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Effective school principals are needed to lead efforts towards quality educational opportunities for all students. Evaluation practices that foster principal effectiveness are critically important in improving professional practices. In Indiana, approximately 80% of public school districts implemented an innovative state-developed principal evaluation model after legislation was passed mandating specific components including value-added measures. The purpose of this study is to investigate and compare the perspectives of superintendents and principals with regard to the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System utilized to evaluate principals in Indiana.

This study examined the RISE Principal Evaluation model in terms of practitioners’ views of effectiveness and implementation fidelity. Survey methodology was employed to gather feedback from evaluators (superintendents) and those being evaluated (principals). A total of 364 school leaders participated, representing a diverse sample from across the state. Mixed-methods analyses revealed areas of model utility, implementation challenges, and statistically significant differences between principals’ and superintendents’ perceptions of model efficacy. Implications for practice include recommendations to facilitate field-based support when implementing evaluative models.
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Chapter 1

Throughout the United States, the evaluation of school principals is changing rapidly. Many of the changes in principal evaluation are the result of new state legislation tied to national educational reform (Clifford, Behrstock-Sherratt, & Fetters, 2012a; National Association of Elementary School Principals [NAESP] and National Association of Secondary School Principals [NASSP], 2012; Shelton, 2013). Historically, principal evaluations have been inconsistent from district to district, and in some cases, principals have never had formal evaluations (NAESP, 2012). Principal evaluation has typically been delegated by the states to the responsibility of school districts; yet, No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (Alexander & Alexander 8th, 2012; NCLB, 2001) and Race to The Top (U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2009) initiatives in the 21st century have created vehicles for nationwide reform efforts that have impacted every aspect of the principal evaluation process. In their article on the evaluation of principals, Goldring, Cravens, Murphy, Elliot, and Carson (2009) stated, “The stakes for effective school leaders are high in today’s climate of system-wide accountability where American public schools are subgroups of an increasingly diverse student population” (p. 20). As a result of federal initiatives, states are now increasingly responsible for establishing principal evaluation systems with more consistency and monitoring principal workforce quality with more intensity (Clifford, Hansen, & Wraight, 2012b).

There is a gap in understanding the boundaries of current evaluation practices and in identifying standards in the field that influence effective leadership. Evaluation systems by and large have been a local endeavor used as a contract-driven review process to document tenure or renew contracts (Portin, Feldman, & Knapp, 2006). The multi-faceted role of the principal has
made it difficult for one evaluation tool or model to capture and accurately measure all principal behaviors. There is lack of implementation, usefulness, and reported effects of current evaluation processes (Goldring et al., 2009; Marcoux, Brown, Irby, & Lara-Alecio, 2003). Furthermore, practices are often inconsistent between states, districts, and schools (Studebaker, 2000). There is a need to study various methods and models that might uncover potential ways to maximize the effect of principal evaluation and school leadership. The perceptions of those who are evaluated and those who evaluate are critical to understanding if the systems utilized provide a connection between leadership effectiveness, student achievement and school improvement. We are in a new era of accountability that lends itself to new information in the study of current principal evaluation practices and challenges us to consider how to improve practice to better align with current leadership expectations for cultivating student achievement.

Research tells us that the number one school related variable for student academic success is the teacher in the classroom delivering instruction (Danielson, 2007; Marzano, Waters, &McNulty, 2005) with the principal as the second most influential school level variable on student achievement (Hallinger & Heck, 1998; King Rice, 2010; Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahstrom, 2004). Jacques, Clifford, and Hornung (2012) noted that “Principal evaluation systems that clearly identify effective principals and provide performance-based feedback to promote improvement can help to ensure that all students attend schools that can truly help them achieve” (p. 1). Since 2012, several states, and Indiana in particular, have adopted legislation mandating that teacher and principal evaluation be performed annually. These evaluations must be based on scientifically proven best practices, and linked to student test data that affects teacher and principal compensation, as well as being categorized and publicly transparent (IC 20-28-11.5).
Research also demonstrates that nearly 60% of a school’s influence on student achievement is attributable to teacher and principal effectiveness, with principals alone accounting for about a quarter of the total school effects, the second most influential factor in student achievement (Marzano et al. 2005, Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Horng, Klasick, & Loeb 2010). The influence of good principals is most significant in schools with the greatest need as there is clear evidence that failing schools can be turned around by talented principals (Leithwood et al., 2004; Shelton, 2013).

**Purpose of the Research**

The purpose of this study was to investigate and compare superintendent and principal perceptions regarding principal evaluation procedures used to support improvement of leadership effectiveness. This research investigated the use of the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System utilized for principals in Indiana, the perceptions of superintendents and principals in regard to the effectiveness ratings, and the potential connections to identifying key behaviors of effective school principals. The investigation also included the perceived improvement of leadership for principals through feedback tied to the evaluation system that assists in the development of effective leadership.

My study included quantitative and qualitative data sought to better describe the status of current school principal evaluation procedures in Indiana. The inquiry also identified if and how superintendents and principals perceived that the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System supported improvement in principal leadership. This research sought to add administrators’ voices to the developing professional dialogue about effective leadership evaluation. Indiana has moved into the era of accountability. The time was suitable to investigate the perceptions of superintendents and principals in regard to the evaluation of
principals due to new requirements in evaluation. The results of this research will contribute to the body of knowledge regarding evaluation systems utilized to more accurately describe the effectiveness of leaders in Indiana schools.

**Statement of the Problem**

Principal evaluation processes have remained largely unaltered for the past 30 years and have not been developed from the best understanding of effective leadership or from the body of scholarship on school improvement (Murphy, Goldring, & Porter 2014). Lashway (2003) indicated a lack of urgency to make changes to the principal evaluation system because the major focus of the reform movement has been on improving student achievement through instructional improvement. Over the years, it has been difficult to empirically measure and evaluate school principals and student achievement has generally not been a major component of the evaluation tool.

Research on the perceptions of the value of principal evaluations have noted a strong disconnect between the evaluation and the measured effectiveness of the principal (Cliffford et al., 2012b). A survey by Duke and Stiggins (1985) found that nearly three-quarters of supervisors and principals were either completely or reasonably satisfied with their principal evaluation systems. Yet, the same survey showed that principals and superintendents disagreed on the thoroughness of the evaluation with superintendents more satisfied than principals on the process. It also noted that only a handful of districts had clearly defined performance levels. More recent research on principal evaluation has indicated that principals viewed performance evaluation as perfunctory, having limited value for feedback, professional development, or accountability to school improvement (Portin et al., 2006). Additionally, the findings of the research conducted in Indiana on principal evaluation, which was confined to 41 school districts,
are consistent with this perception and noted a disconnect between the research on skills and responsibilities of principals correlated to student achievement and the evaluation instruments utilized (McDaniel, 2008).

Although there are a multitude of variables that affect the principal’s position on a daily basis, it has been difficult to determine which parts of the position are the most important. In addition to retaining the largely managerial responsibilities of the past, “today’s principals are expected to lead school improvement, increase student learning, and help staff grow professionally” (Stronge, 2013, p. 102). According to Leithwood et al. (2004), research consistently pointed out that school leaders are critical to helping improve student performance. However, as the position has evolved to include more responsibilities, the ever changing principal role has raised new and challenging questions about principal effectiveness and the development of tools in which to define it (Clifford et al., 2012b).

Research by Thomas, Holdaway, and Ward (2000) indicated that principal evaluations are inconsistently administered by those who evaluate principals; therefore, they conclude that performance is inconsistently measured. Thomas et al. (2000) suggested that there were differences between how principals and superintendents viewed the importance and usefulness of principal evaluation. I believe investigating this potential variability in perceptions is important as these differences might impact evaluation practices. Therefore, it is essential to study principal and superintendent perception of currently utilized evaluation systems and practices to inform measures of effective leadership and to provide support for ongoing growth in the field.
Overview of the Research Design

This study began with an in-depth review of the literature. Areas of research examined the historical role of principal, key leadership behaviors for principals, current evaluation practice in Indiana focused on the RISE system, and factors that influence principal evaluation.

The RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System is the model analyzed as the core of this research. It was developed in 2011 by the Indiana Teacher Evaluation Cabinet, a diverse group of teachers and leaders from across the state of Indiana who came together to design an evaluation system focused on effective leadership practice and student outcomes (Indiana Department of Education [IDOE], 2012a). The IDOE offered school districts to adopt it entirely, draw on components from the system, or create their own model for implementation. However, only districts that adopted the RISE system wholesale or made only minor changes have been granted the use of the RISE label. (A list of allowable modifications can be found in Appendix F). The purpose of this research was to investigate and compare the perceptions of superintendents and principals of the utilization of the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System as it was developed or any modified version of RISE for evaluating principal effectiveness.

Indiana law (IC 20-28-11.5) adopted in 2011 legally mandated that principals be evaluated annually and placed into one of four categories by a trained supervisor, usually a superintendent or assistant superintendent. These categories are Highly Effective, Effective, Needs Improvement, or Ineffective. The RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System was developed to incorporate these legal mandates and went beyond the law to include a more rigorous set of requirements. Two components—Professional Practice and Student Learning—are weighted equally at 50% each (IDOE, 2011).
Component 1, Professional Practice is divided into two domains: Teacher Effectiveness and Leadership Actions that are plotted in a rubric format.

The competencies in Domain 1: Teacher Effectiveness:

1.1 Human Capital Manager
1.2 Instructional Leadership
1.3 Leading Indicators of Student Learning

The competencies in Domain 2: Leadership Actions:

2.1 Personal Behavior
2.2 Building Relationships
2.3 Culture of Achievement (See Appendix G for the rubric).

Component 2, Student Learning is divided into two areas: Achievement and Growth. The school’s A-F Accountability Grade is the set point or “bar” for achievement in meeting a uniform and pre-determined level of mastery. Growth is determined based on student learning outcomes as defined as the improvement of skills and evidence of administrative student learning outcomes based upon baseline performance (IDOE, 2011).

Collecting evidence in each of these components is provided through direct observation, indirect observation, artifacts, and data. Two direct observations for at least 30 minutes per visit are mandatory as well as “the evaluator must, within five school days, provide written and oral feedback to the principal on what was observed, and how evidence maps to the rubric” (IDOE, 2011). A collection of evidence through indirect observations, artifacts, and data by both the evaluator and principal add to the overall body of evidence representing professional practice and student learning from throughout the school year (IDOE, 2011).
The protocol recommended by the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System is for the evaluator and the principal to engage in a beginning of the year conference to discuss prior year performance, review student learning and map out a plan for the year. Throughout the school year, two direct observations with immediate oral and written feedback, and a collection of evidence mapping it to the rubric are to be completed. An end-of-the year conference is then held to review principal performance on all competencies with a data review in order to assign a summative rating in one of the four rating categories (IDOE, 2011).

**Research Questions**

To investigate perceptions of the evaluation of principals in Indiana, this research was guided by the following questions. Exploring these research questions allowed me to seek a higher level of understanding of perceptions of the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System utilized in determining leader effectiveness.

1. To what extent do Indiana superintendents and principals perceive that the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System supports improvement of principal leadership?

2. What competencies do Indiana’s superintendents and principals identify as most important in principal evaluation?

3. If a school district implemented allowable modifications to the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System, what modifications were most commonly made?

4. What are Indiana’s superintendents’ and principals’ perceptions regarding the levels of fidelity of implementation of the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System?
5. What are Indiana’s superintendents’ and principals’ ratings of effectiveness of the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System as a tool for evaluating principals?

6. To what extent do Indiana superintendents and principals perceive that the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System supports leadership effectiveness in principals?

This study was survey-based using a mixed-methods approach. “Mixed method studies are those that combine qualitative and quantitative approaches into the research methodology of a single study or multi-phased study” (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998, pp. 17-18). According to Creswell (2014), using a mixed method approach involves studying a sample population that can provide a description of trends, attitudes, or opinions. Integrating the two forms of data involves philosophical assumptions and theoretical frameworks. Boeije (2010) noted the purpose of qualitative research is to “describe and understand social phenomena in terms of the meaning people bring to them” (p. 11). The identification of factors that influence an outcome generally utilizes a quantitative approach to research (Creswell, 2014). However, combining the strengths of both quantitative and qualitative data analyses can provide the best understanding of the questions posed in this research. In short, using a mixed methodology research design, this study produced quantitative and qualitative data with the goal of generating findings that are useful for principal and district leadership.

With a mixed methods approach, I based the inquiry on the assumption that collecting diverse types of data provided a more complete understanding of the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System regarding principal evaluation in Indiana. This study involved a survey made available to Indiana superintendents and principals through an email link. The
study began with a broad survey that collected participants’ quantitative responses regarding their views on principal evaluation. Then, the survey included several qualitative, open-ended questions that collected detailed opinions that provided additional perspectives on the initial quantitative survey responses. The expectation and hope was that superintendents and principals that utilized the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System in its entirety or a modified version would respond to the survey. There were several school districts in Indiana that did not use the RISE system and had opted to employ another system or a locally-developed model of evaluation who did not participate in the study. The survey results collected were the sole source of data. Ethics and trustworthiness in handling the data were carefully considered. Descriptive and inferential data analysis was used to develop a deeper understanding of principal evaluation in Indiana.

**Limitations and Delimitations of the Study**

According to Mauch and Birch (1993), the difference between limitations and delimitations of a research study are that limitations are not under the control of the researcher and the researcher controls delimitations (i.e. boundaries of a study and the ways in which a study may lack generalizability). In this study, both the small sample size focused on superintendents and principals that utilized the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System (or a modified version) and the localized geographic region of the state of Indiana could be considered delimitations. Other limiting factors that potentially may have influenced study data were that superintendents and principals may have misrepresented information and my possible internal bias regarding the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System as perspectives may have been exaggerated or downplayed.
Definitions of Key Terms

The following definitions are offered to provide an understanding and the context of key terms used in this study:

*Evaluator* is the individual responsible for evaluating and supervising the principal, typically the superintendent or assistant superintendent. “Along with other evaluator-related responsibilities, the evaluator approves Professional Development Plans (when applicable) in the fall and assigns the summative rating in the spring. Principal supervisors serve as evaluators” (IDOE 2011, p. 30).

*Formative evaluations* are ongoing evaluation methods geared toward helping an employee improve (Peterson, 1991).

