.93
(e) The criteria used to evaluate me for the Classroom Environment component are effective indicators of my performance.	18.00%	69.06%	11.30%	1.64%	3.03
(f) The criteria used to evaluate me for the Classroom Environment component can be accurately judged by my evaluator.	17.39%	66.62%	13.93%	2.06%	2.99
(g) The criteria used to evaluate me for the Instruction component are effective indicators of my performance.	19.68%	71.98%	7.15%	1.19%	3.1
(h) The criteria used to evaluate me for the Instruction component can be accurately judged by my evaluator.	17.86%	68.80%	11.56%	1.78%	3.03
(i) The criteria used to evaluate me for the Professional Responsibilities component are effective indicators of my performance.	13.81%	60.54%	22.10%	3.55%	2.85
(j) The criteria used to evaluate me for the Professional Responsibilities component can be accurately judged by my evaluator.	13.52%	61.13%	21.92%	3.42%	2.85
(k) Applying all four components in my work is easy.	13.80%	54.81%	26.61%	4.78%	2.78
(l) The written feedback I receive is aligned with the four components.	24.93%	66.99%	5.71%	2.37%	3.14
(m) The oral feedback I receive is aligned with the four components.	24.39%	65.89%	7.30%	2.42%	3.12

Specialists

As with the teachers, the highest rated item among the specialists was "The five components used to evaluate my performance are understandable." However, the weight was somewhat lower among the specialists compared to teachers. Of the 13 items, only 2 had weighted scores in the desirable end of the scale. Those were about written and oral feedback being aligned with the four components. The item that received the lowest weighted score was "Applying all four components in my work is easy."

Specialists
Evaluation Criteria Items
Please indicate your level of agreement with each statement based on your belief of being a good indicator of performance

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Weighted Score
(a) The four components used to evaluate my performance are understandable.	13.54%	70.71%	13.33%	2.42%	2.95
(b) The four components used to evaluate my performance are reasonable indicators of my effectiveness.	10.61%	65.92%	20.00%	3.47%	2.84
(c) The criteria used to evaluate me for the Planning and Preparation component are effective indicators of my performance.	9.80%	65.51%	21.22%	3.47%	2.82
(d) The criteria used to evaluate me for the Planning and Preparation component can be accurately judged by my evaluator.	7.30%	57.61%	29.61%	5.48%	2.67
(e) The criteria used to evaluate me for the Professional Practice and Delivery of Service component are effective indicators of my performance.	11.81%	69.25%	16.29%	2.65%	2.9
(f) The criteria used to evaluate me for the Professional Practice and Delivery of Service component can be accurately judged by my evaluator.	8.78%	61.63%	24.69%	4.90%	2.74
(g) The criteria used to evaluate me for the Professional Collaboration and Consultation component are effective indicators of my performance.	9.96%	69.72%	16.06%	4.27%	2.85
(h) The criteria used to evaluate me for the Professional Collaboration and Consultation component can be accurately judged by my evaluator.	7.76%	62.65%	24.29%	5.31%	2.73
(i) The criteria used to evaluate me for the Professional Responsibilities component are effective indicators of my performance.	11.43%	69.39%	16.53%	2.65%	2.9
(j) The criteria used to evaluate me for the Professional Responsibilities component can be accurately judged by my evaluator.	9.78%	62.53%	23.01%	4.68%	2.77
(k) Applying all four components in my work is easy.	9.13%	53.11%	30.50%	7.26%	2.64
(l) The written feedback I receive is aligned with the four components.	16.88%	70.89%	8.86%	3.38%	3.01
(m) The oral feedback I receive is aligned with the four components.	16.81%	70.38%	9.66%	3.15%	3.01

Administrators

Administrators also rated the item, "The five components used to evaluate my performance are understandable," as the highest. When the weighted score is compared among the items, 7 of the 13 items have scores on the positive end of the response scale (54%). The item that received the least positive responses was the item, "Applying all five components in my work is easy." Nevertheless, 65% responded on the desirable end of the scale.

Administrators
Evaluation Criteria Items
Please indicate your level of agreement with each statement based on your belief of being a good indicator of performance

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Weighted Score
(a) The four components used to evaluate my performance are understandable.	21.72%	72.13%	4.92%	1.23%	3.14
(b) The four components used to evaluate my performance are reasonable indicators of my effectiveness.	16.80%	71.31%	10.25%	1.64%	3.03
(c) The criteria used to evaluate me for the Vision and Goals component are effective indicators of my performance.	15.23%	69.96%	12.76%	2.06%	2.98
(d) The criteria used to evaluate me for the Vision and Goals component can be accurately judged by my evaluator.	15.64%	66.26%	15.64%	2.47%	2.95
(e) The criteria used to evaluate me for the Culture of Learning component are effective indicators of my performance.	16.25%	73.33%	9.17%	1.25%	3.05
(f) The criteria used to evaluate me for the Culture of Learning component can be accurately judged by my evaluator.	15.29%	68.18%	14.05%	2.48%	2.96
(g) The criteria used to evaluate me for the Management component are effective indicators of my performance.	19.92%	73.03%	5.81%	1.24%	3.12
(h) The criteria used to evaluate me for the Management component can be accurately judged by my evaluator.	18.52%	69.96%	9.05%	2.47%	3.05
(i) The criteria used to evaluate me for the Professional Responsibilities component are effective indicators of my performance.	18.33%	74.17%	6.67%	0.83%	3.1
(j) The criteria used to evaluate me for the Professional Responsibilities component can be accurately judged by my evaluator.	17.43%	69.71%	10.79%	2.07%	3.02
(k) Applying all four components in my work is easy.	13.08%	52.32%	29.96%	4.64%	2.74
(l) The written feedback I receive is aligned with the four components.	17.50%	66.67%	11.67%	4.17%	2.98
(m) The oral feedback I receive is aligned with the four components.	19.42%	63.64%	13.22%	3.72%	2.99

Information from interviews suggests that administrators believe that the components are representative and appropriate for the evaluation.

Documentation (Q4, Q5, Q7, Q8, Q9)

Q4)	**How much time does it take for the person being evaluated to complete the required paperwork?**
Q5)	**How much time does it take for the evaluator to complete the required paperwork?**
Q7)	**Can the evaluators handle the workload of the evaluations?**
Q8)	**Are the forms understandable and useable?**
Q9)	**Do the forms provide the appropriate data for the evaluator to fairly and accurately assess an individual's performance?**

Teachers

The highest level of positive responses from teachers was on the items relating to their evaluator and the evidence needed as documentation for the components. The item with the least desirable responses was, "The time it takes to complete the DPAS II paperwork requirements is reasonable," which is the same as the results from 2009-2010 and 2010-2011. Six of the 11 items were on the positive end of the scale. However, when asked to select the category that fits best regarding the time spent on paperwork, the majority of teachers spent 0-5 hours on paperwork relating to the DPAS II system. The next highest category selected was 6-10 hours.

Teachers
Documentation
Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Weighted Score
(a) The forms play an important role in the overall evaluation.	10.09%	62.51%	23.54%	3.86%	2.79
(b) I am able to provide the evidence and documentation needed by my evaluator for him/her to accurately determine my effectiveness.	22.10%	69.68%	7.10%	1.11%	3.13
(c) I am able to provide evidence of my practice through artifact.	20.47%	69.39%	9.14%	1.00%	3.09
(d) The time it takes to complete the DPAS II paperwork requirements is reasonable.	6.90%	44.69%	34.18%	14.23%	2.44
(e) The forms are easy to complete.	7.38%	56.09%	30.26%	6.26%	2.65
(f) I have access to the information I need to complete the forms.	13.82%	77.56%	7.39%	1.22%	3.04
(g) The forms make the process easy to implement.	7.77%	53.43%	32.67%	6.13%	2.63
(h) The information on the forms is consistent with determining the outcome of the evaluation.	9.84%	70.30%	16.83%	3.02%	2.87
(i) The required paperwork is relevant to the evaluation.	8.98%	61.91%	24.20%	4.91%	2.75
(j) My evaluator completes paperwork in a reasonable time period.	25.96%	55.66%	12.01%	6.36%	3.01
(k) My evaluator handles the workload effectively.	24.79%	56.53%	12.71%	5.97%	3

Q17. On an annual basis, how much time do you spend on paperwork relating to the DPAS II system?		
Responses	**Count**	**%**
0-5 hours	1432	39.67%
6-10 hours	1150	31.86%
11-15 hours	424	11.75%
16-20 hours	148	4.10%
more than 20 hours	214	5.93%
(Did not answer)	242	6.70%
Total Responses	**3610**	

Specialists

Results from specialists indicate that the majority of them are ok with the forms, time, workloads, and access to information. However, there are still no items with weighted mean scores on the positive end of the scale. Because of very few "strongly agree" responses, those that responded on the undesirable end of the scale basically lowered the overall mean score. The item that received the fewest positive responses was, "The time it takes to complete the DPAS II paperwork requirements is reasonable. Similar to the teachers, the majority of specialists responded that they spent 5 hours or less on the paperwork relating to the DPAS II system. The next highest category selected among specialists was 6-10 hours.

