Raising Evaluation Scores While Improving Classroom Instruction

By: Curtis Chase, Southwestern (Shelby) Jr./Sr. High School
Team Members Names: Sabrina Smiley, Andrew Oswalt
Contact: cchase@swshelby.k12.in.us

Background That Led to Your Team's Inquiry:

Therefore, the purpose of our action research was to improve classroom instruction while helping teachers raise their evaluation scores by setting instructional goals. Teachers were frustrated they weren't hitting more competencies during their evaluations so we felt if they set instructional goals to focus on they would have a higher probability of hitting more competencies. We created a model for what classroom instruction should look like and then teachers picked one goal that correlated to a competency they felt they needed to improve on. Our team felt by setting participating in this inquiry we could increase teachers evaluation scores and their overall perspective of the evaluation process of continuous growth.

Statement of Your Team's Wondering:

With this purpose, we wondered what is the correlation between teachers setting instructional goals and the increased number of competencies they meet on the RISE Evaluation Rubric with detailed evaluation feedback?

Methods/Procedures:

To gain insights into our wondering we first started by having the staff create a "principal snapshot" of what they feel the "should see", "might see", and "never see" to get buy in. The teachers participated in this process through a professional development and then we finalized the principal snapshot. The teachers then chose (majority ruled) a goal that I (the principal) would make my goal for the second semester.

Modeling after that, we had the teachers create a "teacher snapshot" following the same premise. We explained that at the end of this snapshot they would pick one goal that would be their "instructional" goal to try and raise their RISE evaluation score during evaluations. Teachers met in their PLCs and then they created their own instructional snapshot and then submitted it. From their, I worked with our team to finalize the teacher instructional snapshot and sent out for teacher approval.

Teachers were then instructed to pick an instructional goal to focus on second semester and when they were evaluated the evaluator would look to see if they met their instructional goal and provide feedback for that teacher. As a team, after multiple evaluations we would meet and discuss whether setting the instructional goal helped them raise their score on that particular evaluation.   We collected data for two and a half months and found that 63.6% of the evaluations had teachers meet competencies they had not previously met in evaluations.

Stating Your Team's Learning and Supporting it with Data:

As a result of analyzing our data, two important things we learned include: 1)Teaches who were already scoring high on the evaluation rubric were the ones that benefited from this process; 2) The teachers who didn't meet their instructional goal and were provided feedback now have concrete evidence on how to meet their instructional goal in the future.

Teaches who were already scoring high on the evaluation rubric were the ones that benefited from this process. They were the staff members who already self reflect and have the internal desire to grow as a professional. They picked instructional goals they wanted to receive feedback on and improve and earned the few tough competencies they had not earned before. By tough, I mean tough for them to earn for how they run their classroom. They were the teachers who only met 1 or 2 new competencies as they had earned many before.

The teachers who didn't meet their instructional goal and were provided feedback now have concrete evidence on how to meet their instructional goal in the future. 36.4% of teachers didn't meet their instructional goal. Some lessons, their goal would not have been applicable. However, the majority could have met their goal during the lesson and were provided feedback on how moving forward, they could implement an activity or make a tweak to meet their instructional goal. Conversations occurred with some teachers after their feedback where they did have an "ah-ha" moment. Moving forward, the team felt this would be beneficial to our teacher's instructional growth.

Providing Concluding Thoughts:

The action research journey led our team to realize that our teachers really want to improve. They want to improve in a non threatening way. We felt them creating the principal snapshot first and getting input on what the principal's goal should be started they buy in. We had a sense that they felt it was a collaborative effort for improvement.

We felt the teachers bought in to the instructional snapshot for teachers as they worked together in their PLCs and collaborated to make an initial list. We were impressed with how many of our PLCs (we have 4) had so many of the same ideas of what you should see, might see and never see. This also helped with the buy in as the final list came out the PLCs saw the majority (if not all) of their input on the instructional snapshot.

We noticed that the teachers who already had a desire to grow benefited from this. Moving forward, we feel that more teachers will grow with this process. The teachers who didn't meet their instructional goal need more time to reflect on their teaching to make adjustments to meet their instructional goal to improve their instruction. The next wondering we had was, "how will teacher instruction improve if the teachers have to collaboratively choose their instructional goal with the principal?" We feel that is our next step towards raising the RISE evaluation rubric scores and improving instruction in our classrooms.

References:

N/A