*Indiana Principal Effectiveness Rubric* contained in Appendix G as part of the Indiana Principal Development and Evaluation System includes six competencies in two domains: Teacher Effectiveness and Leadership Actions (IDOE 2011).

*Indicators* are observable pieces of information for evaluators to look for during an observation. Indicators are listed for each competency in the Indiana Principal Effectiveness Rubric (IDOE, 2011).

*Inter-rater reliability* refers to an assessment of within-group inter-rater agreement (James, Demaree, & Wolf, 1993). “These are statistics are quality indicators of measurement reproducibility” (Gwet, 2001, p. 223).

*Principal* refers to the multi-faceted role of the building administrator in today’s schools (Catano & Stronge, 2007; Marzano et al., 2005).

*Public Law 90* was adopted by the state of Indiana in 2011. This law requires that performance evaluations of all certificated employees must be conducted and discussed annually,
include student assessment results, and be designated into one of four categories: highly effective, effective, needs improvement, or ineffective (IC 20-28-11.5).

RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System was developed in 2011 by educators throughout Indiana; the Department of Education developed an optional model evaluation system named RISE to assist corporations in developing or adopting models that comply with Public Law 90 as noted in the RISE Principal Handbook (IDOE, 2011).

School grade started with the 2011-12 academic year. The State Board of Education adopted the use of a new methodology for determining a school or corporation’s grade, A-F (IDOE, 2015).

Standards refer to the knowledge and skills required for successful school leadership. Standards provide a foundation to effectively evaluate the performance of principals (Derrington & Sharratt, 2008).

Summative evaluation has the goal to precisely evaluate performance. Summative evaluations are often used to facilitate decisions over compensation, contract renewal or tenure (Peterson, 1991).

Summary

This study is divided into chapters. Chapter 1 outlined an overview and introduction of the study. Chapter 2 provides an extensive review of literature that outlines a historical context of the role of the principal, key leadership behaviors that are correlated with effective leadership, factors that influence principal evaluation and current evaluation practices in Indiana. An overview of the research methodology is presented in Chapter 3. In Chapter 4, an in-depth analysis of the results and findings will be delivered with a final chapter offering a summary, discussion, and conclusions.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Educational reform has been debated for decades in the United States by legislators and educators at all levels. However, it has been just in the 21st century that we are seeing widespread efforts by the federal government, the states, and in some of the largest districts across our country that puts education on the cusp of national reform (Hess & Rotherham 2007). A major part of the reform movement has included a more rigorous dimension of evaluation aimed at the American public education system.

The launch of Sputnik in 1957 and the growing power of the Soviet Union alerted the nation to an increased need for math and science education. In 1964, President Johnson’s War on Poverty attempted to improve the education of the nation’s poor along with the 1964 Civil Rights Act committing federal legislation for greater equality providing equal access to educational opportunities (Hess & Petrilli, 2004). However, by 1983, the Bell Commission report, *A Nation at Risk*, sounded an alarm of a failing education system.

The educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a nation and a people. What was unimaginable a generation ago has begun to occur—others are matching and surpassing our educational attainments. . . we have allowed this to happen to ourselves. (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983, p. 135)

Revisiting *A Nation at Risk*, the 2003 Hoover Institution’s Koret Task Force on K-12 Education published *Our Schools and Our Future: Are We Still at Risk?* further describing the concern.

The shrinking globe has made it easier than anyone in 1983 could have imagined for investments and jobs to go anywhere on the planet that seems likeliest to succeed with them. Here we must look to our schools to produce the highly educated citizenry on which America’s future economic vitality depends. (Peterson & Chubb, 2003, p. 21)
The American educational system has been under scrutiny and many reforms have been attempted, embedded, and researched. NCLB in 2001 was a national reform effort that required states to increase accountability efforts (Manna & Ryan, 2011). Test-based accountability, the denunciation of the “soft bigotry of low expectations” and President Bush’s declaration that American schools were “on a new path to reform” had bipartisan support to dismantle questionable school and district status quo (Hess & Petrilli, 2004, p. 16). Race to the Top required more specific change at the state and district level in order to be eligible to receive federal assistance at a time when revenues were depleting (Manna & Ryan, 2011). Change occurred rapidly that in many ways were practical and increased opportunities that had not previously been available. For example, the 4.35-billion-dollar race for education aid encouraged states to present new laws, contracts, and data systems making teachers individually responsible for student achievement (Shelton, 2013). The rise of reformers, a new group of Democratic politicians willing to challenge teacher unions, and high powered foundations like the Gates Foundation pouring money into charter schools spurred urgency in educational reform that moved it into “prime time” (Brill, 2010, p. 4).

Since the earliest years of the 20th century, there has been a systematic decline of the number of school districts nationwide due to consolidation of schools. In the two decades before World War II, the United States had nearly 120,000 school districts. “By 1949-50, this had dropped to under 84,000 districts. Even as the population of the United States grew rapidly, school districts diminished, so that there were under 15,000 districts by the last school year of the twentieth century” (Bankston III, 2010, p. 3). However, even with the consolidation of school systems and the increased federal control of school districts, schools were not getting better (Bankston III, 2010).
Educational reform efforts have had a significant influence on the direction of educational policy that has affected the increase in scrutiny in the evaluation of teachers and school leaders. Educational change is occurring with rapid ferocity and keeping up with the transformation makes it challenging to build and implement systems of effective evaluation of schools, school leaders, and teachers.

This has caused increased interest in the evaluation of school leaders, principals, and teachers due to the ideology that schools are places for reshaping individuals and reforming society (Tyack & Cuban, 1995). Improving the performance of all educators has been in much sharper focus in the educational reform era. According to Glasman and Heck (1992), “The leadership role of the school principal has changed dramatically in the past 20 years. One major by-product of these changes has been the intensification of demands to improve principal assessment methods and instruments for increased school effectiveness” (p. 6). Under these conditions, educational leaders must possess the capacity to manage change and to create collaborative action on behalf of student results. “Every educational reform report of the last decade concludes that the United States cannot have excellent schools without excellent leaders” (National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2002, p. 2).

Due to the multi-faceted role of the school principal it appears that only by a clear and reliable analysis of the level of effectiveness will a principal be able to improve their practice (Harrison & Peterson, 1988). More and more school districts are finding that they must be able to create reliable and meaningful tools in which to evaluate their leaders due to the accountability of student achievement and more recently defaulting to student test scores as a means of evaluation (NAESP, 2012). Catano and Stronge (2007) stated,
If all stakeholders demand the same outcomes by the same methods at the same time, then the job of a school principal are simplified. However, more often than not, the demands are different and may even be at odds with one another. (p. 379)

The research by Marzano et al. (2005) on the 21 responsibilities that have the greatest impact on student achievement produced significant quantitative correlations between leadership behavior and the average academic achievement of students. Cotton (2003) identified 26 essential traits and behaviors of effective principals to show how they achieved success as instructional leaders that closely mirrored Marzano’s research.

Recent research is beginning to uncover essential elements in school leader behavior that is positively impacting student achievement. “Rigorous, well-designed principal evaluations have the potential to leverage school improvement” (Shelton, 2013, p. 2). This study sought to uncover the perceptions of those utilizing a state-developed principal evaluation system and the potential influence of that system on principal leadership effectiveness.

**Historical Perspective of the Principal’s Role**

Tyack and Cuban (1995) outlined the organization and reform of American schools dating back to the mid-1800s. They contended that some things have not changed, such as classes still organized by grade level groups, grades assigned as evidence of learning, and principals charged with supervising teachers to monitor educational instruction and pedagogy. However, the principal’s role in schools has changed many times over the past two centuries evolving from teachers who also served as principals, instructional managers, instructional leaders, and transformational leaders (Glasman & Heck, 1992).

According to Murphy (1998), the history of the principalship can be described in divided time periods over the past 200 years. Early in the 19th century, the Ideological era (1820-1899), educational administration or the principalship was not recognized as a distinct profession. Little
training was required. However, according to Pellicer, Allen, Tonnsen, and Surratt, (1981), *The Common School Report of Cincinnati* included the term “Principal” in 1838. In 1841, Horace Mann made reference to a “male principal” in the *Fourth Annual Report of the Secretary of the Board of Education of Massachusetts* (as cited in Pierce, 1935, p. 11). The emergence of the principal may have been in Boston around 1847, and principals began to spend less time teaching due to increased responsibilities for general management of the school. In 1859, according to Pierce (1935), the duties of a principal included, “examination of classes, classification of students, promotion of students, conducting model lessons, and exercising careful supervision over the discipline and instruction of the whole school” (p. 13). The principal was considered to be scholarly and a highly cultured intellectual leader of the community.

During the Prescriptive era, 1900-1946, principals were trained to do the job as it existed with no forethought to how it might evolve (Murphy, 1998). It was described as a business model. Although more responsibility was given to the principal position, principals were reluctant to try new procedures and became content in their positions with the tendency to maintain the status quo. In the book, *The American High School* (1915) by John Franklin Brown, a description of the principal’s duties were recommended, “leadership, a good organizer and a good manager of people, knowledge, self-confidence, common sense, understanding of human nature and, personality characteristics of honesty, wisdom, and sympathy” (pp. 224-227). However, there was no description of evaluation of the recommended duties.

An early study of the role of a principal in 1919 ranked the functions of the principal as supervision of teaching as the most important, followed by administration, community leadership, professional study, and clerical work (McClure, 1921). In 1921, the National Association of Elementary School Principals was formed and helped to strengthen the role of the
principal as it stressed the responsibility of the principal to offer staff leadership (Pellicer et al., 1981). By 1935, principals were becoming more involved with community leadership, securing publicity through newspapers and radio, and becoming more proficient as instructional leaders resulting in more professionalism in the position (Pierce, 1935). It was assumed that if a principal maintained these relationships positively, they were considered effective in their role. But again, there is no evidence of effective or consistent evaluation of principals during this period.

In the Scientific era, 1947-1985, practice-oriented generalists were being replaced with discipline-focused specialists (Murphy 1998) with the idea that school leadership could be reshaped (Pellicer et al., 1981). According to Anderson and VanDyke (1963), the duties of the principal began to increase and the professional principal was required to be competent in twenty defined areas (see Appendix A for description).

Although these characteristics were desired, Anderson and VanDyke (1963) also noted that there were no national certification standards, which caused variability in experience and degrees. Three states did not require any teaching experience to be hired as a principal (Anderson & VanDyke, 1963). Due to these inconsistencies and the increased responsibilities, technical and professional training were advocated (Douglass, 1963); however, evaluation of these desired characteristics was not organized in any manner for accountability.

The role of the principal continued to evolve along with the many educational reforms of the 20th century. By the late 1960s, the public expressed a growing discontent with American schools. Some of the concern can be attributed to The Coleman Report, a prominent study on student performance (Coleman, Hobson, McPartland, Mood, Wienfeld, & York, 1966). Coleman et al. illustrated that an American public education remained largely unequal despite
the 1954 desegregation act. The assumption implied that if resources were similar in schools, student performance would also be similar (Coleman et al., 1966).

The changing demographics of schools in the 1970s, politics and the new focus on instructional leadership led to work on the Effective Schools research (Edmonds, 1981). Edmonds’ (1981) work noted that the characteristics of schools are important determinants of academic achievement and “. . .the leadership of the principal notable for substantial attention to the quality of instruction” (p. 8).

Exploring the links between principals’ behavior and students’ academic performance, the Effective Schools research introduced the principal as an education leader serving as a resource for teachers and developing a culture of high expectations (Rousmaniere, 2013). This may have been a turning point in focusing on the principal’s leadership as central in student achievement. President Nixon noted that educators should not only be responsible for performing their work, but also accountable to their students and taxpaying communities (Duke, 2005).

Every president since Nixon has had a detailed education agenda. The increased attention on the principal in school improvement was also operationalized in state legislative policy. According to Hallinger and Heck (1996),

Given apparent support from the research community, policymakers now tend to view the principal as a key educational input and one easily accessed through policy channels. Thus during the period from 1975 and 1990, the policy of state-mandated principal evaluations increased from nine to forty states. (p. 6)

This attention increased endeavors to provide a level of accountability to the public on educational efforts. However, sporadically developed tools that had little connection with teaching and learning did not facilitate feedback to principals to increase their effectiveness.
In the current Dialectic period (1986 – present) as described by Murphy (1998), notable efforts to define rigorous standards for the school leader profession are vibrant with research based practices evolving. Standardization was ultimately formalized with the reauthorization of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act, NCLB (2001). What was coined “high stakes accountability,” designated consequences for underperforming schools that was mainly directed at teachers responsible for preparing students for the tests and for principals who were responsible for the performance of the entire school.

On the heels of this initiative was also a restructuring of schools where the promotion of school choice launched principals into becoming both educational leaders and business leaders, advocating for their schools in order to compete in the marketplace (Rousmaniere, 2013). The creation of standards, frameworks, and characteristics all has focused on improving student performance through changing behaviors of educational leaders (Danielson, 2007; Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium [ISLLC], 2008). There is much evidence to support the need for effective educational leaders, but little evidence showing that evaluation impacts principal behavior or what educational leaders do on a daily basis (Catano & Stronge, 2007).

In the early 2000s, approximately 20% of all principals left their jobs each year and more than half of all principals had less than four years of experience (Bottoms & O’Neill, 2001). In their report, Bottoms and O’Neill noted that principals were leaving the profession due to insufficient compensation and an increase in stress and time demands as well as the intensifying pressures for high-stakes accountability. In addition, Davis and Hensley (1999) made the point that principals viewed their evaluation as something that happened to them, not something that was useful for improving their job performance. They further noted that principals felt their
evaluations were influenced by external political factors, for example, parents and board members, rather than on daily practice.

In one study, Reeves (2006) found that brief, annual observations based on little or no context, hearsay, and sensationalized one-time situations were the basis of evaluations. Furthermore, 60% of principals in Reeve’s study felt that their evaluation had no impact on their job performance. Reeves (2006) concluded that many principals lead their schools not knowing what is expected and how their job performance is going to be measured.

As school districts and states are rolling out new evaluation tools to measure this increasingly complicated role, principal preparation programs are also under scrutiny. In a 2005 report by Arthur Levine, President of Teachers College at Columbia University, he stated that administrator programs “are rooted neither in practice nor research, offering programs that fail to prepare school leaders for their jobs, while producing research that is ignored by policy makers and practitioners and looked down on by academics both inside and outside of education schools” (p. 61). In particular, the report derided the rigor of the growing number of off-campus programs created by education schools. Critical evaluations of administrator preparation programs persist to transform the profession (Clark, 1998).