Specialists
Documentation
Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Weighted Score
(a) The forms play an important role in the overall evaluation.	5.97%	65.88%	24.52%	3.62%	2.74
(b) I am able to provide the evidence and documentation needed by my evaluator for him/her to accurately determine my effectiveness.	14.56%	67.93%	15.82%	1.69%	2.95
(c) I am able to provide evidence of my practice through artifacts.	13.28%	67.63%	16.80%	2.28%	2.92
(d) The time it takes to complete the DPAS II paperwork requirements is reasonable.	2.70%	47.40%	37.63%	12.27%	2.41
(e) The forms are easy to complete.	3.97%	50.63%	37.03%	8.37%	2.5
(f) I have access to the information I need to complete the forms.	7.68%	77.80%	11.20%	3.32%	2.9
(g) The forms make the process easy to implement.	3.98%	50.10%	38.99%	6.92%	2.51
(h) The information on the forms is consistent with determining the outcome of the evaluation.	5.21%	63.33%	26.46%	5.00%	2.69
(i) The required paperwork is relevant to the evaluation.	4.78%	61.33%	25.78%	8.11%	2.63
(j) The evaluator completes paperwork in a reasonable time period.	18.62%	64.44%	11.72%	5.23%	2.96
(k) My evaluator(s) handle the workload effectively.	19.58%	63.37%	11.58%	5.47%	2.97

Q16. On an annual basis, how many hours do you spend on paperwork relating to the DPAS II system?		
Responses	**Count**	**%**
0-5 hours	238	47.50%
6-10 hours	144	28.74%
11-15 hours	43	8.58%
16-20 hours	18	3.59%
more than 20 hours	25	4.99%
(Did not answer)	33	6.59%
Total Responses	**501**	

Administrators

The highest level of positive responses from administrators was on the item relating to providing their evaluator and the evidence needed. The weighted score drops into the undesirable end of the scale for every other item. The item with the most disagree/strongly disagree responses was, "The time it takes to complete the DPAS II paperwork requirements is reasonable." There has been a steady increase in the number of respondents who disagree with this item. In 2009-2010, the undesirable responses were at 34%. In 2010-2011, that number increased to 41%. In 2011-2012, that number jumped to 66%. When asked specifically about paperwork, 81% responded that they spend more than 20 hours. This is an increase from 2010-2011 where 74% responded that they spend 20 or more hours.

Administrators
Documentation
Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Weighted Score
(a) The forms play an important role in the overall evaluation.	7.23%	68.09%	20.43%	4.26%	2.78
(b) I am able to provide the evidence and documentation needed by my evaluator for him/her to accurately determine my effectiveness.	15.32%	73.19%	11.06%	0.43%	3.03
(c) The time it takes to complete the DPAS II paperwork requirements is reasonable.	3.81%	30.08%	41.10%	25.00%	2.13
(d) The forms are easy to complete.	4.27%	50.00%	35.90%	9.83%	2.49
(e) I have access to the information I need to complete the forms.	8.90%	80.93%	9.32%	0.85%	2.98
(f) The forms make the process easy to implement.	5.53%	48.51%	38.30%	7.66%	2.52
(g) The information on the forms is consistent with determining the outcome of the evaluation.	6.75%	70.89%	18.57%	3.80%	2.81
(h) The required paperwork is relevant to the evaluation.	4.66%	64.41%	27.97%	2.97%	2.71
(i) The evaluator completes paperwork in a reasonable time period.	15.95%	65.09%	13.79%	5.17%	2.92
(j) My evaluator(s) handle the workload effectively.	16.38%	64.22%	15.09%	4.31%	2.93

Administrators
Documentation
On an annual basis, how many hours do you spend on paperwork relating to the DPAS II system?

Q17. On an annual basis, how many hours do you spend on paperwork relating to the DPAS II system?		
Responses	Count	%
0-5 hours	2	0.81%
6-10 hours	11	4.44%
11-15 hours	11	4.44%
16-20 hours	7	2.82%
more than 20 hours	200	80.65%
(Did not answer)	17	6.85%
Total Responses	**248**	

Administrators
Documentation
On an annual basis, how many hours do you spend on paperwork relating to the administrative portion of DPAS II?

Interviewees stated that paperwork and forms were causing the process to take so long. Shortening the forms was a common theme among administrators. There were also comments made about the form not aligning to teacher roles. Lastly, administrators alluded to needing clarification on how to complete the forms.

Feedback (Q2, Q6, Q12)

Q2)	**Do the number of observations and other collections of evidence provide enough information for an evaluator to make an accurate assessment of performance?**
Q6)	**Is there an appropriate balance between conversation or conferencing and documentation?**
Q12)	**Are the conferences meaningful and timely?**

Teachers

A majority of teachers responded on the positive end of the scale for all items related to feedback. Overwhelmingly, teachers believe that the oral feedback and the discussions are useful and/or valuable. The only item that had a weighted mean score on the undesirable end of the scale was about forms.

Teachers
Feedback
Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Weighted Score
(a) Overall, the feedback I receive is adequate.	23.42%	65.53%	8.42%	2.63%	3.1
(b) The oral feedback I receive is useful and applicable.	27.16%	61.44%	9.01%	2.40%	3.13
(c) The written feedback I receive is useful and applicable.	22.99%	61.60%	12.16%	3.26%	3.04
(d) In general, the conferences are valuable.	25.62%	61.71%	9.79%	2.89%	3.1
(e) The forms completed after conferences are valuable.	14.94%	57.46%	23.33%	4.27%	2.83
(f) I am able to provide evidence of my practice through discussion.	27.31%	67.73%	3.73%	1.23%	3.21
(g) The timing of the conferences is good.	20.40%	65.79%	10.77%	3.05%	3.04
(h) The number of conferences/conversations with my evaluator is adequate.	20.97%	66.56%	9.34%	3.12%	3.05

Specialists

Similar to teachers, specialists responded least favorably to the item, "The forms completed after conferences are valuable." The highest mean score occurred on the item, "I am able to provide evidence of my practice through discussion," followed by "The oral feedback I receive is useful and applicable" and "Overall the feedback I receive is adequate."

Specialists
Feedback
Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Weighted Score
(a) Overall, the feedback I receive is adequate.	16.35%	70.02%	11.11%	2.52%	3
(b) The oral feedback I receive is useful and applicable.	19.71%	65.41%	12.37%	2.52%	3.02
(c) The written feedback I receive is useful and applicable.	16.18%	65.34%	15.76%	2.73%	2.95
(d) In general, the conferences are valuable.	16.88%	66.88%	13.92%	2.32%	2.98
(e) The forms completed after conferences are valuable.	9.83%	60.68%	25.64%	3.85%	2.76
(f) I am able to provide evidence of my practice through discussion.	21.80%	70.86%	5.66%	1.68%	3.13
(g) The timing of the conferences is good.	13.35%	72.03%	11.23%	3.39%	2.95
(h) The number of conferences/conversations with my evaluator is adequate.	13.32%	71.67%	12.05%	2.96%	2.95

Administrators

Responses from administrators on feedback were positive. The weighted mean scores that are on the undesirable end of the scale were really close to a score of 3. Therefore, respondents weren't overly positive, but the majority was still on the positive end of the scale.

Administrators
Feedback
Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Weighted Score
(a) Overall, the feedback I receive is adequate.	14.77%	70.46%	11.81%	2.95%	2.97
(b) The oral feedback I receive is useful and applicable.	23.31%	63.98%	9.32%	3.39%	3.07
(c) The written feedback I receive is useful and applicable.	14.16%	66.52%	15.02%	4.29%	2.91
(d) The timing of conferences is good.	14.04%	71.49%	10.21%	4.26%	2.95
(e) The number of conferences/conversations with my evaluator is adequate.	16.24%	64.53%	14.10%	5.13%	2.92

System / Training Related Items (Q13, Q14, Q17, Q18, Q20)

Q13)	**Does the proposed system demonstrate equity among Teachers? Specialists? Administrators?**
Q14)	**Are educators' ratings, under the DPAS II, reasonably aligned with prior evaluations under DPAS I?**
Q17)	**Is the training adequate?**
Q18)	**Is the Guide useful?**
Q20)	**Are the content, materials, timelines, and delivery methods appropriate and effective?**

Teachers

The majority of teachers responded, "Agree," to all items related to the system overall. However, when the disagree/strongly disagree responses are taken into account, all of the 7 weighted means are below the desirable end of the scale indicating there are about ¼ of teachers who don't think positively about the system. The items with the highest mean among the system related items were, "The evaluation did NOT interfere with my duties" and "The evaluation process (observations, documentation, and conferences) provides adequate evidence of my teaching." When asked how often teachers refer to the Guide, 42% selected, "2-3 times per year," and 28% responded "1 time per year."

Teachers
System Related Items
Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Weighted Score
(a) The system overall is easy to follow.	8.16%	63.71%	24.26%	3.87%	2.76
(b) The evaluation process (observations, documentation, and conferences) provides adequate evidence of my teaching.	10.25%	64.44%	21.13%	4.18%	2.81
(c) The evaluation process (observations, documentation, and conferences) provides an accurate picture of my teaching.	9.55%	61.91%	24.14%	4.40%	2.77
(d) The Guide is helpful.	7.97%	69.66%	19.32%	3.05%	2.83
(e) The Guide is easy to understand.	7.52%	64.62%	24.37%	3.48%	2.76
(f) The evaluation did NOT interfere with my duties.	12.10%	62.61%	19.41%	5.89%	2.81
(g) I perceive the system to be fair and equitable.	8.38%	65.15%	21.60%	4.87%	2.77

Teachers
How often do you use or refer to the Guide for DPAS II?

Q16. How often do you use or refer to the Guide for DPAS II?			
Responses	**Count**	**%**	**Percentage of total respondents**
Never	507	14.04%	
1 time per year	1009	27.95%	
2-3 times per year	1504	41.66%	
4-5 times per year	276	7.65%	
6 or more times per year	87	2.41%	
(Did not answer)	227	6.29%	
Total Responses	**3610**		20% 40% 60% 80% 100%

Of the training items, among teachers, 58% responded that additional training would make them feel more competent in the process. The majority of teachers responded "Strongly Agree/Agree" for the training being timely and adequate. Sixty-one percent stated they did not need more training. However, there was an increase in teachers specifying they needed training in the Professional Responsibilities component. There is also evidence of this need from the interviews and focus groups. The sentiment was that it is a valid indicator, but there needs to be a better definition to match with teacher responsibilities and more clarity on what should be included in the component.

Over 20% of teachers responded they could use additional training in managing the requirements with other duties, the rubrics, and the process as a whole.

Teachers
Training Related Items
Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Weighted Score
(a) The training was timely.	10.34%	70.34%	16.26%	3.07%	2.88
(b) Training in the process is adequate.	8.38%	65.17%	22.00%	4.44%	2.77
(c) Additional training would make me feel more competent in the process.	12.21%	45.89%	36.53%	5.38%	2.65

Teachers
Training Related Items
From the following list, select the components of the DPAS process where you need additional training.

	None	Component 1 Planning and Preparation	Component 2 – Classroom Environment	Component 3 - Instruction	Component 4 - Professional Responsibilities	Did not answer	Total
2007/2008	48.43%	5.18%	7.38%	13.42%	8.48%	12.72%	1274
2008/2009	53.17%	11.41%	14.38%	21.34%	13.71%	5.00%	3261
2009/2010	55.23%	8.73%	10.85%	16.71%	9.93%	6.49%	4914
2010/2011	54.77%	8.91%	10.25%	16.40%	9.89%	5.80%	3670
2011/2012	60.58%	14.43%	12.35%	14.88%	15.98%	9.56%	3610

Note: Multiple answers per participant possible. Percentages added may exceed 100 since a participant may select more than one answer for this question.

Teachers
Training Related Items
From the following list, select specific aspects of the DPAS process where you need additional training.

	Providing evidence of work	Completing paperwork	Interpreting data	Presenting data	Managing the requirements of the evaluation with my regular duties	Understanding the Guide	Preparing for conferences	DPAS II cycle	Understanding the rubrics	Total
2007/2008	15.38%	16.72%	28.18%	21.90%	21.04%	16.41%	10.05%	n/a	n/a	1274
2008/2009	18.89%	18.34%	28.15%	21.22%	25.76%	14.41%	12.60%	n/a	n/a	3261
2009/2010	13.47%	12.23%	25.17%	18.40%	19.35%	12.15%	8.95%	n/a	n/a	4914
2010/2011	12.34%	10.22%	27.17%	19.56%	18.15%	12.18%	8.2%	n/a	n/a	3670
2011/2012	15.87	15.79%	23.13%	19.42%	25.18%	13.43%	9.92%	21.16%	21.69%	3610

Note: Multiple answers per participant possible. Percentages added may exceed 100 since a participant may select more than one answer for this question.

Specialists

The item that had the highest mean score was "The Guide is helpful." Similar to past years, the item with the lowest weighted mean score was, "The evaluation process (observations, documentation, and conferences) provides an accurate picture of my performance." The majority of specialists reported that they refer to the Guide "2-3 times per year." The next highest category selected was, "1 time per year."

Specialists
System Related Items
Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Weighted Score
(a) The system overall is easy to follow.	3.42%	55.98%	34.40%	6.20%	2.57
(b) The evaluation process (observations, documentation, and conferences) provides adequate evidence of my performance.	4.42%	56.63%	32.84%	6.11%	2.59
(c) The evaluation process (observations, documentation, and conferences) provides an accurate picture of my performance.	4.00%	53.26%	36.21%	6.53%	2.55
(d) The Guide is helpful.	5.73%	67.94%	22.08%	4.25%	2.75
(e) The Guide is easy to understand.	5.57%	64.24%	25.91%	4.28%	2.71
(f) The evaluation did NOT interfere with my duties.	8.47%	62.50%	23.09%	5.93%	2.74
(g) I perceive the system to be fair and equitable.	4.46%	59.45%	29.51%	6.58%	2.62

Specialists
How often do you use or refer to the Guide for DPAS II?

Q15. How often do you use or refer to the Guide for DPAS II?			
Responses	**Count**	**%**	**Percentage of total respondents**
Never	62	12.38%	
1 time per year	152	30.34%	
2-3 times per year	205	40.92%	
4-5 times per year	36	7.19%	
6 or more times per year	14	2.79%	
(Did not answer)	32	6.39%	
Total Responses	**501**		20%　40%　60%　80%　100%

In 2010-2011, the majority of specialists responded on the disagree end of the scale when asked if additional training would make them more competent in the process. In 2011-2012, the majority responded on the agree end of the scale. As with the teachers, the largest percent of specialists either did not respond or answered "None" when asked to indicate the areas in which they need additional training. The next largest percent of respondents checked "Collaboration and Consultation." When asked about specific areas where they would need additional training, "DPAS II cycle" and "Understanding the Rubrics" were checked the most.

Specialists
Training Related Items
Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Weighted Score
(a) The training was timely.	5.83%	71.33%	17.95%	4.90%	2.78
(b) Training in the process is adequate.	3.27%	60.75%	31.54%	4.44%	2.63
(c) Additional training would make me feel more competent in the process.	13.06%	48.46%	32.54%	5.94%	2.69

Specialists
Training Related Items
From the following list, select the components of the DPAS process where you need additional training.

	None	Component 1 - Planning and Preparation	Component 2 - Professional Practice and Delivery of Service	Component 3 - Professional Collaboration and Consultation	Component 4 - Professional Responsibilities	Did not answer	Total
2007/2008	46.34%	6.34%	6.34%	5.37%	3.90%	19.02%	205
2008/2009	53.35%	14.06%	11.82%	18.85%	12.78%	8.63%	313
2009/2010	58.05%	8.90%	9.32%	11.23%	8.47%	8.90%	472
2010/2011	50.31%	11.23%	12.06%	13.10%	11.85%	11.85%	481
2011/2012	53.49%	19.96%	19.76%	22.55%	15.17%	11.58%	501

Note: Multiple answers per participant possible. Percentages added may exceed 100 since a participant may select more than one answer for this question.

Specialists
Training Related Items
From the following list, select specific aspects of the DPAS process where you need additional training.

	Providing evidence of work	Completing paperwork	Interpreting data	Presenting data	Managing the requirements of the evaluation with my regular duties	Understanding the Guide	Preparing for conferences	DPAS II cycle	Understanding the Rubrics	Total
2007/2008	17.56%	20.00%	29.27%	24.88%	22.44%	15.61%	9.27%	n/a	n/a	205
2008/2009	20.45%	16.93%	25.24%	20.13%	22.36%	15.65%	12.46%	n/a	n/a	313
2009/2010	16.95%	10.81%	26.27%	23.52%	15.04%	12.08%	6.57%	n/a	n/a	472
2010/2011	18.30%	8.32%	23.49%	21.41%	17.05%	14.14%	8.32%	n/a	n/a	481
2011/2012	22.95%	19.36%	20.96%	24.35%	15.37%	11.58%	26.15%	27.94%	32.73%	501

Note: Multiple answers per participant possible. Percentages added may exceed 100 since a participant may select more than one answer for this question.

Administrators

Among administrators, the majority responded that the system is easy to follow and provides adequate evidence and an accurate picture of performance. Items related to the Guide also received positive responses. When asked "How often do you refer to the guide for DPAS II," the category with the most responses from administrators was, "6 or more times per year."

Administrators
System Related Items
Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Weighted Score
(a) The system overall is easy to follow.	5.68%	62.88%	27.07%	4.37%	2.7
(b) The evaluation process (observations, documentation, and conferences) provides adequate evidence of my performance.	4.26%	71.91%	20.43%	3.40%	2.77
(c) The evaluation process (observations, documentation, and conferences) provides an accurate picture of my performance.	4.33%	66.67%	25.11%	3.90%	2.71
(d) The Guide is helpful.	9.05%	77.16%	12.93%	0.86%	2.94
(e) The Guide is easy to understand.	6.93%	70.13%	20.78%	2.16%	2.82
(f) The evaluation did NOT interfere with my duties.	9.44%	57.94%	28.33%	4.29%	2.73
(g) I perceive the system to be fair and equitable.	6.06%	75.32%	15.15%	3.46%	2.84

Administrators
How often do you refer to the guide for DPAS II?