According to Seashore, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, and Anderson (2010), principal turnover has moderately negative effects on school culture and explains a modest but significant amount of variation in student achievement. Yet, principal turnover is inevitable and preparation of and recruitment into the profession becomes challenging as the literature suggests that the shortage of people willing to serve as principals remains a topic of concern (Bottoms & O’Neill, 2001, Pijanowski, Hewitt, & Brady, 2009). Among strategies defined to attract candidates to the principal position, the second most important to superintendents was to improve training
strategies by colleges and universities (Pijanowski et al., 2001). Therefore, it is imperative to define the role of principal in a manner that allows for an understanding of adequate preparation. This should include an evaluation system that accurately reflects the job so that candidates considering this profession are prepared to take on the responsibility of school principal.

**Key Leadership Behaviors for Principals**

Principal effectiveness is a key factor in influencing school success and principals need to be aware of leadership behaviors that will maximize their effectiveness. New reforms that include shared decision-making and school management requires principals to be on the cutting edge in regard to what works in schools because “leadership matters” (King Rice, 2010, p. 1). According to Ginsberg and Berry (1990),

> The non-routine nature of principal’s work, the hard-to-conceptualize factors that lead to success, and the great variety of schools that exist within and across districts in each state demanding differing leadership styles, evaluation methods are needed to gauge properly the performance of individual principals in their complex and often diverse worlds. (p. 206)

Research done by the Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research noted evidence “that the quality of a principal affects a range of school outcomes” (King Rice 2010, p. 1) and that effectiveness is related to teaching and learning (Cotton, 2003). In order to be effective, school leaders must be knowledgeable in a variety of areas of the school that are tied to school improvement (Marzano et al., 2005).

> Tomorrow’s educational leaders must be able to work with diverse groups and to integrate ideas to solve a continuous flow of problems. They must study their craft as they practice their craft, reflecting and then applying what they have learned to people and institutions and the achievement of tasks. This requires patience and perspective, the exercise of judgment and wisdom, and the development of new technical and analytical skills. It also demands sensitivities to other cultures and highly developed communications skills. Finally, it requires personal values that integrate the ethical dimensions of decision-making with those of a more technical variety. (National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2002, p. 3)
Research conducted by Marzano et al. (2005) and the Wallace Foundation (2010) concluded that there are leadership behavioral characteristics that can be measured and statistically correlated to student achievement. In a meta-analysis of over 69 studies examining effective school leadership in the United States, Marzano et al. (2005), synthesized the six most popular theories on school leadership and derived 21 leadership responsibilities for principals (Appendix B). The six leadership theories consist of transformational leadership, transactional leadership, total quality management, servant leadership, situational leadership, and instructional leadership.

**Transformational leadership.** Based on the works of Burns (1978), Hater and Bass, (1988), Bass and Riggio (2012), transformational leaders are postulated to be responsible for performance beyond ordinary expectations as they transmit a sense of mission, stimulate learning experiences, and arouse new ways of thinking. It has an emphasis on intrinsic motivation and on the positive development of followers where they seek inspiration, challenge, and empowerment to be loyal, high performers.

**Transactional leadership.** Building on the work of Avolio and Bass’s (1995) management theories, also known as transactional theories focus on the role of supervision, organization and group performance. The assumptions for leadership are that people are motivated by reward and punishment and that social systems work best with a clear chain of command.

**Total quality management (TQM).** Based on Deming (1986), the founder of TQM and his business theory, the 14 principles outlined can be organized into five basic factors the more specifically define the actions of effective leaders: change agency, teamwork, continuous improvement, trust building, and eradication of short-term goals. Deming’s 14 points included:
Constancy of Purpose, Adopt the Philosophy, Don’t rely on mass inspections, Don’t award business o price, Constant improvement, Training, Leadership, Drive out fear, Break down barriers, Eliminate slogans and exhortations, Eliminate quotas, Pride of workmanship, Education and retraining, and Plan of action (Deming, 1986).

**Servant leadership.** Based on the work of Greenleaf (1970), servant leadership notes that effective leadership emerges from the desire to help others. The servant leader leads from the middle of the hierarchy connected to all facets of the organization. Ten characteristics are outlined for effective leadership: listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community (Appendix E).

**Situational leadership.** Based on the work of Hersey and Blanchard (1996), the basic principle of situational leadership is that the leader adapts his/her leadership behavior to followers’ maturity based on their willingness and ability to perform a specific task. Four styles are associated with situational leadership: telling, participating, selling, and delegating. The effective leader is skilled in all four styles and knows the ability level of followers along with their willingness to perform specific tasks.

**Instructional leadership.** There are many definitions of the most popular theme in education today. Based on the work of Smith and Andrews (1989), four dimensions or roles of an instructional leader are defined as: resources provider, instructional resource, communicator, and visible presence. Blasé and Blasé (1998) identified the following characteristics in their Reflection-Growth model: encouraging and facilitating the study of teaching and learning, facilitating collaborative efforts among teachers, establishing coaching relationships among teachers, using instructional research to make decisions, and using the principles of adult
learning when dealing with teachers. Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon (1995) identified the following: direct assistance to teachers in their day-to-day activities, development of collaborative groups among staff, design and procurement of effective staff development activities, curriculum development, and use of action research. Hallinger, Murphy, Weil, Mesa, and Mitman (1983) identified three functions of the instructional leader: defining the school’s mission, managing curriculum and instruction, and promoting a positive school climate. Leithwood, Jantzi, and Steinbach (1999) linked transformational leadership to instructional leadership as it increases efforts and develops more skilled practice.

These six prominent leadership theories studied and described by Marzano et al. (2005) laid the foundation in their meta-analysis that developed the 21 responsibilities of school leaders “. . .that validate the opinions expressed by leadership theorists for decades” (Marzano et al., 2005, p. 41). They focused on the principal’s abilities to combine the roles of instructional leader, coach and manager of the building and correlated the responsibilities with positive student achievement. In connecting these theories to principal practice, Marzano’s work, along with many researchers such as Cotton, Stronge, and others, contributed to the understanding of the needed leadership responsibilities, actions, and behaviors that is outlined in more recent research.

In 2013, The Learning Sciences Marzano Center for Teacher and Leader Evaluation outlined 24 categories of principal actions and behaviors organized into five domains to offer a comprehensive approach to school leader evaluation (Appendix D). Stronge, Xu, Leeper, and Tonneson, (2013) in their most recent publication, Principal Evaluation, Standards, Rubric, and Tools for Effective Performance outlined a summary of research on the Qualities of Effective Principals based on the research of many notable in the field of principal evaluation. These
theories and research defining behavioral characteristics that school leaders must have in order to be effective principals (Appendix C) have influenced the development of principal evaluation systems in many states including Indiana.

Although Stronge, Marzano, and their colleagues, as well as many nationally known researchers, defined effective elements of the role of the principal, the definitions allow each state or school district the autonomy in system development. Differentiating to the needs of each state and school district and aligning to delineated definitions notably create inconsistencies from district to district and state to state. Does consistency in evaluation of principals matter? A few states are developing a state-wide evaluation model, (e.g. North Carolina and Tennessee) while most states continue to leave room for differentiation (Jacques et al., 2012).

The Indiana Department of Education was charged with developing an evaluation model to meet Public Law 90 (Indiana Education Statute, 2012) which calls for rigorous teacher and principal evaluation to satisfy the requirements for Indiana’s NCLB waiver. Probably the most influential evaluation model for teacher evaluation in the nation comes from the research of Danielson, (2007). The framework and rubric for teachers includes 22 competencies in four primary domains which mirrors much of the rubric in Indiana RISE for teachers.

However, in developing the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System, a team looked at national research calling specifically on many nationally recognized educational works in the area of principal leadership, including that of Doug Reeves, Todd Whittaker, VAL-ED, the National Board’s Accomplished Principal Standards, and several other models of effective research, all created before Race to the Top. “Apparently, policy makers simply assume that if teacher effectiveness could be estimated, then principal effectiveness could be estimated as well, despite the absence of research that would validate such an assumption” (Fuller & Hollingworth,
According to Grissom, Kalgorides, & Loeb (2012), there are three approaches to evaluating principal effectiveness. The first approach assumed that principal effectiveness can be accurately estimated by simply estimating school effectiveness. The second approach assumed that principal effectiveness can be accurately measured only by isolating the effects of a principal on student test scores apart from the effects of schools on student test scores. And the third approach assumed that the only accurate approach to estimate principal effectiveness is to examine school improvement during a principal’s tenure. The most common approach to evaluating principal effectiveness is to equate principal effectiveness with school effectiveness (Davis, Kearney, Sanders, Thomas & Leon, 2011; Jacques et al., 2012).

Currently, Indiana does not require the use of one evaluation system and does not mandate a particular approach to principal evaluation. School districts in Indiana have been allowed to select from a menu of pre-developed systems (e.g., RISE, TAP, PAR) based on research done by national leaders like Stronge, Marzano, Whittaker, and Reeves or develop their own system while maintaining the language within the law (IDOE, 2011). Nevertheless, the RISE system developed by a group of educators and the IDOE exceeded the language in the Public Law 90, and has allowed for modifications to meet the needs of each school district for immediate implementation. Many school districts have implemented RISE, modified RISE or have developed a RISE-like system that seeks to define and measure effective leadership behaviors. However, there are several school districts utilizing other models or developing their own local model. Arguably, this has created a lack of consistency and continuity across the state to meet the concerns of the United States Department of Education (USDOE) in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) waiver of No Child Left Behind (NCLB).
states have a one size fits all system of evaluation, Indiana continues to grant autonomy to the local school districts in meeting the language of the law.

**Factors Influencing Principal Evaluation**

Politics in education, just as the presence of politics in any organization, makes it difficult to completely insulate any form of human judgment from effecting or influencing job performance evaluations (Davis & Hensley, 1999). According to Kirst and Wirt (2009), “politics is a form of social conflict rooted in group differences over values about using public resources to meet private needs” (p. 36). Personnel evaluation as a purely rational and objective process rarely exists. Understanding how political pressures may influence the evaluation of principals is particularly important.

Most principals today are immersed in an ongoing political dynamic of organizational influences. The typical principal is routinely confronted with an increasingly politically diverse myriad of pressures from within the school, the community, the district office, the judicial system, and society at large (Davis & Hensley, 1999; Kirst & Wirt, 2009). The impact of the larger political and social context surrounding the school on the principal presents an arduous challenge in assessing the quality of the principal’s work (Heck & Glasman 1993).

According to Seyfarth (1999), “Principals are sandwiched between what state and district policy makers intend, what the superintendent directs, what parents expect, what teachers need, and what students want” (p. 12). However, although it may seem difficult to determine the precise effects of principal evaluation on the quality of education, “evaluating and developing school principals is increasingly recognized as a key strategy for improving schools, increasing student achievement and narrowing persistent achievement gaps” (Shelton, 2013, p. 2).
Since 1997, the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) has been developing criteria having a national impact on the development, training and licensure of our nations’ principals. Soon after, the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) was born. The ISLLC standards, while continuing to evolve, had been the clearest standard definition for principal preparation and principal professional development (Babo & Ramaswami, 2011). They provided a specific focus on high expectations, teaching and learning and value driven direction for leaders. Today, in addition to ISLLC, the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) standards guide principal preparation programs and licensure assessments in Indiana as well as many other states and are included as a guiding reference along with 14 other references in the RISE Principal Effectiveness Rubric.

In a more recent attempt to provide standards of excellence for principals, Accomplished Principal Standards were developed in 2009 by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and a pilot program for National Board Certification for Principals began in 2011. Sixteen hundred principals across the United States applied and more than 200 principals were selected to go through the rigorous program. In early 2014, the Board of Directors of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards voted unanimously to discontinue development of the principal certification, a $3.5-million-dollar effort. It was stated, “Financial and administrative challenges were insurmountable” (Thorpe as cited in Maxwell, 2014, para. 2). Issues around the assessment’s design, validity, and reliability determined that those challenges could not be overcome; indicating the degree of difficulty there is in creating a system to evaluate principal effectiveness.

In the development of the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System and its rubric, the framers noted schools and districts that elect to utilize the rubric may add or develop
additional indicators (IDOE, 2011) because it is impossible to create an evaluation tool that encompasses all aspects of this multi-faceted position. The 21st century context of the role of the principal as instructional leader rather than manager then competes in the political arena to be all things to all entities. About three quarters of all states have adopted strategies to evaluate principal effectiveness that are simplistic (Fuller & Hollingworth, 2013). Many policy makers assume that student test scores can be measure principal effectiveness without adjusting for the influence of other factors that are unsubstantiated by research in educational leadership (Fuller & Hollingworth, 2013). So, when states are determining factors to measure principal performance, much more needs to be considered in the development of a tool or the process.

Principals have a direct and indirect influence on schools; however, the connection to student achievement is more challenging to assess (Clifford et al., 2012a). “Principal leadership assessment and evaluation can be an integral part of a standards-based accountability system and school improvement. When designed appropriately, executed in a proactive manner, and properly implemented, it has the power to enhance leadership quality...” (Murphy, Goldring, Cravens, Elliott, & Porter, 2011, p. 1). Currently, many states and school systems are legislated to utilize a results-based or ‘value-added’ evaluation procedure (Goldring et al., 2009, Clifford et al., 2012b). With the emphasis on evaluation for teachers and principals, results based evaluations for accountability are becoming the norm. As Hart (1992) stated,

While some argue that the complexity of schools makes principal’s evaluation on the basis of outcomes unrealistic, the need increases for models that tie evaluation more closely with valued outcomes. With expanding diversity of structure and goals among public schools, the growing popularity of site-based management and parental governance committees, and mounting demands for accountability for outcomes rather than procedural compliance from schools, these needs can only grow. In the face of these demands, frameworks for principal evaluation tend to be atheoretical and idiosyncratic. (p. 37)
Although it appears appropriate to utilize test scores to quantify a results-based evaluation, it continues to be debated as to how much weight should be given to student achievement scores in the overall evaluation procedure. Heck and Marcoulides (1996) noted that principals should not be held accountable for the achievement of many of these outcomes because they do not have control over all the variables upon which these outcomes depend. However, work by researchers from the National Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research, among other notable educators; have advanced our knowledge base on quantifying school leadership (King Rice, 2010).