Q16. How often do you refer to the guide for DPAS II?			
Responses	**Count**	**%**	**Percentage of total respondents**
Never	1	0.40%	
1 time per year	3	1.21%	
2-3 times per year	39	15.73%	
4-5 times per year	50	20.16%	
6 or more times per year	134	54.03%	
(Did not answer)	21	8.47%	
Total Responses	**248**		20% 40% 60% 80% 100%

There has been a slight increase in administrators stating that additional training would make them feel more competent. In 2009-2010, 65% responded on the agree end of the scale. That increased to 70% in 2010-2011and in 2011-2012. When asked what components or areas do they need additional training, about ¼ selected "Culture of Learning" and "Vision and Goals." Since 2007-2008, more administrators have indicated that they need additional training in "Managing the requirements of the evaluation with my regular duties."

Administrators
Training Related Items
Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Weighted Score
(a) The training was timely.	17.98%	46.49%	25.88%	9.65%	2.73
(b) Training in the process is adequate.	15.04%	54.42%	24.34%	6.19%	2.78
(c) Additional training would make me feel more competent in the process.	20.70%	50.66%	25.11%	3.52%	2.89

Administrators
Training Related Items
From the following list, select the components of the DPAS process where you need additional training.

	Component 1 - Vision and Goals	Component 2 - Culture of Learning	Component 3 - Management	Component 4 - Professional Responsibilities	Did not answer	Total
2007/2008	17.65%	19.61%	9.80%	7.84%	39.22%	51
2008/2009	14.95%	16.49%	11.86%	9.79%	53.09%	194
2009/2010	14.73%	13.79%	10.03%	6.90%	49.84%	319
2010/2011	23.51%	20.90%	17.16%	16.42%	36.19%	268
2011/2012	25.40%	25.00%	14.52%	13.31%	11.69%	248

Note: Multiple answers per participant possible. Percentages added may exceed 100 since a participant may select more than one answer for this question.

Administrators
Training Related Items
From the following list, select specific aspects of the DPAS process where you need additional training.

	Providing evidence of work	Completing paperwork	Interpreting data	Presenting data	Managing the requirements of the evaluation with my regular duties	Understanding the Guide	Preparing for conferences	DPAS II cycle	Understanding the rubrics	Total
2007/2008	13.73%	7.84%	33.33%	21.57%	19.61%	1.96%	15.69%	n/a	n/a	51
2008/2009	18.56%	12.37%	18.04%	17.53%	24.23%	5.67%	19.59%	n/a	n/a	194
2009/2010	14.42%	11.91%	21.94%	15.67%	27.27%	4.39%	13.48%	n/a	n/a	319
2010/2011	22.39%	14.93%	28.36%	24.25%	38.81%	8.58%	20.52%	n/a	n/a	268
2011/2012	26.61%	22.98%	19.35%	14.11%	44.35%	5.65%	17.34%	13.31%	16.94%	248

Note: Multiple answers per participant possible. Percentages added may exceed 100 since a participant may select more than one answer for this question.

Data Related Issues (Q10)

Q10) What specific issues were encountered with Component V of the teacher and specialist processes?

Between 2 groups (teachers and specialists), the item with the highest mean in the data construct was, "Student data helps me adjust instruction for my students." Among administrators, the item with the highest mean was "Student data gives me an accurate picture of my students' progress." The lowest mean score among all 3 groups dealt with being able to complete the data documentation with difficulty.

Teachers
Data Related Items
Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Weighted Score
(a) Student data gives me an accurate picture of my students' progress.	15.72%	60.19%	20.44%	3.65%	3429	2.88
(b) I was able to complete the data documentation requirements without difficulty.	10.34%	61.92%	23.54%	4.20%	3403	2.78
(c) Student data helps me adjust instruction for my students.	21.46%	66.94%	9.56%	2.04%	3430	3.08

Specialists
Data Related Items
Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Weighted Score
(a) Student data gives me an accurate picture of my school's progress.	3.90%	52.81%	32.90%	10.39%	462	2.5
(b) I was able to complete the data documentation requirements without difficulty.	3.28%	50.55%	36.98%	9.19%	457	2.48
(c) Student data helps me adjust instruction for my students.	7.38%	55.26%	27.07%	10.29%	447	2.6

Administrators
Data Related Items
Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Weighted Score
(a) Student data gives me an accurate picture of my school's progress.	15.15%	61.04%	19.48%	4.33%	231	2.87
(b) I was able to complete the data documentation requirements without difficulty.	10.76%	56.95%	24.66%	7.62%	223	2.71
(c) Student data helps me adjust goals for my school evaluation system should be continued in its current form.	14.35%	59.13%	20.43%	6.09%	230	2.82

Improvement Plans (Q16)

Q16)   Is the "Improvement Plan" process helpful?

Only 1.3% of the teacher respondents were placed on improvement plans in 2010-2011. There were less than 5 specialists and administrators who responded that they were on improvement plans. Subsequently, only the teacher responses to the improvement plan items are presented. Among teachers on improvement plans, 60% responded "Strongly Agree" or "Agree," when asked if the improvement plan outlined measurable goals to work toward achieving. In 2008-2009, slightly fewer than 50% responded on the strongly agree/agree end of the scale for "There are adequate resources to implement improvement plans." This percent increased to 61% in 2009-2010, decreased to 44% in 2010-2011, and increased back to the original level (51%).

Teachers
Improvement Plans
Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Weighted Score
(a) The Improvement Plan process helped direct my professional growth goals.	13.33%	33.33%	31.11%	22.22%	45	2.38
(b) The Improvement Plan recommendations were useful.	15.56%	37.78%	28.89%	17.78%	45	2.51
(c) There are adequate resources to implement improvement plans.	11.11%	40.00%	24.44%	24.44%	45	2.38
(d) The Improvement Plan outlined measurable goals for me to work toward achieving.	11.11%	48.89%	22.22%	17.78%	45	2.53

Teachers
Improvement Plans
Were you placed on an improvement plan this year?

	Yes	No	Total
2008/2009	1.32%	98.68%	3261
2009-2010	1.14%	98.86%	4819
2010-2011	1.60%	98.4%	3569
2011-2012	1.27%	93.46%	3610

Website Evaluation (Q24)

Q24) Does the system provide the necessary support and resources to allow educators to reflect on and identify ways to improve their practice?

Almost all administrators were aware of the DPAS II website. Fewer teachers (72%) and specialists (73%) were aware of it. Across all 3 groups there were positive responses about the online manual, training materials, and the website. The lowest rated item among all 3 groups was about the short videos.

Teachers
Website Evaluation
Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Weighted Score
(d) The online manual was useful.	6.50%	65.76%	23.25%	4.50%	3110	2.74
(e) The online manual was easy to use.	6.41%	63.31%	25.87%	4.40%	3088	2.72
(f) The short videos were helpful.	5.18%	61.52%	28.16%	5.15%	3090	2.67
(g) The training materials were helpful.	5.56%	71.36%	19.59%	3.49%	3094	2.79
(h) The FAQs addressed my questions.	4.90%	70.02%	21.79%	3.28%	3079	2.77
(i) The website provides me with all the information I need on DPAS II.	6.58%	68.29%	21.70%	3.43%	3087	2.78

Specialists
Website Evaluation
Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Weighted Score
(d) The online manual was useful.	8.11%	64.68%	23.63%	3.58%	419	2.77
(e) The online manual was easy to use.	6.78%	62.95%	26.88%	3.39%	413	2.73
(f) The short videos were helpful.	3.79%	54.80%	36.87%	4.55%	396	2.58
(g) The training materials were helpful.	4.32%	69.30%	22.54%	3.84%	417	2.74
(h) The FAQs addressed my questions.	3.26%	62.16%	29.07%	5.51%	399	2.63
(i) The website provides me with all the information I need on DPAS II.	4.35%	63.29%	27.78%	4.59%	414	2.67

Administrators
Website Evaluation
Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Weighted Score
(d) The online manual was useful.	18.94%	63.88%	13.66%	3.52%	227	2.98
(e) The online manual was easy to use.	19.20%	59.82%	16.96%	4.02%	224	2.94
(f) The short videos were helpful.	12.33%	57.99%	25.11%	4.57%	219	2.78
(g) The training materials were helpful.	11.95%	73.45%	11.06%	3.54%	226	2.94
(h) The FAQs addressed my questions.	8.60%	73.76%	14.93%	2.71%	221	2.88
(i) The website provides me with all the information I need on DPAS II.	13.72%	59.73%	23.89%	2.65%	226	2.85

Website Evaluation
Are you familiar with the Department of Education website that supports DPAS II?

2011-2012	Yes	No
Teachers	72.3%	20.8%
Specialists	72.9%	19.6%
Administrators	92.7%	1%

There were a few positive comments about the online materials among interviewees.

Handling Unique Circumstances (Q25)

25) What unique circumstances were encountered? How were they handled?

No specific unique circumstances were brought to the attention of the interviewers or during the focus groups.