Throughout the United States, there continues to be controversy with principal and teacher evaluation efforts that include student test scores as a defining element in teacher and principal evaluation. Using value-added measures in teacher and principal evaluation is based on the belief that measured achievement gains reflect an educator’s effectiveness (McCaffrey, Lockwood, Koretz, & Hamilton, 2003). However, research notes that gains in student achievement are influenced by a plethora of factors including school and home environment, peer culture and achievement, and the specific tests used (Darling-Hammond, Amrein-Beardsley, Haertel, & Rothstein, 2012). Recommendations for the use of value-added measures in policy and practice by McCaffrey et al. (2003) suggested that the research base was insufficient for high stakes decisions and the sources of error in teacher effects must have an understanding of potential errors. “Simple efforts used by many states such as SGP’s, simple VAMs, and one-step VAMs produce wildly inaccurate results that would be biased against principals in lower performing and/or high-poverty schools” (Fuller & Hollingworth, 2013, pp. 27-28).

The concerns have become widespread. In 2011, principals in New York wrote a letter of protest of the new value-added system being developed based on the state’s application
requirement for the Race to the Top dollars (Strauss, 2011). Studies have recently shown that value-added models have led to inaccuracies, in combination with the intense pressure to increase student achievement, leading to concerns of narrowed instruction or teaching to the test (Boyland, Harvey, Quick, & Choi, 2014).

Despite concerns, value-added measures in Indiana are included in principal evaluations; however, adjustments to the weights continue to be made as it is still relatively new to the evaluation landscape. In many states, a percentage of weight is given to student data in regard to teacher and principal evaluation. New Leaders for New Schools (2010) suggested that principal evaluations systems should place 70% of their weight on student achievement and teacher effectiveness outcomes. Delaware, one of the first states to receive Race to the Top dollars, required that 20% of a principal’s evaluation be based on annual student growth (Jacques et al., 2012). In Indiana, professional practice and student learning (50% each) are equally weighted in the evaluation of principals (IDOE, 2011) and in Florida, it is at least 50% (FDOE, 2011) and there are states with weights everywhere in between.

Thompson and Barnes (2007) noted, “Research has consistently shown that high-performing schools have principals who are effective leaders” (p. 32). Bolton (1980) considered that evaluation will always occur and “If one wants to be systematic, an application of systems analysis procedures will indicate that attention should be given to input, process, and output” (p. 20) creating a multi-level process looking through the layers of the job.

Thompson and Barnes (2007) recommended establishing a definition for a highly effective principal, improving professional development for school leaders, and identifying the needs of principals. Research that has been conducted in the last several years (Leithwood et al., 2004, Marzano et. al., 2005, Stronge et al., 2013) and direction at the state level has pushed states
toward legislation requiring annual evaluations of all school personnel. Although it may look
different from state to state and even district to district, principal evaluation is now directly
linked with school accountability. In today’s climate, principals are expected to produce results
(Stronge et al., 2013). Having distinct definitions that are measurable is necessary for a strong
policy in regards to principal evaluation. “Although there has been incredible pressure from
state policy makers, philanthropists and the U.S. Department of Education to move quickly ‘for
the children,’ the history of policy implementation is replete with examples of hurriedly
implemented policies that caused more harm than good” (Fuller & Hollingworth, 2013, p. 28).
So, it is incumbent upon educational leaders to analyze the current research that is exploding
onto the national scene, post RttT. Evaluation of principals may never be a perfect measurement
but should synthesize all the factors of the role itself, especially over time, to determine
effectiveness of the individual holding the principal position.

**Current Evaluation Practice in Indiana**

Since 2005, thirty-four states have passed legislation requiring district adoption of new
principal evaluation systems (Jacques et al., 2012). However, legislation rarely explicitly
includes the goals or purposes of the evaluation systems. Of the 19 states that won the first
round of Race to the Top (RttT) funds, identification of professional growth and student growth
were only required in two states—Massachusetts and New Jersey (Jacques et al., 2012). States’
decisions about roles and responsibilities vary according to state politics, district capacity, state
size, goals, and support infrastructure. However, the federal government under the Obama
administrations’ blueprint for the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education
Act (ESEA) in 2011 proposed the definition of an “effective” and “highly effective” principal
(Clifford et al., 2012a).
States are required to use student academic growth as a factor in measurement and ensure that principals with effective ratings are spread equitably among schools (Samuels, 2011). Colorado, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Florida, Michigan, West Virginia and Wisconsin have set in statute the percentage of an evaluation that must be based on student academic growth along with multiple measures of performance (Shelton, 2013). Decisions also vary depending on whether or not the state requests ESEA flexibility. Some states, like Tennessee, use a statewide evaluation system and have submitted an ESEA flexibility request. Other states that have submitted an ESEA flexibility request, like New York and Indiana, allow districts to choose an evaluation model (Clifford et al., 2012b).

In 2012, Public Law 90 (PL 90) in Indiana mandated annual evaluations of all certified personnel and school districts in Indiana were placed under a tight timetable to adjust their evaluation practice of school administrators. This was a direct result of the Race to the Top initiative at the federal level. With the PL 90 legislation, most of the priority and notoriety was placed in the area of teacher evaluation; however, building administrators were now also required to have an annual evaluation. The IDOE, under the direction of former State School Superintendent Tony Bennett, developed an evaluation system to meet the mandates of the law, entitled RISE. The RISE Evaluation and Development System was piloted for teacher evaluation in four districts in 2011-2012: Fort Wayne, Greensburg, and Bloomfield school districts, and three other corporations, Beech Grove City Schools, MSD Warren Township, and Bremen Public Schools piloted alternative evaluation systems (IDOE, 2012a), however, no pilot for the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System occurred.

Some districts revised and/or developed their own teacher and principal evaluation model to meet the guidelines of the law awaiting the results of the teacher evaluation pilot to determine
the model they would ultimately utilize. In conjunction with the implementation of RISE System for Teacher Evaluation and in a simultaneous design effort, many schools also subsequently adopted and implemented the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System without pilot testing the system. Other school districts either developed a modified version of RISE or adopted other approved models to meet their district needs. The Executive Summary to the Indiana Evaluation Pilot (IDOE, 2012b), noted that a “profound shift in school culture” (p. 24) was needed to successfully implement a new system of evaluation for teachers and principals. According to the RISE Handbook for Principals and Evaluators,

> Assessing a principal’s professional practice requires evaluators to constantly use their professional judgment. No observation rubric, however detailed, can capture all of the nuances in how principals lead, and synthesizing multiple sources of information into a final rating on a particular professional competency is inherently more complex than checklists or numerical averages. Accordingly, the Principal Effectiveness Rubric provides a comprehensive framework for observing a principal’s practice that helps evaluators synthesize what they see in the school, while simultaneously encouraging evaluators to consider all information collected holistically. (IDOE, 2011, p. 16)

This disclaimer in the handbook signified the difficulty in which the reform era advocates for measurement and accountability of the principal’s role have found in determining the system to use to evaluate a principal’s effectiveness.

In 2011-2012, as school districts in Indiana felt the pressure to move quickly in order to be current under the new laws, many school districts adopted the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System as written by the IDOE. Legislation in Indiana, much like Arizona, Illinois, Massachusetts, South Dakota, Washington, and West Virginia requires the evaluation of principals be provided by a trained evaluator (Shelton, 2013). Two sets of professional development opportunities were offered in the summer and fall of 2012 for evaluators of principals that were intended to initiate implementation immediately. Concern for inter-rater
reliability of trained evaluators, whether a district chooses to use the RISE system or another model, continues to drive professional development opportunities for accountability. In 2014, summer conferences were scheduled for administrators to provide up to the minute training for evaluation purposes.

As of 2015, several school districts in Indiana have developed their own principal evaluation system in an effort to meet the legal requirements of PL 90. Several other school districts that adopted the original RISE system are now in the process of making modifications and others are maintaining the system as originally written. The requirements by the IDOE are for each district to submit their system of evaluation to the IDOE for documentation of legality, not for approval, as autonomy of the evaluation systems are still maintained at the local district level. However, due to the recent requirements of the ESEA waiver for Indiana, a monitoring system for teacher and principal evaluation is being developed by the IDOE to remain in compliance with state and federal guidelines. This may affect school districts that have modified the RISE system. This study is specifically focused on the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System with or without modifications.

Traditional principal performance evaluation has not been routine and systematic, and evaluations have not been comprehensive, informed by valid measures, or aligned with contemporary professional standards (Clifford & Ross, 2011; Davis et al., 2011). However, the landscape is changing. In the past, principals have not viewed evaluation systems as providing valuable feedback to improve their practice (Reeves, 2006; Davis & Hensley, 1999). The RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System is relatively new with requirements including annual protocol and trained evaluators in each district. One of the intentions of the RISE system is providing feedback that can increase principal effectiveness and professional growth. This
study looks at superintendents’ and principals’ perspectives as to whether or not the RISE system is meeting this intended purpose.

Summary

The historical context of the role of school principal has evolved from teacher leader to manager, and now in the 21st century, primarily to instructional leader. The role is significantly complex and multi-faceted. The gap between principal evaluation systems and their link to effective leadership for evaluative purposes continues to elude the education field (Fuller & Hollingworth, 2013). The need for deeper understanding is underscored by the lack of empirical evidence to connect evaluation to effective leadership while researchers continue to search for scientifically proven practices (Shelton, 2013).

Multiple studies have uncovered the various definitions and expectations of the role of principal with some research demonstrating a link between increased principal effectiveness and student achievement. Due to recent educational reform and accountability movements, many states have passed legislation mandating rigorous evaluations for public school principals. In 2011, Indiana legislators passed PL 90, which mandated yearly evaluations for all public school principals. Subsequently, the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System was developed by the IDOE. Many Indiana school corporations soon adopted the RISE system, in its original form or with approved modifications, while other school districts look for other sources to create an evaluation tool for principals that meet the requirements of the law. However, the new system has not been welcomed with open-arms. As Clifford and Ross (2011) explained, overcoming past practices of evaluation that many current administrators have experienced has met with resistance, possibly due to

- Principals view performance evaluation as perfunctory, having limited value for feedback, professional development or accountability to school improvement.
Principal evaluations are inconsistently administered; therefore, performance is inconsistently measured.
Performance evaluations may not align with existing state or national professional standards or practice.
Few widely available principal evaluation instruments display psychometric rigor or make testing public so that validity and reliability can be examined. (Clifford & Ross, 2011, pp. 2-3)

The pace of change in school leadership paradigms coupled with the increased demands for accountability and political scrutiny to increase student achievement continues to validate the need to understand the systems that are being developed and utilized for best practices of effective leaders.
Chapter 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Utilizing a mixed methodology, the purpose of this study was to explore current perspectives of practicing superintendents and principals on the implementation of the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System in the evaluation process of principals in Indiana. Tashakkori & Teddlie (2003) described the definition of a mixed methods study to involve the collection or analysis of both quantitative and/or qualitative data in a single study in which the data are collected concurrently or sequentially, are given a priority, and involve the integration of the data at one or more stages in the process of research. (p. 221)

The collection and combination of both quantitative and qualitative data in research has been influenced by several factors. In that all methods of data collection have limitations, the use of multiple methods can neutralize or cancel out some of the disadvantages of each method (Datta, 1994).

The literature review revealed a plethora of research regarding the characteristics and behaviors of principals, but it also exposed years of study that disclosed the variability and individuality of the role of the principal. This study adds to the body of knowledge regarding administrators’ perceptions of the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System utilized in Indiana school districts to support the improvement of leadership effectiveness in the schools.

Research Questions

1. To what extent do Indiana superintendents and principals perceive that the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System supports improvement of principal leadership?
2. What competencies do Indiana’s superintendents and principals identify as most important in principal evaluation?

3. If a school district implemented allowable modifications to the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System, what modifications were most commonly made?

4. What are Indiana’s superintendents’ and principals’ perceptions regarding the levels of fidelity of implementation of the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System?

5. What are Indiana’s superintendents’ and principals’ ratings of effectiveness of the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System as a tool for evaluating principals?

6. To what extent do Indiana superintendents and principals perceive that the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System supports leadership effectiveness in principals?

**Research Design**

This research design combines quantitative and qualitative methods, seeking a representation of the perceptions of superintendents and principals regarding the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System. An on-line survey was utilized and was cross-sectional, as the data was collected at one point in time (Creswell, 2014). I have employed a cluster procedure where the researcher identifies groups or organizations to obtain membership and then uses a sample within them (Creswell, 2014). I worked with the Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents and the Indiana Association of School Principals to draw a self-identified sample from within their membership. This was an “all call” to any principal or
superintendent through their membership association to participate in the survey if they were using the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System or a modified version.

Survey research has a number of advantages in that it is highly flexible and can be generalized to real-world settings (Muijs, 2010). Sue & Ritter (2012) describe the advantages of e-mail surveys to be speed, economy, convenience, and simplicity. Surveys are efficient in terms of being able to gather large numbers of data compared to other methods such as observation. Surveys allow an opportunity to guarantee anonymity than interviews or questionnaires, which may lead to more candid answers (Muijs, 2010). The disadvantages are availability of a sampling frame, unsolicited e-mail (spam), gray or blacklisting, and too many e-mail surveys (Sue & Ritter, 2012). As the survey was made available to all Indiana superintendents and principals through their state-wide associations, this was an efficient attempt to achieve a higher response rate and reduce the possibility of the survey landing in spam mailboxes. However, superintendents and principals may have chosen not to complete the survey due to the large number of requests they generally receive to participate in e-mail surveys. In addition, survey availability was limited to those principals and superintendents who were currently members of their associations.

I collected both the quantitative and qualitative data via an online survey developed using Qualtrics (www.bsu.qualtrics.com). The anonymous survey first gathered basic demographic information, including age, gender, race/ethnicity, highest degree earned, and years of experience as a superintendent or principal. General information about the schools and districts were also obtained, including student enrollments, percent of students identified as participants in free and reduced meals, and types of school community (rural, suburban, or urban).
Using a four-point Likert-type scale, the survey then asked questions to gather information on the perceptions of superintendents and principals on the six competencies of the system and the fidelity of implementation of the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System. The four-point Likert scale included 4 = strongly agree, 3 = agree, 2 = disagree, and 1 = strongly disagree. This Likert scale was selected in order to encourage participants to be conclusive about their responses to the survey questions.