General System (Q26)

26) As a whole, how did the system work?

There were almost the same percent of teachers agreeing and disagreeing with the item "I believe the current DPAS II evaluation system should be continued in its current form." The majority believe it is being implemented appropriately.

Teachers
General System Items
Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Weighted Score
(a) The DPAS II evaluation system needs improving.	18.74%	51.06%	29.02%	1.18%	3394	2.87
(b) I believe the DPAS II evaluation system is being implemented appropriately in my work location.	10.54%	69.91%	15.43%	4.12%	3397	2.87
(c) I believe the current DPAS II evaluation system should be continued in its current form.	5.42%	41.91%	42.47%	10.20%	3374	2.43

Q18. How often has an evaluator conducted a walk-through in your classroom?						
	Never	1 time	2-3 times	4-5 times	6 or more times per year	Did not answer	Total
Responses Received in %	4.99%	8.89%	29.70%	20.44%	29.47%	6.51%	3610

Q19. Prior to DPAS II, how often did an evaluator conduct a walk-through in your classroom?						
	Never	1 time	2-3 times	4-5 times	6 or more times per year	Did not answer	Total
Responses Received in %	11.08%	11.69%	34.13%	17.26%	17.42%	8.42%	3610

8. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Weighted Score
(a) Administrator walk-throughs improve teaching more than announced observations.	10.22%	37.21%	42.42%	10.16%	2.47
(b) Unannounced observations by an administrator improve teaching more than walk-throughs.	6.82%	33.97%	50.67%	8.54%	2.39
(c) Prior to DPAS II, walk-throughs were conducted more frequently during the year.	6.81%	29.24%	53.48%	10.47%	2.32
(d) Walk-throughs should be part of a formative evaluation.	6.27%	40.60%	37.83%	15.30%	2.38
(e) Walk-throughs should be part of a summative evaluation.	5.19%	35.47%	43.17%	16.16%	2.3

9. How valuable are the following in the DPAS II process?

	Very Valuable	Some Value	Limited Value	Not at all Valuable	Weighted Score
(a) Announced observations	41.29%	47.94%	8.95%	1.82%	3.29
(b) Unannounced observations	27.21%	54.15%	15.21%	3.43%	3.05
(c) Announced walk-throughs	17.68%	52.65%	22.80%	6.87%	2.81
(d) Unannounced walk-throughs	23.37%	48.62%	20.13%	7.88%	2.87
(e) Peer observations	35.76%	42.76%	16.03%	5.45%	3.09
(f) Use of rubrics	30.36%	49.49%	16.43%	3.72%	3.07
(g) Mentoring	33.74%	43.69%	16.67%	5.90%	3.05
(h) Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)	22.29%	40.06%	25.42%	12.23%	2.72
(i) Data Coaches	9.32%	28.34%	34.39%	27.96%	2.19
(j) Building Level Administrators	40.19%	44.61%	11.28%	3.92%	3.21
(k) District Level Administrators	14.06%	38.55%	30.67%	16.72%	2.5

10. Indicate your level of understanding of the following:

	Complete Understanding	Some Understanding	Limited Understanding	No Understanding	Weighted Score
(a) DPAS II rubrics	30.49%	55.89%	12.54%	1.08%	3.16
(b) DPAS II process	32.71%	56.89%	9.79%	0.62%	3.22
(c) DPAS II expectations	33.96%	55.80%	9.45%	0.79%	3.23
(d) Commendations	27.20%	52.27%	16.21%	4.33%	3.02

11. Indicate the level of impact for each of the following statements.

	Major Impact	Some Impact	Limited Impact	No Impact	Weighted Score
(a) What level of impact does the use of rubrics have on positive reinforcement?	16.33%	61.63%	18.07%	3.98%	2.9
(b) What level of impact does DPAS II overall have on improving my teaching?	15.19%	54.43%	24.49%	5.89%	2.79
(c) What level of impact does the Planning and Preparation component have on improving my teaching?	26.58%	51.41%	17.24%	4.77%	3
(d) What level of impact does the Classroom Environment component have on improving my teaching?	23.76%	52.85%	18.15%	5.24%	2.95
(e) What level of impact does the Instruction component have on improving my teaching?	29.44%	52.12%	14.51%	3.92%	3.07
(f) What level of impact does the Professional Responsibilities component have on improving my teaching?	12.92%	50.62%	26.90%	9.56%	2.67
(g) What level of impact do unannounced observations have on improving my teaching?	15.19%	51.70%	25.63%	7.48%	2.75
(h) What level of impact do announced observations have on improving my teaching?	19.46%	55.16%	20.11%	5.28%	2.89
(i) What level of impact do unannounced walk-throughs have on improving my teaching?	13.79%	48.48%	26.55%	11.19%	2.65
(j) What level of impact does announced walk-throughs have on improving my teaching?	11.60%	49.67%	28.35%	10.38%	2.62
(k) What level of impact does peer observations have on increasing effective conversations about teaching?	23.85%	48.93%	19.27%	7.94%	2.89

The majority of specialists disagree that the DPAS II system should continue in its current form. As with teachers, the majority also believe that it is being implemented appropriately.

<div align="center">

Specialists
General System Items
Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

</div>

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Weighted Score
(a) The DPAS II evaluation system needs improving.	27.16%	50.43%	21.55%	0.86%	464	3.04
(b) I believe the DPAS II evaluation system is being implemented appropriately in my work location.	6.79%	69.64%	18.26%	5.31%	471	2.78
(c) I believe the DPAS II evaluation system should be continued in its current form.	1.52%	37.31%	47.07%	14.10%	461	2.26

8. How valuable are the following in the DPAS II process?

	Very Valuable	Some Value	Limited Value	Not at all Valuable	Weighted Score
(a) Announced observations	27.12%	54.45%	14.41%	4.03%	3.05
(b) Unannounced observations	19.53%	58.17%	17.62%	4.67%	2.93
(c) Peer observations	27.72%	42.13%	18.63%	11.53%	2.86
(d) Use of rubrics	18.80%	50.21%	21.37%	9.62%	2.78
(e) Mentoring	30.02%	43.49%	15.67%	10.82%	2.93
(f) Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)	16.63%	41.46%	23.73%	18.18%	2.57
(g) Data Coaches	6.22%	34.56%	29.49%	29.72%	2.17
(h) Building Level Administrators	28.48%	48.39%	16.27%	6.85%	2.99
(i) District level Administrators	12.28%	41.59%	28.66%	17.46%	2.49

9. Indicate your level of understanding of the following:

	Complete Understanding	Some Understanding	Limited Understanding	No Understanding	Weighted Score
(a) DPAS II rubrics	22.77%	54.26%	18.30%	4.68%	2.95
(b) DPAS II process	26.33%	56.90%	14.44%	2.34%	3.07
(c) DPAS II expectations	27.45%	55.96%	14.47%	2.13%	3.09
(d) Commendations	19.27%	51.61%	22.48%	6.64%	2.84

10. Indicate the level of impact for each of the following statements.

	Major Impact	Some Impact	Limited Impact	No Impact	Weighted Score
(a) What level of impact does the use of rubrics have on positive reinforcement?	7.84%	56.43%	26.80%	8.93%	2.63
(b) What level of impact does DPAS II overall have on improving my performance?	8.30%	54.89%	26.81%	10.00%	2.61
(c) What level of impact does the Planning and Preparation component have on improving my performance?	12.79%	51.81%	26.87%	8.53%	2.69
(d) What level of impact does the Professional Practice and Delivery of Service component have on improving my performance?	18.05%	48.83%	26.33%	6.79%	2.78
(e) What level of impact does the Professional Collaboration and Consultation component have on improving my performance?	11.75%	55.98%	24.57%	7.69%	2.72
(f) What level of impact does the Professional Responsibilities component have on improving my performance?	14.44%	50.74%	27.39%	7.43%	2.72
(g) What level of impact do unannounced observations have on improving my performance?	9.25%	45.59%	32.90%	12.26%	2.52
(h) What level of impact do announced observations have on improving my performance?	10.66%	50.32%	29.00%	10.02%	2.62
(i) What level of impact does peer observations have on increasing effective conversations about performance?	14.73%	45.71%	26.15%	13.41%	2.62

The majority of administrators believe that the evaluation system is being implemented appropriately in their work location. However, as with the teachers and specialists, the majority disagree that DPAS II should be continued in its current form.