The perception survey questions were directly related to the study’s research questions (See Appendix K). Using the quantitative responses, basic descriptive statistics including mean, mode, and standard deviation were computed. The quantitative data were then subjected to inferential analysis using appropriate statistical tests (e.g. ANOVA, t tests, and Pearson chi-square). Then, for any statistically significant results, appropriate ad-hoc tests were performed.

The survey also gathered open-ended responses regarding the perceptions of the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System supporting the improvement of principal leadership. These open-ended questions were coded and categorized into emerging trends (Saldana, 2013; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Questions in the survey have been designed to ascertain from superintendents and principals if their district modifies the RISE System, and the types of modifications they have made to the original design. The survey also asked to what extent superintendents and principals perceive the RISE System as supporting leadership effectiveness and to what extent they believed the RISE System supported leadership effectiveness. Comparing the responses of superintendents and principals has highlighted the similarities and differences of district and building leaders.

Analysis of data from the survey assisted in understanding how superintendents and principals perceived the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System in terms of
supporting leadership effectiveness, professional practice, and other areas directly related to the research questions. In sum, this study attempted to make the world of principal evaluation in Indiana visible and transparent through an exploration of quantitative and qualitative data gathered directly from those who practice in the field of education.

Methodology

This study is described as a survey-based, mixed-methodology study. The primary intent of this study was to explore administrators’ perspectives of principal evaluation utilizing the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System as a kind of road map or guide. “Guides call our attention to aspects of the situation or place we might otherwise miss” (Eisner, 1991, p. 59). To gain a deeper understanding of the perceptions of superintendents and principals across Indiana with regard to the utilization and implementation of the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System, an open-call to superintendents and principals through their professional organizations facilitated the data collection.

There were approximately 290 superintendents in Indiana in 2014. Almost all 290 superintendents were current members of the IAPSS (J. Coopman, personal communication, December 14, 2014). Nearly 1,300 principals (54%) in Indiana were members of the Indiana Association of School Principals (IASP) out of 2,389 total principals employed in Indiana (IASP, 2014). Recruitment for participants in this study was made through e-mail and requested responses from evaluators utilizing the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System as adopted or modified. This reduced the eligible population. Approximately 153 districts indicated that they utilize a modified version of the RISE System, and 70 districts utilized RISE as adopted. Therefore, a total of 223 districts indicated that they employed a form of RISE to evaluate principals out of all school districts (302) throughout Indiana (IDOE, 2014). Locally
created evaluation systems, the System for Teacher and Student Advancement (TAP), Peer Assistance and Review (PAR), and other systems were reported for the remaining 79 districts for principal evaluation (IDOE, 2014).

Contacts made with both of the Executive Directors of the IAPSS and the IASP assisted in launching the on-line survey to their membership through their databases. An e-mail cover letter introduced the study purpose and rationale of the research, which encouraged superintendents and principals to contribute by completing the survey. An embedded link to the survey tool took the participants directly to the instrument and informed consent. The cover letter also provided assurance of anonymity as well as information on participation procedures, inclusion/exclusion criteria, data confidentiality, risks, benefits, and storage of data, which was also part of the informed consent. As the surveys were completed, within 10 days of the original launch through both organizations, a generic follow-up e-mail was sent to express gratitude for their consideration of participation and encouraged those to complete the survey if they had not yet done so.

**Data Collection Methods**

The literature review provided a framework for the development of the survey questions. I recognized that utilizing a survey method with quantitative introductory, probing, and direct questions may have had limited the outcome (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). However, open-ended questions to enhance the qualitative design, (Rubin & Rubin, 2012) created a mixed methodology to obtain maximum results. No names, schools, or districts were identified and sensitivity to the needs of each participant was maintained. All data were stored in a password-protected computer at all times during the study and only me as the one doing research and my faculty sponsors had access to the data.
In administering the survey, reliability and validity tests were established. A panel of 17 experts composed of principals, superintendents, and assistant superintendents were asked to conduct pilot testing of the instrument. The primary purposes of the pilot test were to determine if the survey instrument was reliable and could be completed effectively and efficiently by the participants and to collect feedback about each item (Creswell, 2014). The pilot survey generated a 76% completion rate as 13 of the 17 panel members asked to pilot the survey took and completed it. I also asked panel members to report on the amount of time it took to complete the survey, which averaged approximately 10-15 minutes. The feedback from the panel members allowed me to establish content validity. They were asked to comment on any item as to whether the item was relevant or not relevant to principal evaluation with 100% agreement for relevance (Polit & Beck, 2006). Further, they were asked if the survey as a whole was relevant to the topic of principal evaluation, again with 100% agreement. They were asked to comment and provide suggestions to improve the survey. Several changes were made in wording and in the arrangement of the questions on the instrument after this review, which improved the clarity of the survey.

Along with the pilot test to establish content validity, Cronbach’s alpha was used to calculate the internal consistency and reliability of the survey (Gliem & Gliem, 2003). For the 11 “perception” questions on the pilot test using standardized Likert-type scale responses, the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for internal consistency and reliability was .952. Cronbach’s alpha levels >.80 indicate a high level of internal consistency and reliability (Gay & Airasian, 2000).

After the pilot test was completed and final revisions approved by my committee, the survey was distributed with a cover letter through the IAPSS and the IASP. Participants were given 20 days to reply before the data were tabulated. A reminder e-mail was sent after 10 days.
A total of 364 superintendents and principals participated in the survey, with an overall response rate of 79.6%, which indicated that some of the questions in the survey did not receive a response. Therefore, some questions on the survey had a higher response rate than others and all of the responses were determined valid and usable for the data analysis.

**Data Analysis**

Bogdan and Biklen (1982) defined data analysis as “working with data, organizing it, breaking it into manageable units, synthesizing it, searching for patterns, discover what is important and what is to be learned, and deciding what you will tell others” (p. 145). The survey collected quantitative data. “Quantitative research is explaining phenomena by collecting numerical data that are analyzed using mathematically based methods (in particular, statistics)” (Muijs, 2010, p. 1). The quantitative information collected from the questionnaire was analyzed using a t test to determine if there was a difference between the responses of the two groups: principals and superintendents. I used a $p = .05$ level to determine if there was a statistical significance between groups (Rice, 1989). An ANOVA was used when looking at the effects of several factors outlined in the survey, for example, when incorporating the demographic variables. For the 11 “perception” questions on the actual survey instrument using standardized Likert-type scale responses, the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for internal consistency reliability was .924, establishing high reliability (Gay & Airasian, 2000).

In addition to quantitative information, qualitative data were also collected. Qualitative researchers tend to use inductive analysis of data, meaning that the critical themes emerge out of the data (Patton, 1990). Standard qualitative analytical procedures as outlined by Marshall and Rossman (2006) were used to analyze the open-ended responses. This included organizing the data, sorting the data, coding the data, generating categories and themes, offering interpretations,
and reporting findings. Analysis of the open-ended qualitative data required some creativity, to place the raw data into logical, meaningful categories; to examine them in a holistic fashion; and to find a way to communicate this interpretation. Eisner (1991) believed that the following three features of qualitative research should be considered:

**Coherence:** Does the story make sense? How have the conclusions been supported? To what extent have multiple data sources been used to give credence to the interpretation that has been made? (p. 53).

**Structural Corroboration:** This is related to coherence and is also known as triangulation (p. 55).

**Consensus:** The condition in which the readers of a work concur that the findings and/or interpretations reported by the investigator are consistent with their own experience or with the evidence presented (p. 56).

**Summary**

This chapter outlined the research design and methodology for this study. This study explored current perspectives of practicing superintendents and principals on the utilization and the fidelity of implementation of the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System in the evaluation process of principals in Indiana. Quantitative data were collected through an anonymous survey that also included several qualitative open-ended items. The survey was formatted through Qualtrics and distributed through to the memberships of both the Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents (IAPSS) and the Indiana Association of School Principals (IASP) following a pilot review by a panel of experts. The trustworthiness of the data was addressed through the lens of credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability.
(Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Analyses of data are outlined in Chapter Four, and a summary of findings is contained in Chapter Five with recommendations for further research.
Chapter 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA

This study explored current perspectives of practicing superintendents and principals on the implementation of the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System in the evaluation process of principals in Indiana. The purpose of this study was to investigate and compare superintendent and principal perceptions regarding principal evaluation procedures used to support improvement of leadership effectiveness. Survey questions were organized and grouped around the research questions for analysis and the findings are detailed in the following sections.

Participants

The participants in this study were public school superintendents and principals of all levels from Indiana. Participants included a total of 364 individuals; however, only 339 identified their positions. The position breakdowns were elementary principals \((n = 108)\), middle school principals \((n = 40)\), high school principals \((n = 83)\), superintendents \((n = 89)\), assistant superintendents \((n = 13)\), and other central office personnel \((n = 6)\). This breakdown of participants’ positions appears in Table 1.
Table 1

*Current Positions Held by Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Principals</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School Principals</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Principals</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendents</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Central Office</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>339</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. % = the percent of overall respondents who indicated their current position.*

I combined respondents who indicated their current positions were either superintendent, assistant superintendent, or other central office personnel into one group called “superintendents.” Superintendents were classified as the evaluators of principals. I also combined those responding as elementary, middle, and high school principals into a group called “principals.” Principals were classified as the group being evaluated. Table 2 shows the percentage of participants after being combined into the two groups.

Table 2

*Percentage of Participants Combined Into Two Groups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>339</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. % = the percent of overall respondents who indicated their current position.*
Response Rate

Responses from the survey were collected during a 20-day period. The number of respondents with data completed enough to be analyzed overall was 364; however, in some cases the analysis revealed a number slightly lower than this number because some participants did not answer every question. As the survey was made available to all Indiana superintendents and principals through their state-wide associations, the response rate was 22% of all possible respondents. Bartlett, Kotrlik, and Higgins (2001) developed a table for determining minimum return sample size for a given population for continuous and categorical data. It noted that a return of 306 surveys for a population of 1,500 would be an appropriate sample size for both continuous and categorical data. Therefore, the response rate on this survey was adequate for the purposes of this study.

Participant Demographics

Demographic data were collected providing participant information according to the categories of gender, age, years in the current position, total years as superintendent or principal, highest degree earned, race/ethnicity, school community designation, and percent of students with free and reduced meals.

The respondents were composed of 68% (n = 231) principals and 32% (n = 108) superintendents. Of the principals who responded, 58% (n = 135) were men and 42% (n = 96) were women. Of the superintendents who responded, 78% (n = 85) were men and 21% (n = 23) were women. Overall, the distribution of the participants described 65% (n = 220) as men and 35% (n = 119) as women.

In terms of age, most principals, 36% (n = 83), were in the age range of 41-50 years. More superintendents, 37% (n = 40), were in the age range of 51-60 than other age range
categories. Two percent (n = 5) of principals were younger than 30 years of age, and one superintendent indicated he or she was over the age of 71.

Forty-seven percent (n =161) of respondents indicated that they had three or fewer years of experience in their current positions, 25% (n = 69) of principals reported three years or fewer in the position of principal, and 30% (n = 28) of superintendents reported three years or fewer in the position of superintendent. Yet, most principals, 41% (n = 113), and superintendents, 41% (n = 38), reported between four to 10 years’ total experience in their careers. Only 3% (n = 10) of both positions had more than 25 years in their current positions.

The highest degree earned by 56% (n = 189) of principals and superintendents was master’s degrees. Most principals, 78% (n = 181), had an M.A. or M.S., and 45% (n = 48) of superintendents were noted as having earned the Ed.S. or Specialist degree. Another 47% (n = 50) of superintendents had earned the Ed.D., Ph.D., or Doctorate degree. Nineteen percent (n = 65) of all respondents had earned a doctorate degree.

School community was most often defined by both principals, (56%, n = 130), and superintendents, (62%, n = 68), as rural, 58% (n = 198). Suburban districts were next at 25% (n = 84), and urban at 17% (n = 58). Twenty-seven percent of principals (n = 63) and 19% (n = 21) of superintendents reported that they served in suburban districts. Urban districts were reported as served by 17% (n = 40) principals and 16% (n = 18) superintendents. In Indiana, 54.9% of all (n = 288) public school districts were designated as rural, 21.1% were suburban, 11.4% were town schools, and 12.5% were urban or metropolitan schools. This made up 1,933 schools that served 1,046,026 students in the state of Indiana (James, "APRA Records Request Indiana Department of Education").
A total of 40% \((n = 134)\) of all respondents, 58% \((n = 89)\) principals and 42% \((n = 45)\) superintendents, reported that they served students in higher poverty schools with a population of 41-60% of students who qualified for free or reduced meals. However, an additional 20% \((n = 67)\) of principals and superintendents reported serving populations with more than 61% of students within the school or district who received free and reduced meals. Only 13% \((n = 13)\) reported student enrollments of 20% or less who received free and reduced meals. Demographic data concerning superintendents and principals are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

*Participant Demographics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th></th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 or less</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&gt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&gt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Current Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or less</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-10</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&gt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&gt;1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td></td>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years as Prin/Supt</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or less</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-10</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>272</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>231</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&gt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&gt;1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&gt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>230</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Designation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>233</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of Free/Reduced Meals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% or less</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-40%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60%</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-80%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80+</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&gt;1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>153</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overview of the Analysis of Research and Survey Questions**

The survey questions were written to align with the research questions. This facilitated the organization of the data by each research and survey question. The survey was divided into
six parts. The first part of the survey collected responses on demographic data that were presented previously. The remaining parts of the survey collected responses regarding superintendents’ and principals’ perceptions of the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System.

Survey Questions 14 through 20 were linked to Research Question 1 and asked respondents to employ a Likert-type scale to give their perception on seven indicators that represented identified competencies, 1 = Strongly Agree to 4 = Strongly Disagree. These survey questions were designed to have respondents indicate their perceptions on overall leadership effectiveness. They were also linked to the six competencies listed under the Professional Practice section that includes the two domains of Teacher Effectiveness and Leadership Actions of the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System. Using each of the six competencies as well as overall leadership effectiveness as dependent variables, I compared principals’ and superintendents’ mean responses on demographic variables of gender, age, total years in current position, highest degree earned, race/ethnicity, school community designation, and percent of students on free and reduced meals.

Survey Question 21 was linked to Research Question 2 and asked respondents to rank the competencies found in the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System rubric. Survey Questions 22 and 23 were linked to Research Question 3 and asked respondents to indicate if they utilized the RISE System as originally developed and, if not, to describe the modifications put in place. These modifications were coded to develop groupings of modifications. Survey Questions 24, 26, and 27 were linked to Research Questions 4 and 5 and asked respondents to respond on a Likert-type scale to indicate the use of RISE with fidelity, if it was an effective tool for evaluating principals, and if they would recommend it to their colleagues. Again, I compared
principals’ and superintendents’ mean responses on the demographic variables. A visual inspection of the means and standard deviations of principals and superintendents provided insight if there were differences between the two groups concerning survey item mean responses. Inferential statistical analysis using t tests and analysis of variance (ANOVAs) were conducted to further examine the data and explored for any statistically significant mean differences between the principals’ and the superintendents’ responses.

The ANOVA results on the survey questions utilizing the Likert-type scale responses did not uncover statistically significant results that added meaning to the analyses. There were a few cases where results suggested significant statistics in the category 25+ years in the role of superintendent position. However, upon further examination, there were only four respondents in this category; therefore, this was not a representative sample to inform the data.

Question 25, linked to Research Question 6, asked respondents to respond on a Likert-type scale to indicate their perception of the RISE System supporting leadership effectiveness in principals. Additionally, the open-ended Survey Questions 28-30, also linked to Research Question 6, allowed me to code the responses into themes (Saldana, 2013; Strauss & Corbin, 1990) to provide insight to the strengths and challenges of the RISE System as well as how the respondents perceived the system to support leadership effectiveness. Holistic coding was employed and then refined into more detailed coding or through a categorization process to disseminate themes (Saldana, 2013; Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

In the following paragraphs, I present summary data outlining principals’ and superintendents’ responses on each individual perception grouped by research questions. A summary of the descriptive statistics for the survey perception questions can be found at the end
of this section in Table 7. A summary of the $t$ test for equality of means for survey perception questions can be found in Table 8.

Research Question 1 asked, “To what extent do Indiana superintendents and principals perceive that the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System supports improvement of principal leadership?” and corresponded to Survey Questions 14-20. Survey Question 14 asked respondents to rate the RISE System in how it supported the improvement of the principal in regard to overall leadership effectiveness. When principals and superintendents’ responses were combined ($n = 318$), their responses indicated agreement that the RISE System supported principals’ overall leadership effectiveness ($M = 2.17, SD = .571$). When the two groups were separated, superintendents ($n = 103$) reported higher agreement ($M = 2.01, SD = .495$), and principals ($n = 215$) indicated a slightly lower level of agreement with a mean of 2.25 (SD = .590). Further exploring the data for this question, independent sample $t$ test analyses were conducted indicating a statistically significant difference between the superintendents’ and principals’ mean responses, $t(316) = 3.592, p = .000$.

Survey Question 15 asked respondents to rate the RISE System in how it supported the improvement of the principal in regard to human capital management. When principals’ and superintendents’ responses were combined ($n = 317$), responses indicated agreement that the RISE system supported human capital management ($M = 2.30, SD = .568$). When the two groups were divided, superintendents ($n = 102$) reported slightly higher agreement ($M = 2.13, SD = .539$), and principals ($n = 215$) reflected a mean of 2.38 (SD = .566). Independent sample $t$ test analysis for human capital management suggested a statistically significant difference between the superintendents’ and principal’s mean responses, $t(315) = 3.721, p = .000$. 
Survey Question 16 asked respondents to rate the RISE system in how it supported the improvement of the principal in regard to instructional leadership. Principals’ and superintendent’s collective responses, \((n = 315)\) indicated that the mean was in agreement \((M = 2.10, SD = .660)\) and that the RISE system supported instructional leadership. However, when I separated the two groups, the superintendents \((n = 102)\) reported higher agreement \((M = 1.86, SD = .581)\), and the principals \((n = 213)\) indicated a lower level of agreement, \((M = 2.22, SD = .666)\). This was the largest mean difference between the two groups for any of the items within the survey. \(T\) test analysis for instructional leadership indicated a statistically significant difference between the superintendents’ and principals’ mean responses, \(t(313) = 4.585, p = .000\).

Survey Question 17 asked respondents to rate the RISE System in how it supported the improvement of the principal in regard to student learning. When principals’ and superintendents’ responses were combined \((n = 314)\), their responses denoted agreement that the RISE system supported student learning \((M = 2.22, SD = .681)\). When the two groups were separated, superintendents’ responses \((n = 100)\) suggested a higher agreement \((M = 2.00, SD = .636)\), than the principals \((n = 214)\) who reported a mean of 2.22 \((SD = .681)\). \(T\) test analysis indicated a statistically significant difference between the superintendents’ and principals’ mean responses, \(t(312) = 3.939, p = .000\).

Survey Question 18 asked respondents to rate the RISE System in how it supported the improvement of the principal in regard to personal behavior. When the responses of both groups were put together, \((n = 307)\) principals’ and superintendents’ answers indicated agreement that the RISE system supported personal behavior \((M = 2.26, SD = .658)\). After dividing the two groups, the superintendents \((n = 100)\) reported somewhat higher agreement \((M = 2.16, SD = .581)\) than the principals \((n = 209)\) who denoted a mean of 2.31 \((SD = .688)\). Personal behavior
is the only agreement between the two groups with no statistical significance between the superintendents’ and principals’ mean responses, $t(307) = 1.835, p = .067$.

Survey Question 19 asked respondents to rate the RISE system in how it supported the improvement of the principal in regard to building relationships. When the responses of principals and superintendents were joined ($n = 318$), this question indicated agreement that the RISE system supported building relationships ($M = 2.34, SD = .682$). When the two groups were split, superintendents ($n = 103$) reported higher agreement ($M = 2.20, SD = .647$), and principals ($n = 215$) suggested a lower level of agreement with a mean of 2.41 ($SD = .690$). $T$ test analysis for building relationships pointed to a statistically significant difference between the superintendents’ and principal’s mean responses, $t(316) = 2.533, p = .012$.

Survey Question 20 asked respondents to rate the RISE System in how it supported the improvement of the principal in regard to culture of achievement. When principals’ and superintendents’ responses were combined, ($n = 318$) their responses reported agreement that the RISE system supported culture of achievement ($M = 2.22, SD = .648$). When the two groups responses were separated, superintendents ($n = 103$) suggested somewhat higher agreement ($M = 2.05, SD = .616$), and principals ($n = 215$) indicated a lower level of agreement with a mean of 2.31 ($SD = .648$). $T$ test analysis for culture of achievement showed a statistically significant difference between the superintendents’ and principal’s mean responses, $t(316) = 3.382, p = .001$.

Research Question 2 asked, “What competencies do Indiana superintendents and principals identify as most important in principal evaluation? The corresponded to Survey Question 21 which asked respondents to “Rank the following competencies in the order of importance.” This section of the survey asked respondents to rank the six competencies in the
RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System in the order of importance using 1 = Most Important and 6 = Least Important. Not all of the respondents selected a ranking for each competency and a few ranked more than one competency the same. Combining the respondents’ selections of 1, 2, or 3 assisted in determining the competencies deemed Most Important. It is, therefore, clear from these combined rankings that Student Learning was selected as the most important competency, 75% (n = 230). The second most important competency indicated was Instructional Leadership, 67% (n = 207), followed by Building Relationships, 54% (n = 165) and Culture of Achievement, 50% (n = 155). Human Capital Management, 27% (n = 85) and Personal Behavior 26% (n = 80) were noted as the least important competencies for principal evaluation. Table 4 indicates these findings.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Leadership</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Relationships</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture of Achievement</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Capital Management</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Behavior</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Selection of a 1, 2, or 3 was combined to indicate that Principals and Superintendents rated the competency as Most Important

Research Question 3 asked, "If a school district implemented allowable modifications to the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System, what modifications were most commonly made?" This section of the survey asked respondents to answer two questions in regard to whether the district utilized the RISE System as it was written or if the system had been modified. Survey Question 23 asked respondents to describe the modifications their district had
implemented to the original document. Survey Question 22 stated, “My school district utilized the RISE System for principal evaluation as originally developed.”

Understanding that the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System is a state-wide model introduced as an option for use in school districts, it was important to disseminate the districts using the RISE model as it was originally developed with those districts that are utilizing a modified RISE system. With 84% \((n = 305)\) of the total respondents who answered this question, it was described that 60% \((n = 182)\) of respondents utilized the RISE system as it was originally developed, and 40% \((n = 123)\) had made modifications. Table 5 provides statistics that describe the use of the RISE System as originally developed and the RISE system modified by the respondents in the survey.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original RISE System</th>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No – Modified</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Question 23 asked, “My school district utilizes a modified RISE System for principal evaluation. Please list all modifications to RISE that your school implemented.” Participants were asked to describe the modifications their school district had implemented to the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System. However, several descriptions were not able to be used in the study as some respondents noted changes made in their district to the teacher evaluation system and did not describe changes in the principal evaluation system. Also, some respondents noted they could not describe changes as they have only known the system
they were currently using and did not know if changes had been made due to their short tenure in
the position.

There were 78 useable responses. Of these, it was noted that 35% ($n = 27$) described the
most common modification in the principal evaluation system was changing the language or
wording of the rubric. The second most common modification at 22% ($n = 17$) was changing the
metrics. Other modifications were described as changing the number of observations (17%, $n =
13$), changing everything (14%, $n = 11$), using only the rubric (3%, $n = 2$), and some noted that
the criteria for evaluation was not followed (6%, $n = 5$). Other responses indicated that instead
of the requirement of a specific number of observations of the principal, “that on-going meetings
with the principals occur, as the concept that a principal can be evaluated by observations similar
to that of a classroom teacher is impractical.”

When changing the language or wording of the rubric, one respondent stated, “The
original wording is negative, our school district rewrote the rubric to demonstrate the behaviors
and outcomes we want to observe. We combined some areas as it seemed redundant.” Another
stated, “The RISE system has been modified to lessen the harshness of the language of several of
the indicators, however, 98% of the language is written similar to the RISE model.” One district
added technology under the competency of 2.3 Culture of Achievement and another district had
“condensed much of the rubric – several of the areas overlapped so we attempted to combine
areas that were very similar. Also we eliminated several items on the rubric and moved them to
core professionalism (i.e.: teacher evaluation, hiring, and teacher assignment).”

Respondents who indicated they had “changed everything” noted that “we have created
loose interpretations of the basic requirements,” or “the only component remaining is a small
segment regarding standardized test scores.” Another respondent noted that “we don’t use all of
the criteria; we have selected those that are the most important to us.” Some districts had created
different schedules, rubrics, timelines, and suggested protocols and as one district noted, “we
have modified all of the RISE system as RISE was way over the top!” Below, Table 6 describes
the types of modifications that were most commonly described.

Table 6

Types of Modifications to the RISE System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modifications</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changed Rubric</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed Metrics</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed # Observations</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed Everything</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria Not Followed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Rubric Only</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 4 asked, “What is Indiana’s superintendents’ and principals’
perceptions regarding the levels of fidelity of implementation of the RISE Principal Evaluation
and Development System? This section of the survey collected responses on a Likert-type scale
and asked the respondents to give their perception on implementation fidelity of the RISE
Principal Evaluation and Development System. Survey Question 24 asked respondents to rate
the RISE System as to the fidelity of implementation according to the requirements. When
principals and superintendents’ responses were combined (n = 300), their responses suggested
agreement that the RISE System was implemented with fidelity (M = 2.23, SD = .783). When
the two groups were separated, superintendents (n = 99) reported higher agreement (M = 2.06,
SD = .793), and principals (n = 201) indicated a lower level of agreement with a mean of
2.31(SD = .766). Independent sample t test analysis for fidelity to implementation indicated a
Research Question 5 asked, “What are Indiana’s superintendents’ and principals’ ratings of effectiveness of the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System as a tool for evaluating principals? This part of the survey collected responses on a Likert-type scale asked superintendents and principals their perceptions of the RISE system as it pertained to using the RISE system to evaluate principals. This question surveyed for perceptions from the two groups as to whether the RISE system is an effective tool for measuring principals and whether or not they would recommend it to their colleagues.

Survey Question 26 asked respondents to rate the RISE System to as to whether they believed it is an effective tool for evaluating principals. Together, principals’ and superintendents’ \((n = 303)\) responses indicated agreement that the RISE System is an effective tool for evaluating principals \((M = 2.40, SD = .668)\). However, when the two groups were divided, superintendents \((n = 98)\) reported higher agreement \((M = 2.17, SD = .658)\), and principals \((n = 205)\) indicated disagreement \((M = 2.51, SD = .646)\). This disagreement by the principals was the first of all the perception questions where one group disagreed with the question posed. \(T\) test analysis that described the degree that superintendents and principals believe the RISE System is an effective tool for evaluating principals signified a statistically significant difference between the superintendents’ and principal’s mean responses, \(t(301) = 4.242, p = .000.\)

Survey Question 27 asked, “I would recommend the use of the RISE System to my colleagues who are currently using another model to evaluate principals.” Respondents were asked if they would recommend the use of the RISE system to colleagues who currently utilized
another model to evaluate principals. Principals’ and superintendents’ combined responses \((n = 303)\) indicated they would not recommend the RISE system to colleagues \((M = 2.52, SD = .713)\). However, when the two groups were separated, superintendents \((n = 99)\) reported agreement \((M = 2.34, SD = .717)\), and principals \((n = 204)\) indicated disagreement \((M = 2.61, SD = .697)\). Once again, this perception question noted disagreement from the principals and indicated they would not recommend the RISE system to colleagues. \(T\) test analysis for the recommendation of the RISE system suggested a statistically significant difference between the superintendents’ and principal’s mean responses, \(t(301) = 3.069, p = .002\). Table 7 is a summary of the descriptive statistics for the perception questions in the survey.