General System Items

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Weighted Score
(a) The DPAS II evaluation system needs improving.	29.65%	57.52%	11.06%	1.77%	226	3.15
(b) I believe the DPAS II evaluation system is being implemented appropriately in my work location.	11.11%	71.11%	13.78%	4.00%	225	2.89
(c) I believe the current DPAS II evaluation system should be continued in its current form.	3.56%	32.89%	49.33%	14.22%	225	2.26

8. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.						
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Did Not Answer	Weighted Score
(a) Administrator walk-throughs improve teaching more than announced observations.	29.44%	43.95%	18.95%	0%	7.66%	3.11
(b) Unannounced observations by an administrator improve teaching more than walk-throughs.	17.34%	50.40%	22.58%	2.02%	7.66%	2.9
(c) Prior to DPAS II, walk-throughs were conducted more frequently during the year.	17.34%	35.08%	36.69%	2.82%	8.06%	2.73
(d) Walk-throughs should be part of a formative evaluation.	18.95%	47.18%	22.98%	4.44%	6.45%	2.86
(e) Walk-throughs should be part of a summative evaluation.	20.16%	46.77%	22.18%	3.63%	7.26%	2.9

9. How valuable are the following in the DPAS II process?						
	Very Valuable	Some Value	Limited Value	Not at all Valuable	Did Not Answer	Weighted Score
(a) Announced observations	30.24%	43.15%	20.16%	0.81%	5.65%	3.09
(b) Unannounced observations	68.55%	22.98%	2.02%	0%	6.45%	3.71
(c) Announced walk-throughs	13.71%	49.60%	25.00%	3.63%	8.06%	2.8
(d) Unannounced walk-throughs	66.13%	23.39%	3.63%	0.81%	6.05%	3.65
(e) Peer observations	45.56%	35.48%	9.27%	2.42%	7.26%	3.34
(f) Use of rubrics	47.98%	38.71%	6.45%	0.81%	6.05%	3.42
(g) Mentoring	54.03%	32.26%	6.05%	0%	7.66%	3.52
(h) Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)	55.24%	30.65%	7.26%	0%	6.85%	3.52
(i) Data Coaches	23.39%	36.29%	22.18%	11.29%	6.85%	2.77

10. Indicate your level of understanding of the following:						
	Complete Understanding	Some Understanding	Limited Understanding	No Understanding	Did not answer	Weighted Score
(a) DPAS II rubrics	55.24%	34.68%	2.42%	0.40%	7.26%	3.56
(b) DPAS II process	60.48%	31.45%	0.40%	0%	7.66%	3.65
(c) DPAS II expectations	53.63%	36.69%	2.42%	0%	7.26%	3.55
(d) Commendations	46.77%	39.11%	6.45%	0%	7.66%	3.44

Overall Grade

Teachers, specialists, and administrators were asked to give the evaluation process a grade (A – F) and to indicate their level of agreement with 3 general items about the system. The majority of teachers, specialists, and administrators gave the process a grade of a "B." A higher percent of teachers gave the process a grade of "A" than specialists or administrators. The next highest grade among all 3 groups was "C."

Teachers

Q23. Overall, what grade would you give the evaluation process?		
Responses	Count	%
A	242	6.70%
B	1492	41.33%
C	1163	32.22%
D	355	9.83%
F	126	3.49%
(Did not answer)	232	6.43%
Total Responses	3610	

Specialists

Q20. Overall, what grade would you give the evaluation process?		
Responses	Count	%
A	22	4.39%
B	167	33.33%
C	177	35.33%
D	76	15.17%
F	29	5.79%
(Did not answer)	30	5.99%
Total Responses	501	

Administrators

Q23. Overall, what grade would you give the evaluation process?		
Responses	Count	%
A	5	2.02%
B	88	35.48%
C	86	34.68%
D	43	17.34%
F	9	3.63%
(Did not answer)	17	6.85%
Total Responses	248	

Focus Group Findings

Teacher Focus Groups

Teachers overwhelmingly believe in the effectiveness of walkthrough observations. Many voiced the reality that the announced, formal observation was not authentic. The teachers had to "perform" for the administrator in order to demonstrate all parts of a lesson. This demonstration did not reflect the normal flow of their classroom, and because it was contrived, they believe the feedback to be on behaviors and activities that were not authentic or how they really teach. Teachers indicated requiring evidence that was not part of the normal day suggested a "lack of trust" and possibly encouraged "dishonest behavior" on the part of some.

When asked how to strengthen this part of the process, teachers listed several suggestions.

1. Increase the amount of unannounced observations as long as the discussion and oral feedback are coupled with the increase.

2. Increase walkthrough observations for some as long as the discussion and oral feedback are coupled with the increase.

3. Have a select group of individuals, agreed upon by the administrator and teacher, provide feedback. Teachers want to be viewed through more than one lens.

4. May include peer visitation and observation.

5. Walkthrough observations (multiple) should be the basis of the experienced teacher's yearly reflection.

6. Make evidence authentic, part of the normal routine, not a collection of artifacts.

7. Make use of technology to provide feedback after walkthrough observations.

8. Provide brief conferencing after walkthrough observations.

9. Eliminate formal announced observations for prepared (as agreed upon by the teacher and principal) teachers and replace with walkthrough observations.

10. Expand some form of mentoring for experienced teachers.

11. Continue training focusing on observation and feedback techniques for evaluators and peer observers.

12. Remove the word "Evaluator" from DPAS II. Choose another term such as "Reflective Practitioner" to refer to the person supporting and facilitating a teacher's reflective practice.

The fear mentioned last year that DPAS II could become routine in the future and thus lose the leverage it enjoyed is now happening. Teachers believe they are returning to the checklists of years past. They believe that feedback and conversation make a difference. Teacher perception is that the rubrics are being turned into checklists. The mountain of paperwork required to do one formal observation is such that it is all one can do and must be made routine to survive. Teachers state that DPASII has become impersonal and less authentic. They also believe training must be continued and become more sophisticated. This is in contrast to the survey that indicates teachers no longer need training. When discussing training, teachers do not need more training on the basics of DPAS II but they do want additional discussion and communication to improve reflective practice. Late programmatic changes caused confusion and concern about how the program would operate in 2011-2012. The following suggestions are continued from last year. There can never be enough emphasis placed on the communication needs of teachers.

1. Create additional vehicles for conversations and communication for teachers.

2. Use the Internet to share information and ideas.

3. Build in refresher training for all teachers to reconnect with the philosophy of reflective practice.

4. No changes in DPAS II once the school year begins.

5. Eliminate the routine questions contained in Professional Responsibilities.

6. Train teachers with the same information given to evaluators. "It was more insightful."

7. Make certain emphasis on goal setting and sharing extends to areas like parent communication.

Specialists Focus Group Findings

Specialists remain cautious about the value of DPASII. This year many voiced concern about whether they were really a specialist or a teacher. They would like to have a review of their classification. They strongly believe walkthroughs with multiple observers is important, especially if one of the observers is familiar with their field. Like teachers, specialists are concerned about the rubrics and returning to a checklist mentality. They would like to see more use of the variety of association standards used in their reflective practice. They believe the increase in walkthroughs would have a very positive impact on discipline in the schools because of the increased visibility of administrators and visitors. They also voiced that teacher morale would be positively impacted with increased observations and authentic feedback.

1. Use walkthroughs with several different observers.

2. Use peer evaluation.

3. Tie goals and expectations to national standards from the various professional associations.

4. Increase training for evaluators on specialist DPAS II.

5. Review current classification to assure correct instrument is being used, teacher versus specialist.

6. Customize rubrics and forms by specialty.

Administrator Focus Group Findings

Administrators provided the most dynamic change in the conversation this year. They reflected the same concerns as teachers and specialists, DPAS II is an "evaluation" program. Reflective practice and growth was not mentioned unless prodded in the discussions. Administrators feel they are trapped in a system that requires shortcuts and checklists to survive. They are determined to help teachers but the system does set up contrived performances by teachers and specialists. They realize that their feedback is not an authentic reflection of daily behavior. They support the concept of walkthroughs with several sets of eyes at different times throughout the day and year. They believe new teachers require early structure, but can be moved to a system of walkthroughs when comfortable. There is concern with tying improvement activities to DPAS II. There is concern that working with teachers requiring formal intervention as part of DPASSII improvement plan is distracting.

1. Use walkthroughs on a regular basis.

2. Create opportunities for several individuals to participate at different times in walkthroughs. Do not invade the classroom with more than one observer at a time.

3. Gather observations from walkthroughs for the purpose of reflective feedback at the end of the year.

4. Use announced, formal observations and walkthroughs for new teachers.

5. Improve and customize rubrics and forms for specialists.

6. Continuation training for reflective practice conferences.

7. Find a way to increase unannounced observations, the best part of DPAS II.

8. Separate formal Improvement Process actions from the DPAS II program.

9. Summative conversations should be as much about the future as the past.

Actual Time Intervals

There were no big discrepancies between the actual interval of days between activities and the recommended interval of days on scheduling the observation and the pre-observation conference. There were discrepancies with the post-observation intervals and the summative conference. There were more teachers recommending the "1-5 day" interval versus those responding that it was the actual.