Table 7

*Descriptive Statistics for the Survey Perception Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>(M)</th>
<th>(SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Leadership Effectiveness</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Capital Management</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Leadership</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Behavior</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Relationships</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture of Achievement</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.648</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implemented with Fidelity</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports Leadership Effectiveness</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>.628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Tool for Evaluating Principals</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend RISE to Colleagues</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>.713</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. 1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Disagree, 4 = Strongly Disagree

Table 8

*T Tests for Equality of Means for Survey Perception Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Overall Leadership Effectiveness</td>
<td>3.592</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Human Capital Management</td>
<td>3.721</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Instructional Leadership</td>
<td>4.585</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Student Learning</td>
<td>3.939</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Personal Behavior</td>
<td>1.835</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Culture of Achievement</td>
<td>3.382</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Implemented with Fidelity</td>
<td>2.658</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Supports Leadership Effectiveness</td>
<td>4.272</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Effective Tool for Evaluating Principals</td>
<td>4.242</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Recommend RISE to Colleagues</td>
<td>3.069</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Significant results (p < .05) are indicated with italics.
Research Question 6 asked, “To what extent do Indiana superintendents and principals perceive that the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System supports leadership effectiveness in principals?” The last section of the survey collected responses on a Likert-type scale and asked superintendents and principals their perceptions of the RISE system as it pertained to supporting leadership effectiveness. In addition, this section was also composed of open-ended questions that asked respondents to describe how the RISE system compared to their previous evaluation systems in supporting leadership effectiveness. Content analysis was used to derive themes in the data (Saldana, 2013; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). The themes and associated frequencies are discussed below and also provided later in Table 9. Further, the next two open-ended questions asked the respondents to describe the strengths and challenges of the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System as it was currently implemented. The themes and associated frequencies for the strengths and challenges of the RISE system are summarized at the end of this section and then in Tables 10 and 11.

Survey Question 25 asked respondents to rate the RISE system as it supported leadership effectiveness in principals. When principals’ and superintendents’ responses were merged together (n = 303), there was agreement that the RISE system supported leadership effectiveness (M = 2.28, SD = .632). When the two groups were separated, superintendents (n = 99) reported higher agreement (M = 2.06, SD = .586), and principals (n = 204) indicated a lower level of agreement that the RISE system supported leadership effectiveness (M = 2.38, SD = .628). T test analysis for supporting leadership effectiveness suggested a statistically significant difference between the superintendents’ and principals’ mean responses, t(301) = 4.272, p = .000.

Survey Question 28 stated, “Compared to the evaluation system my district previously used, describe how the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System supports leadership
effectiveness in principals.” A total of 60% \( (n = 217) \) of all respondents provided 317 coded responses to this question. Several descriptions \( (9\%, \ n = 27) \) could not be used in the study as some respondents referred to the teacher evaluation system and not the principal evaluation system. Also, some respondents noted they could not describe leadership effectiveness in the RISE system as they had only known the system they were currently using due to their short tenure.

More superintendents, 33\% \( (n = 43) \), than principals, 16\% \( (n = 29) \), stated that the RISE system supported leadership effectiveness in principals as an improved system for evaluation. Additionally, more principals, 19\% \( (n = 36) \), than superintendents, 12\% \( (n = 16) \), perceived the RISE system as not supporting leadership effectiveness. Combined, 23\% \( (n = 72) \) of all responses indicated the RISE system supported leadership effectiveness, 16\% \( (n = 52) \) perceived the RISE System as not supporting leadership.

The next group of descriptors in support of leadership effectiveness portrayed that the RISE system’s framework for guidance, 8\% \( (n = 26) \), and higher accountability, 8\% \( (n = 25) \), supported leadership effectiveness. Both principals and superintendents, were nearly equal in their perceptions on these values. Other indicators of support for leadership effectiveness depicted that the RISE system for principals included (6\%, \( n = 18 \)) more communication. More specifically, 7\% \( (n = 21) \) of all respondents declared it was more objective, and 4\% \( (n = 13) \) indicated the focus on data improved the evaluation for principals. More superintendents, 11\% \( (n = 14) \), perceived the RISE system as having more accountability than principals, 6\% \( (n = 11) \). And yet, a total of 4\% \( (n = 13) \) of all respondents noted that the evaluation system was too time consuming.
One principal indicated that, “The RISE evaluation system has provided a framework and focus for meaningful work which, in part, can help lead to greater student achievement.”

Another principal noted that the RISE System “places more accountability on the principal to ensure that the dynamic teaching and instruction is taking place in each individual classroom.”

Yet, some principals voiced concerns that RISE has not been utilized with fidelity, and therefore, it does not support leadership. Several principals and superintendents noted that the RISE system provided specific expectations, was more detailed and multi-faceted, and that it allowed principals to show leadership in ways that might not be evident to the evaluator. Additionally, one superintendent indicated that, “The RISE model has made a definite impact on increasing discussions, collaborations and generally moving in the right direction.” Conversely, another superintendent stated, “I don’t believe it works any better at all than the system we used previously and is much more burdensome to use.”

Overall, it was clear that more superintendents than principals perceived that the RISE system supported leadership in principal evaluation. Although it was noted by both groups that the RISE system was time consuming, both principals and superintendents indicated that it generally provided guidance for increased leadership in principals by providing a framework, more communication, and higher accountability. Table 9 provides thematic descriptors from respondents on how the RISE System supports leadership effectiveness in principals.
Table 9

Descriptors of How the RISE System Supports Leadership Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Evaluation for Leadership</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Not Support Leadership</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Thorough and Specific</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments Not Used</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework for Guidance</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Accountability</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Objective</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Communication</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Time Consuming</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused on Data</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Question 29 stated, “Compared to the evaluation system my district previously used, describe the strengths of the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System.” A total of 56% (n = 189) of all respondents provided 195 coded responses to this question. On this question, 11% (n = 18) of the total responses were not utilized as participants noted they did not have experience with other evaluation systems for principals.

Indicative of the overall responses, more principals (23%, n = 28), than superintendents, (15%, n = 11) revealed they could see no strengths with the RISE System for Principal Evaluation compared to their previous evaluation system which equaled 20% (n = 39) of all responses. One principal noted that “It doesn’t correlate to what is actually done in a building on a daily basis.” However, another principal noted, “It could be beneficial if it was utilized effectively” which indicated a lack of fidelity in its implementation. One superintendent commented that, “RISE does not provide any benefit compared to our old system.” Yet, another
superintendent stated that “It is somewhat better, but I do not believe it is a good evaluation tool.”

When principals and superintendents’ perceptions were combined, 32% (n = 62), of more positive responses were coded under the theme of “Clear Expectations,” and noted that the RISE system’s strength had a clearer definition of principal expectations than previous evaluation tools or models. A statement from a principal mentioned, “The feedback is more specific to areas in the competencies. It is crystal clear on what needs to happen at each area for effective and highly effective performance.” Another principal stated, “The RISE Principal Evaluation is clear and based on research and good leadership.” A superintendent noted, “The RISE evaluation process provides clear focus on student growth and developing instructional leaders…our main goals.”

The rubric was perceived as a strength by 12% (n = 24) of principals with comments such as “The RISE rubric hits the areas that are important in improving student achievement.” Remarking that the evaluation’s strength is in the rubric, one principal said, “It is identification of the specific indicators and the clarity of the descriptions within the indicators that guides discussion between the principal and the superintendent.” Both principals and superintendents mentioned that the rubric breaks down different areas specifying the areas defined more precisely to be an effective principal. A more thorough explanation was given by a superintendent who stated,

The rubric establishes the focus for the evaluator and the principal. Our previous instrument was open-ended and required the evaluator to provide specific examples of highly effective actions. Using the RISE rubric saves time and assures access to a high quality description of the many aspects of a principal’s work. The downside is the rubric sets a very high standard which can rarely be accomplished by a busy principal dealing with many difficult issues during a work day.
Although, 6% \((n = 12)\) of both principals and superintendents described that more communication was a strength, one superintendent illustrated that “It can be used as a collaborative tool” indicating that communication and “forging a relationship of trust is a key ingredient to the rich dialogue that is critical to an on-going basis.” More focused on data, \((16\%, n = 31)\) and more time with teachers \((5\%, n = 9)\) indicated by both groups were the next areas of significance noted as strengths to the RISE system for principals. The comments provided by both principals and superintendents were suggestive of the strengths perceived in utilizing the RISE system to evaluate principals in Indiana. Table 10 provides the coded themes derived from the strengths described of the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths of RISE</th>
<th>Principals (n)</th>
<th>Principals %</th>
<th>Superintendents (n)</th>
<th>Superintendents %</th>
<th>Total (n)</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear Expectations</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Strengths</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Focused on Data</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubric is a Strength</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments Not Used</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Communication</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Time with Teachers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Question 30 stated, “Compared to the evaluation system my district previously used, describe the challenges of the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System.”

When considering the challenges to the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System, a total of 52% \((n = 189)\) responded to this question revealing 227 coded responses. The RISE system being too time consuming was the thought expressed by both superintendents and
principals more than any other indicator, 31% \( (n = 70) \). However, when the two groups were separated, more superintendents \( (43\%, n = 37) \) than principals \( (23\%, n = 33) \) noted concern with the time it took to conduct the principal evaluation system. Many comments from superintendents had a negative tone such as, “Time is always the biggest challenge as it has been difficult for me to arrange observations of principals.” Or, “Time and the observation of the principal on location seem, in many cases, rather contrived and less than productive.” A principal observed, “It is very time consuming. Superintendents do not have time to see us work in in each of the evaluated areas.” However, on a more positive note, one superintendent commented that, “It takes more time, but it is worth taking more time on evaluations.” Another superintendent’s positive commentary stated, “There is no perfect evaluation system! Challenges are the time constraints and effort it takes to complete the evaluation with fidelity.”

Responses indicated that another challenge of the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System has been lack of fidelity in the implementation of the evaluation system. Fifteen percent \( (n = 34) \) of all respondents mentioned that the system had not been put into place according to the manner in which it was intended. One principal noted that “Evaluation is based on perception rather than observation” and another said that “A principal’s job is not easily defined in just a couple short observations (and I would venture to say many districts are not even completing those).” This principal went on to note, “An evaluator needs to be in a building for long periods of time and many days throughout the school year to gain understanding of a principal’s strengths and needs.” Another principal stated, “It depends on the evaluator” and “inconsistent documentation” as well as “the challenge lies in developing a common understanding of the competencies being measured” were comments which could be interpreted that inter-rater reliability has yet to be established.
Some respondents, 17% \( (n = 38) \), indicated that the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System was not representative of the job of a principal. Comments such as “The RISE system does not support the management job principals have,” and that, “It is hard to statistically evaluate all facets of the principal’s job” were indicative of this theme. One superintendent stated, “The RISE model does little to offer opportunity to react to the daily demands and tasks principals must perform that impact the climate and general management of the school.”

Other coded themes drawn from the comments described that the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System was too broad and impersonal and created an unhealthy climate. One superintendent remarked that, “It is not rich in the dialogue that is essential for trust and professional growth for principals who are eager to learn and improve the culture for learning in their schools.” Another superintendent noted, “It is very structured and not relationship based when implemented as written.” A principal commented that “One big challenge from our previous model is the competition it has created between those ranked highly effective to those who are ranked effective.” A different principal claimed that, “One size fits all systems may improve efficiency of procedures and human capital decisions, but very seldom has long-term effects with positive culture needed to improve performance.” This principal went on to say, “The rigidity of the RISE tools does not recognize cultural diversity, human capital needs and local expectations. It attempts to micro-manage diverse school environments with the expectation that educators are minimalist by nature.”

Very few principals (5%, \( n = 7 \)) and superintendents (5%, \( n = 4 \)) remarked that there were no challenges to the RISE system. This seemed to indicate that regardless of the strengths of the new principal evaluation system, there have been more perceived challenges in
implementing the system effectively and with fidelity just three years into the state-wide model.

Table 11 depicts the themes coded for the challenges of the RISE System.

Table 11

Descriptors of the Challenges of the RISE System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges of RISE</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th></th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Consuming</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Representative of Job</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Fidelity</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Broad and Impersonal</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates Unhealthy Climate</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments Not Used</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Use Other System</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Challenges</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This research investigated the perceptions of principals and superintendents on the implementation of the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System in the evaluation process of principals in Indiana. One of the purposes of this study was to compare and determine if there were differences between the perceptions of principals and superintendents regarding the utilization of the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System with regard to supporting improvement of principal leadership and leadership effectiveness. The responses to each survey question, which were tied to the six research questions, were analyzed and the results described in order to provide the essential information upon which to draw conclusions. Comparison of superintendents’ perceptions of the RISE system to those of principals’ perceptions was an integral part of the research. This study’s findings are discussed and summarized in Chapter
Five, as well as conclusions, implications, and recommendations that emerged from my analysis of the results.
Chapter 5

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

This study explored current perspectives of practicing superintendents and principals regarding use of the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System in the evaluation process of principals in Indiana. In Indiana, approximately 80% of public school districts implemented this innovative state-developed principal evaluation model in 2012 after legislation was passed mandating specific components including value-added measures. The development of the RISE System represented a paradigm shift in the state because school districts previously had autonomy in developing their principal evaluation models. This study examined the new reform model in terms of district and building-level practitioners’ views of effectiveness and implementation fidelity. This research was important to undertake as the Indiana RISE System for principal evaluation had not yet been studied.

Research has proven that effective principal leadership is an essential factor in school success (Jacques, Clifford, & Hornung, 2012; Ginsberg & Thompson, 1990; King Rice, 2010; Leithwood et al., 2004; Marzano et al., 2005). The literature review described studies that identified leadership practices and behaviors that increased effectiveness in principals (Cotton, 2003; Marzano et al., 2005; Murphy et al., 2011; Stiggins & Duke, 2008; Stronge et al., 2013).

In the past, research has been focused on traditional practices in the evaluation of school principals, yet today there is a strong impetus toward state-level reform efforts that include the use of new evaluative processes (Jacques et al., 2012; New Leaders for New Schools, 2010). The importance of improving the performance of principals has become a stronger focus in the reform era. Due to new accountability requirements as well as an increased emphasis on raising
student achievement, states and school districts have been charged with creating meaningful
evaluation systems to measure leadership effectiveness (Clifford et al., 2012b).