Teachers
Actual Time Intervals

	1-5 Days	6-10 Days	11-20 Days	21-30 Days	More than 30 Days	Did Not Answer
(a) Scheduling the observation and the pre-observation conference	59.94%	21.11%	5.96%	2.13%	2.91%	7.95%
(b) Pre-observation conference and the observation	81.11%	8.78%	1.25%	0.19%	0.61%	8.06%
(c) Observation and the post-observation conference	61.61%	19.39%	4.82%	1.69%	2.91%	9.58%
(d) Post-observation conference and receipt of the formative feedback form	49.11%	22.49%	8.34%	3.19%	8.14%	8.73%
(e) Summative conference and receipt of the summative feedback form	42.22%	21.75%	8.17%	3.05%	10.80%	14.02%

Teachers
Staff Recommendation for Intervals

	1-5 Days	6-10 Days	11-20 Days	21-30 Days	More than 30 Days	Did Not Answer
(a) Scheduling the observation and the pre-observation conference	59.63%	25.47%	7.51%	2.56%	2.11%	2.71%
(b) Pre-observation conference and the observation	83.99%	12.39%	1.09%	0.24%	0.15%	2.14%
(c) Observation and the post-observation conference	78.80%	16.55%	1.96%	0.30%	0.30%	2.08%
(d) Post-observation conference and receipt of the formative feedback form	64.37%	27.29%	4.09%	0.76%	0.61%	2.88%
(e) Summative conference and receipt of the summative feedback form	56.51%	28.79%	6.00%	1.56%	2.02%	5.11%

Among specialists, there were minimal discrepancies on observation and pre-observation conference, post-observation conference and summative conference. There were 6 percentage points difference in the observation and the post-observation conference. More staff recommended "1-5 days" than was indicated in the actual.

Specialists
Actual Time Intervals

	1-5 Days	6-10 Days	11-20 Days	21-30 Days	More than 30 Days
(a) Scheduling the observation and the pre-observation conference	58.99%	27.42%	7.37%	2.53%	3.69%
(b) Pre-observation conference and the observation	72.98%	19.17%	4.85%	0.92%	2.08%
(c) Observation and the post-observation conference	60.32%	27.61%	7.42%	1.62%	3.02%
(d) Post-observation conference and receipt of the formative feedback form	54.39%	28.27%	9.03%	2.38%	5.94%
(e) Summative conference and receipt of the summative feedback form	47.50%	29.75%	10.25%	2.25%	10.25%

Specialists
Staff Recommendation for Intervals

	1-5 Days	6-10 Days	11-20 Days	21-30 Days	More than 30 Days	Don't Know/ Don't Care
(a) Scheduling the observation and the pre-observation conference	54.34%	29.22%	6.85%	2.28%	1.14%	6.16%
(b) Pre-observation conference and the observation	66.74%	22.48%	4.59%	0.69%	0.23%	5.28%
(c) Observation and the post-observation conference	65.65%	25.00%	3.50%	0.70%	0.23%	4.91%
(d) Post-observation conference and receipt of the formative feedback form	54.88%	31.63%	6.51%	0.93%	0.47%	5.58%
(e) Summative conference and receipt of the summative feedback form	46.70%	34.43%	8.02%	2.36%	1.18%	7.31%

The majority of administrators selected 1-5 days as the interval that represents the actual time between pairs of activities. This closely aligns with the staff recommendations of the intervals between pairs of activities. One discrepancy showed up in the pre-observation conference and the observation activities. Seventy-nine percent indicated 1 – 5 days was the recommended, while 91% stated 1-5 days was actual.

Administrators
Actual Time Intervals

	1 - 5 Days	6 - 10 Days	11 - 20 Days	21 - 30 Days	More than 30 Days
(a) Scheduling the observation and the pre-observation conference	65.20%	27.75%	4.41%	2.64%	0%
(b) Pre-observation conference and the observation	90.75%	7.49%	1.76%	0%	0%
(c) Observation and the post-observation conference	69.78%	25.33%	4.00%	0.89%	0%
(d) Post-observation conference and receipt of the formative feedback form	28.32%	47.35%	15.49%	4.42%	4.42%
(e) Summative conference and receipt of the summative feedback form	33.49%	48.17%	11.47%	1.38%	5.50%

Administrators
Staff Recommendation for Intervals

	1 - 5 Days	6 - 10 Days	11 - 20 Days	21 - 30 Days	More than 30 Days	Did not Answer
(a) Scheduling the observation and the pre-observation conference	61.29%	22.18%	6.05%	1.61%	0%	8.87%
(b) Pre-observation conference and the observation	79.03%	10.89%	1.21%	0%	0%	8.87%
(c) Observation and the post-observation conference	65.73%	20.97%	3.63%	0%	0%	9.68%
(d) Post-observation conference and receipt of the formative feedback form	33.47%	35.48%	15.73%	4.44%	1.21%	9.68%
(e) Summative conference and receipt of the summative feedback form	34.27%	34.27%	12.10%	3.23%	4.03%	12.10%

Evaluation Process (Q22, Q23)

22)	**Does the system enable evaluators to make valid judgments about the performance of educators?**
23)	**Does the system help evaluators improve the skills and knowledge of those they evaluate?**

At the end of the administrator survey, respondents were asked if they were responsible for evaluating other administrators, teachers, and/or specialists. If they answered "Yes," they were branched to a series of items. If they answered "No," that section of the survey ended. Overall, the evaluator responses were overwhelmingly positive.

Evaluating Administrators

In 2011 - 2012, 52 respondents evaluated administrators. The categories selected the most by administrator evaluators as good indicators of performance were "Management," "Culture of Learning," and "Professional Responsibilities." The item that had the lowest weighted score was, "I can accurately evaluate administrators using the criteria for the Vision and Goals component." Additionally, all of the evaluators responded on the "Agree/Strongly Agree" end of the scale for alignment of written and oral feedback with the five components.

Evaluators
Criteria for Evaluating Administrators
Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Weighted Score
(a) I can accurately evaluate administrators using the criteria for the Vision and Goals component.	21.28%	68.09%	8.51%	2.13%	3.09
(b) I can accurately evaluate administrators using the criteria for the Culture of Learning component.	23.40%	68.09%	6.38%	2.13%	3.13
(c) I can accurately evaluate administrators using the criteria for the Management component.	20.45%	77.27%	2.27%	0%	3.18
(d) I can accurately evaluate administrators using the criteria for the Professional Responsibilities component.	19.15%	74.47%	6.38%	0%	3.13
(e) The written feedback I provide to administrators is aligned with the four components.	29.55%	65.91%	4.55%	0%	3.25
(f) The oral feedback I provide to administrators is aligned with the four components.	36.17%	61.70%	2.13%	0%	3.34

Evaluators
Of the 5 major components (as defined in the DPAS II Guide) used in administrator evaluations, which do you believe are good indicators of performance?

Q34. EVALUATOR Of the 4 major components (as defined in the DPAS II Guide) used in administrator evaluations, which do you believe are good indicators of performance? (check all that apply)								
	Vision and Goals		Culture of Learning		Management		Professional Responsibilities	Total
Responses Received	40	85.11%	41	87.23%	42	89.36%	37	78.72%	47
Note: Multiple answers per participant possible. Percentages added may exceed 100 since a participant may select more than one								

Evaluators were asked to respond to a series of items that dealt with the system, documentation, data, and feedback mechanisms. The item with the lowest mean score was regarding the forms being easy to complete. Interview information provides some clarity about issues with the forms. It appears that the majority of administrators think the forms are not difficult, but that it takes a long time to complete them and there is redundancy. Similar to 2010-2011, the highest mean score was on administrators being accepting of their feedback. The majority of administrator evaluators indicated that the rubrics, the process, the components, and announced observations have some impact on improving performance. The majority believe that unannounced observations have a major impact on improving performance.

Evaluators
Administrator Evaluations (System, Documentation, Data, Feedback)
Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Weighted Score
(a) Administrators are able to provide the evidence and documentation I need to evaluate them accurately.	23.40%	70.21%	6.38%	0%	3.17
(b) The administrator forms are easy to complete.	12.77%	53.19%	34.04%	0%	2.79
(c) Administrators are accepting of their evaluation feedback.	26.09%	73.91%	0%	0%	3.26
(d) The timing of administrator conferences is good.	14.89%	65.96%	19.15%	0%	2.96
(e) The evaluation process provides adequate evidence of administrators' performance.	15.56%	60.00%	17.78%	6.67%	2.84
(f) The evaluation process provides an accurate picture of administrators' performance.	17.02%	55.32%	21.28%	6.38%	2.83
(g) There are adequate resources for administrators to implement improvement plans.	12.77%	63.83%	19.15%	4.26%	2.85

	Major Impact	Some Impact	Limited Impact	No Impact	Weighted Score
(a) What level of impact does use of the rubrics have on positive reinforcement?	23.40%	59.57%	12.77%	4.26%	3.02
(b) What level of impact does DPAS II overall have on improving teaching?	27.66%	55.32%	17.02%	0%	3.11
(c) What level of impact does the Vision and Goals component have on improving performance?	21.28%	63.83%	12.77%	2.13%	3.04
(d) What level of impact does the Culture of Learning component have on improving teaching?	27.66%	63.83%	8.51%	0%	3.19
(e) What level of impact does the Management component have on improving teaching?	31.91%	59.57%	8.51%	0%	3.23
(f) What level of impact does the Professional Responsibilities component have on improving teaching?	19.57%	60.87%	19.57%	0%	3
(g) What level of impact do unannounced observations have on improving performance?	53.19%	38.30%	6.38%	2.13%	3.43
(h) What level of impact do announced observations have on improving teaching?	19.57%	69.57%	6.52%	4.35%	3.04
(i) What level of impact does peer observations have on increasing effective conversations about performance?	44.68%	48.94%	2.13%	4.26%	3.34

Evaluating Teachers

There were 211 respondents who evaluated teachers. The majority of teacher evaluators believe the "Planning Preparation," "Classroom Environment," and "Instruction" components are good indicators of performance. Fewer than half of teacher evaluators indicated that the "Professional Responsibilities" component was a good indicator. The item with the most respondents on the undesirable end of the scale pertained to professional responsibilities. The items with the highest mean scores were about written and oral feedback being aligned with the 4 components.

Evaluators
Criteria for Evaluating Teachers
Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Weighted Score
(a) I can accurately evaluate teachers using the criteria for the Planning and Preparation component.	33.17%	63.41%	2.93%	0.49%	3.29
(b) I can accurately evaluate teachers using the criteria for the Classroom Environment component.	34.31%	62.25%	2.94%	0.49%	3.3
(c) I can accurately evaluate teachers using the criteria for the Instruction component.	37.56%	58.54%	2.93%	0.98%	3.33
(d) I can accurately evaluate teachers using the criteria for the Professional Responsibilities component.	24.14%	59.61%	14.78%	1.48%	3.06
(e) The written feedback I provide to teachers is aligned with the four components.	42.57%	56.44%	0.50%	0.50%	3.41
(f) The oral feedback I provide to teachers is aligned with the four components.	42.36%	56.65%	0.49%	0.49%	3.41

Evaluators
Of the 5 major components (as defined in the DPAS II Guide) used in teacher evaluations, which do you believe are good indicators of performance?

Q39. EVALUATOR Of the 4 major components (as defined in the DPAS II Guide) used in teacher evaluations, which do you believe are good indicators of performance?								
	Planning and Preparation		Classroom Environment		Instruction		Professional Responsibilities	Total
Responses Received	178	88.56%	167	83.08%	193	96.02%	94	46.77%	201

Note: Multiple answers per participant possible. Percentages added may exceed 100 since a participant may select more than one answer for this question.

Among the teacher evaluators, there were positive responses relating to providing evidence, forms, and feedback. The item with the highest mean score was "Teachers are able to provide the evidence and documentation I need to evaluate them accurately." The majority believe that walk-throughs and unannounced observations improve performance. Unannounced observations appear to be very valuable, while announced observations are of some value. When asked about the impact on performance, unannounced walk-throughs and unannounced observations had the highest mean scores.

Evaluators
Teacher Evaluations (System, Documentation, Data, Feedback)
Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Weighted Score
(a) Teachers are able to provide the evidence and documentation I need to evaluate them accurately.	22.44%	70.24%	7.32%	0%	3.15
(b) The teacher forms are easy to complete.	13.73%	49.51%	33.82%	2.94%	2.74
(c) Teachers are accepting of their evaluation feedback.	18.93%	75.24%	5.83%	0%	3.13
(d) The timing of teacher conferences is good.	17.48%	73.79%	8.25%	0.49%	3.08
(e) The evaluation process provides adequate evidence of teachers' performance.	13.59%	64.08%	20.39%	1.94%	2.89
(f) The evaluation process provides an accurate picture of teachers' performance.	11.22%	62.93%	23.41%	2.44%	2.83
(g) There are adequate resources for teachers to implement improvement plans.	13.79%	66.01%	15.76%	4.43%	2.89

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Weighted Score
(a) I believe that administrator walk-throughs improve teaching more than announced observations.	39.32%	36.41%	23.30%	0.97%	3.14
(b) Unannounced observations by an administrator improve teaching more than walk-throughs.	27.80%	47.80%	21.46%	2.93%	3
(c) Prior to DPAS II, walk-throughs were conducted more frequently during the year.	23.88%	36.82%	35.82%	3.48%	2.81
(d) Walk-throughs should be part of a formative evaluation.	28.16%	43.20%	23.79%	4.85%	2.95
(e) Walk-throughs should be part of a summative evaluation.	28.64%	45.15%	20.87%	5.34%	2.97

	Very Valuable	Some Value	Limited Value	Not at all Valuable	Weighted Score
(a) Announced observations	23.41%	54.63%	20.49%	1.46%	3
(b) Unannounced observations	67.80%	28.78%	2.93%	0.49%	3.64
(c) Announced walk-throughs	13.93%	57.71%	22.89%	5.47%	2.8
(d) Unannounced walk-throughs	64.22%	26.47%	7.35%	1.96%	3.53
(e) Peer observations	46.53%	42.57%	8.42%	2.48%	3.33
(f) Use of rubrics	42.08%	49.01%	7.43%	1.49%	3.32
(g) Mentoring	47.76%	46.77%	4.98%	0.50%	3.42
(h) Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)	56.93%	36.14%	5.94%	0.99%	3.49
(i) Data Coaches	23.00%	42.00%	23.50%	11.50%	2.77

	Major Impact	Some Impact	Limited Impact	No Impact	Weighted Score
(a) What level of impact does the use of rubrics have on positive reinforcement?	25.73%	55.34%	16.50%	2.43%	3.04
(b) What level of impact does DPAS II overall have on improving teaching?	20.39%	62.62%	16.99%	0%	3.03
(c) What level of impact does the Planning and Preparation component have on improving teaching?	40.10%	49.50%	10.40%	0%	3.3
(d) What level of impact does the Classroom Environment component have on improving teaching?	36.76%	53.43%	9.80%	0%	3.27
(e) What level of impact does the Instruction component have on improving teaching?	46.80%	44.83%	8.37%	0%	3.38
(f) What level of impact does the Professional Responsibilities component have on improving teaching?	17.07%	54.15%	25.37%	3.41%	2.85
(g) What level of impact do unannounced observations have on improving teaching?	48.77%	46.80%	4.43%	0%	3.44
(h) What level of impact do announced observations have on improving teaching?	19.12%	61.76%	17.65%	1.47%	2.99
(i) What level of impact do unannounced walk-throughs have on improving teaching?	51.98%	41.58%	5.45%	0.99%	3.45
(j) What level of impact do announced walk-throughs have on improving teaching?	13.30%	61.58%	20.20%	4.93%	2.83
(k) What level of impact does peer observations have on increasing effective conversations about teaching?	40.70%	48.24%	10.05%	1.01%	3.29

Evaluating Specialists

There were 169 respondents who evaluate specialists. Among specialist evaluators, the "Professional Responsibilities" component was the least selected component for being a good indicator of performance. Evaluators of specialists responded positively to the items relating to the evaluation criteria. The items with the most desirable responses were regarding written and oral feedback being aligned with the five components."

Evaluators
Criteria for Evaluating Specialists
Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Weighted Score
(a) I can accurately evaluate specialists using the criteria for the Planning and Preparation component.	16.77%	56.89%	20.96%	5.39%	2.85
(b) I can accurately evaluate specialists using the Professional Practice and Delivery of Service component.	22.29%	57.83%	14.46%	5.42%	2.97
(c) I can accurately evaluate specialists using the criteria for the Professional Collaboration and Consultation component.	21.82%	55.76%	16.36%	6.06%	2.93
(d) I can accurately evaluate specialists using the criteria for the Professional Responsibilities component.	16.77%	61.68%	17.37%	4.19%	2.91
(e) The written feedback I provide to specialists is aligned with the four components.	27.11%	65.66%	4.22%	3.01%	3.17
(f) The oral feedback I provide to specialists is aligned with the four components.	27.44%	66.46%	3.05%	3.05%	3.18

Evaluating Specialists
Of the 5 major components (as defined in the DPAS II Guide) used in specialist evaluations, which do you believe are good indicators of performance?

Q46. EVALUATOR Of the 4 major components (as defined in the DPAS II Guide) used in specialist evaluation, which do you believe are good indicators of performance?								
	Planning and Preparation		Professional Practice and Delivery of Service		Professional Collaboration and Consultation		Professional Responsibilities	Total
Responses Received	118	73.29%	153	95.03%	133	82.61%	89	55.28%	161
Note: Multiple answers per participant possible. Percentages added may exceed 100 since a participant may select more than one answer for this question.								

Similar to the responses from evaluators of teachers and administrators, the evaluators of specialists responded positively to the item, "Specialists are accepting of their evaluation feedback." The item that received the least support among the system, documentation, data, and feedback construct was, "The specialist forms are easy to complete."

Evaluators
Specialists Evaluations (System, Documentation, Data, Feedback)
Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Weighted Score
(a) Specialists are able to provide the evidence of documentation I need to evaluate them accurately.	15.15%	66.06%	15.15%	3.64%	2.93
(b) The specialist forms are easy to complete.	11.45%	44.58%	36.75%	7.23%	2.6
(c) Specialists are accepting of their evaluation feedback.	19.75%	74.07%	3.09%	3.09%	3.1
(d) The timing of specialist conferences is good.	15.66%	73.49%	7.83%	3.01%	3.02
(e) The evaluation process provides adequate evidence of specialists' performance.	13.25%	57.83%	24.70%	4.22%	2.8
(f) The evaluation process provides an accurate picture of specialists' performance.	12.73%	53.33%	28.48%	5.45%	2.73
(g) There are adequate resources for specialists to implement improvement plans.	13.04%	55.28%	22.98%	8.70%	2.73