The state of Indiana has aggressively moved forward with an innovative principal
evaluation model with several emergent practices such as required annual protocol, trained
evaluators in each district, rubric-based assessment, and value-added measures. The purpose of
this study was to investigate and compare superintendents’ and principals’ perceptions regarding
principal evaluation procedures utilizing the new Indiana model, the RISE Principal Evaluation
and Development System. The questions that guided this study were:

1. To what extent do Indiana superintendents and principals perceive that the RISE
   Principal Evaluation and Development System supports improvement of principal
   leadership?
2. What competencies do Indiana’s superintendents and principals identify as most
   important in principal evaluation?
3. If a school district implemented allowable modifications to the RISE Principal
   Evaluation and Development System, what modifications were most commonly
   made?
4. What are Indiana’s superintendents’ and principals’ perceptions regarding the levels
   of fidelity of implementation of the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development
   System?
5. What are Indiana’s superintendents’ and principals’ ratings of effectiveness of the
   RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System as a tool for evaluating
   principals?
To what extent do Indiana superintendents and principals perceive that the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System supports leadership effectiveness in principals?

The discussion for this study is organized around the research questions. Connections with relevant literature are made within the discussion of each research question. This chapter summarizes the main conclusions of my study and their implications for practice. The chapter concludes with recommendations for further research and suggestions for the ongoing development of principal evaluation. Through my study, I endeavored to add administrators’ voices to the developing professional dialogue about effective leadership evaluation and whether or not the RISE model is meeting intended purposes.

Procedure

This study included a comprehensive literature review that contained a historical look at the principal role, key leadership behaviors important for today’s principals, current principal evaluation practices, and factors influencing principal evaluation. With the new Indiana RISE system as the primary evaluation model to examine, the goal was to obtain information directly from Indiana principals and superintendents regarding their perceptions of the implementation and use of the RISE System. I wanted to compare the responses of principals with those responses of superintendents in order to determine any differences in perceptions between those being evaluated and the evaluators. In Indiana, superintendents and assistant superintendents are primarily responsible for principal evaluation. Thomas et al. (2000) suggested that there were differences between how principals and superintendents viewed the importance and usefulness of principal evaluation. I wanted to further investigate this premise.
An anonymous online survey approach was deemed most appropriate in achieving my study’s purposes, as it allowed me to collect information directly from Indiana principals and superintendents. All survey items were directly related to my study’s research questions and were grounded in the literature review. *Qualtrics* was used to create a 30-item survey with four open-ended questions, to disseminate the survey, and to collect the responses. Then, the Statistical Package for Social Sciences software (SPSS 19) was used to sort results and run data analyzes.

The survey first gathered participants’ basic demographic information, including age, gender, race/ethnicity, degrees earned, and years of experience. General information about the school district was also obtained, including student enrollment, SES indicators, and school community type (rural, suburban, or urban). I used a Likert-type scale format and created 11 “perception” survey items designed to gather participants’ views on the RISE model.

After compiling the results, descriptive statistics were utilized to provide an overview of participants’ responses. *T* test analyses were conducted to compare principals’ and superintendents’ responses on the Likert-type scale questions. To delve deeper, ANOVA tests were calculated using the participants’ demographic characteristics as the independent variable and the individual perception questions as the dependent variables, with appropriate post hoc tests performed for any statistically significant results. Finally, the narrative responses from the open-ended questions were coded and categorized into emerging trends (Saldana, 2013; Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

**Summary of Results**

Utilizing relevant literature as a lens through which to discuss the specific findings of this research, I present results through a discussion within each research question.
**Improvement of Leadership.** My first research question sought to understand the extent that superintendents and principals perceived that the RISE system supported the improvement of principal leadership. The six professional practice competencies within the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System were derived from several models and leadership theories, as indicated in the RISE Principal Handbook (IDOE, 2011). The six competencies are human capital management, instructional leadership, student learning, personal behavior, building relationships, and culture of achievement.

These competencies, plus the indicator of overall leadership effectiveness (IDOE, 2011), were examined for principals’ and superintendents’ perceptions regarding the improvement of principal leadership. The professional practice competencies in the RISE system rubric have observable indicators that suggest the levels of effectiveness through the four categories of highly effective, effective, needs improvement, and ineffective. According to Derrington and Sharratt (2008), the foundation of an effective evaluation is determining the competencies or criteria for assessing performance.

According to my results, principals and superintendents agreed that all six of the competencies with observable behaviors supported the improvement of principal leadership per the RISE model. However, when examining both groups’ mean responses, statistically significant differences in the levels of agreement were noted between principals and superintendents. Unlike the study by Reeves (2006) where it was concluded that principals do not know what is expected or how they are measured to improve their practice, the perceptions of Indiana principals regarding the competencies to improve their practice in the RISE system underscore an increased level of understanding of what is expected. However, principals may
not have the same level of consideration as superintendents, who may perceive that understanding at an even higher plateau.

For the competencies, superintendents’ mean responses showed a higher level of agreement than the principals,’ indicating statistically significant differences in perceptions that the RISE system supports the improvement of principal leadership. The exception to this was the category of personal behavior. The competency of personal behavior did not reveal a statistically significant difference in perceptions between principals and superintendents in regard to the RISE model supporting improvement for principal leadership. This agreement suggested that personal behavior in principals (professionalism, time management, using feedback to improve student performance, initiative, and persistence of effort), may be a common language understood by both groups as a positive indicator supporting the improvement of leadership.

In the competency of instructional leadership (mission and vision, classroom observations, and teacher collaboration), superintendents’ and principals’ responses indicated agreement that this competency supported the improvement of principal leadership. However, this competency posed the largest gaps in the levels of agreement between the mean responses of the two groups, with superintendents reporting significantly higher levels of agreement. In other words, although both groups agreed that instructional leadership per the RISE model supported the improvement of principal leadership, the significant difference suggested that superintendents found this competency to be a much more important factor on RISE in improvement of principal leadership than did the principals. Open-ended questions revealed concerns that included time-based implementation challenges, lack-of-faith in the required value-added measures, and perceptions that the model does not facilitate overall leadership
effectiveness. Although not quite as large, this gap occurred again for each of the remaining competencies of human capital management (hiring and retention, evaluation of teachers, professional development, leadership and talent development, delegation, strategic assignment, and addressing teachers who are in need of improvement or ineffective), building relationships (culture of urgency, communication, and forging consensus for change and improvement), and culture of achievement (high expectations, academic rigor, and data usage in teams).

These gaps in perceptions between the principals and superintendents may be in part due to time issues associated with model implementation. On open-ended questions, superintendents indicated that they were not able to be at the building adequate amounts of time to know the daily activities that affect the improvement of principal leadership. Both superintendents and principals reported that time was a barrier for superintendents to properly examine all areas of principal leadership.

Additional comments revealed that principals felt the RISE system was not relationship based and was too structured. One principal stated, “The challenge lies in developing a common understanding of the competencies to be measured.” Additionally, a superintendent indicated that it does not allow for the type of dialogue that is essential for trust and professional growth and “finding evidence to support all competency areas is a challenge.” Although the RISE Principal Handbook does not specifically give examples of evidence for each of the competencies other than what is written in the observable indicators, these types of comments could be perceived as a lack of understanding in what is being observed and/or measured. Furthermore, there seemed to be discrepancy in understanding and interpreting the common language of the competencies and/or the overall evaluation system between principals and superintendents that might be creating gaps in perceptions.
However, some positive common themes were discovered in the open-ended questions to support the improvement of a principal in regard to the competencies. Principals and superintendents indicated that the RISE system had clear expectations, was more focused on data, and the rubric was considered as a strength. This aligned with information found in the RISE Handbook, which stated that one of the four key purposes for the development of the RISE system to evaluate principals was to “provide clear expectations” in that the “rubric defines and prioritizes the actions in which effective principals must engage to lead breakthrough gains in student achievement” (IDOE, 2011).

The principals’ role is intricate and comprehensive. In this study, superintendents and principals indicated that the competencies of the RISE system supported the improvement of principal leadership, with superintendents agreeing at higher levels on several competencies. Similar to the studies of Marzano et al. (2005) and Stronge et al. (2013), which indicated key behaviors that influence effective leadership, the RISE system’s six competencies are Indiana’s attempt to define, categorize, and connect human behavior to the job to determine the most effective practices of school leaders and to influence student achievement.

**Rankings of Importance of the Competencies.** According to Derrington and Sharratt (2008), the foundation of an effective evaluation is determining the competencies or criteria for assessing performance. Stronge et al. (2013), noted that there are a host of variables that affect the principal’s position on a daily basis, and in the past it has been difficult to determine which parts of the position are the most important. To address this issue in my research, I asked superintendents and principals to rank the six RISE competencies in terms of importance.

Together, principals and superintendents ranked student learning (75%) as the most important competency to assess in the evaluation of principals. Student learning was closely
followed by instructional leadership (67%). This was not surprising as these two competencies relate principal effectiveness to teaching and learning just as the Effective Schools research also indicated that focusing on the principal’s leadership is central to student achievement (Edmonds, 1981; Rousmaniere, 2013). Marzano et al. (2005), also indicated that a focus on the principal’s abilities to combine the roles of instructional leader, coach, and manager of the building, correlated those responsibilities with positive student achievement.

Comments from superintendents supported these rankings in that “The RISE rubric hits the areas that are important to improving student achievement” and “The guidelines for academic leadership and student learning are clear.” One principal noted that “RISE is more geared to instructional leadership.” Although the competencies of building relationships (54%) ranked third, followed by culture of achievement (50%) and human capital management (27%), the rubric as a whole was considered by only 12% of all respondents as a more positive aspect of the system. Noting that many districts changed the language of the rubric, it may be difficult to gain a clear understanding of the key behaviors or competencies that influence overall leadership effectiveness or improvement.

RISE as Developed or Modified. For my research, it was important to understand if the RISE system was being utilized as originally designed or if modifications had been made. Additionally, if districts modified the RISE system, understanding the types of modifications assisted in clarifying the strengths and challenges in implementation. It was discovered that of the 84% (n = 305) who responded to this part of the study, 60% (n = 182) utilized the RISE System as originally designed, and 40% (n = 123) implemented with allowable modifications. Making modifications indicated that school districts in Indiana were not satisfied with the RISE
system as it was designed. Of the modifications, 35% (n = 27) of respondents indicated that they changed the language of the rubric.

Although the rubric was perceived as one of the strengths compared to previous evaluation systems, changing the language in the rubric was the most indicated modification followed by changing the metrics, changing the number of observations and then “changing everything.” One superintendent observed that “Observing all the criteria on the rubric is a challenge,” with another noting, “All the process skills related to running an organization are not measured or evaluated.” This superintendent went on to say, “The role of the principal is vast and no rubric can capture all the necessary responsibilities of a successful building leader.” Principals’ comments indicated agreement about the rubric, for example, “It doesn’t cover everything that needs to be addressed,” and “It does little to acknowledge day-to-day responsibilities.” Another noted, “The human element has been taken out of consideration and yet is the most important in education.” These comments indicated challenges of implementation of the original design and perhaps reasons that districts chose to modify the RISE system.

**Fidelity of Implementation.** Implementation requirements of the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System were outlined in the RISE Principal Handbook developed in 2011 (IDOE, 2011). The RISE model was designed by a group of educators across Indiana to comply with the adoption of Public Law 90. The RISE model was required to include specific evaluative components and districts could adopt it as written or make certain allowable modifications. However, in adopting the original or modified version of the RISE system, districts had to agree to commit to the system’s components or modifications developed. For this study, understanding the perceptions of superintendents and principals regarding the levels of
fidelity of implementation of the RISE system was important to understanding the strengths and challenges of the system as it supports leadership effectiveness.

A survey by Duke and Stiggins in 1985 showed that principals and superintendents disagreed on the thoroughness of evaluations, with superintendents feeling more satisfied than principals on the process. Results of this study indicated similar findings in that superintendents perceived a higher level of fidelity of implementation than principals, revealing statistically significant differences in perceptions on the use of the RISE System. Although The RISE model is grounded in the research of several well-noted models, it appeared there were concerns with implementation fidelity of current practice in terms of lack of alignment between written procedure and current practice.

The first of these dealt with procedures of implementation, which are outlined in the RISE Principal Handbook (IDOE, 2011). Although allowable modifications can and have been made by 40% of respondents utilizing the RISE system, principals noted that procedures for implementation were not being followed. In addition, principals reported that the results of their evaluations depended on the evaluator. This confirmed research done by Thomas et al. (2000) that indicated that principal evaluations had been inconsistently administered by those who evaluated principals and concluded that performance had been inconsistently measured.

Principals perceived the lack of consistency, lack of gathering evidence, lack of time for superintendents to be in the buildings, and lack of the ability to acknowledge the job responsibilities to be the challenges of accurate implementation of the RISE system. Superintendents indicated that the many responsibilities of their positions have been barriers to consistency, as well as the process itself being too time consuming to be consistently effective. However, superintendents had an overall more favorable view of the system than principals.
In 2006, Portin et al. noted in their study that principals viewed their evaluations as perfunctory and having limited value. In Indiana, it is possible that low implementation fidelity and evaluators not following the protocols contributed to principals’ perceptions regarding lack of internal consistency with their RISE evaluations. This result suggests that there is still training that needs to be done on the RISE system for both principals and superintendents. Without a strong definition of competencies of the rubric with explicit examples and a well-defined understanding of the implementation protocols, principals may continue to view their evaluations similar to what Davis and Hensley’s (1999) research found, that principal evaluation is something that is happening to them, rather than a useful tool to improve their job performance.

**Effective Tool for Principal Evaluation.** When asked to compare the RISE system with their previous principal evaluation models, principals’ and superintendents’ responses indicated perceptions that the RISE system was more thorough and specific, included a framework for guidance, increased accountability and objectivity, facilitated communications, and was data-focused. These attributes indicated that overall, both superintendents and principals perceived the RISE system to be a more effective tool to evaluate principals than previous models. According to Jacques et al. (2012), principal evaluation systems that openly recognize effective and highly effective principals and provide performance-based feedback to encourage leadership improvement can help to ensure that all students can be successful.

Prior to 2011, Indiana school districts adopted pre-existing evaluation models or created their own evaluation tool based on their perceived needs. Historically, principal evaluation was not a district priority, and in some cases, it did not occur at all (NAESP, 2012). The RISE model was Indiana’s first attempt to develop a system that could be used state-wide, at a time when
yearly evaluations for all educators became mandated by state law. However, it was not intended to be wholly comprehensive, as evidenced in the RISE Handbook for Principal Evaluation.

The goal was not to create a principal evaluation tool that would try to be all things to all people. Rather, the rubric focuses unapologetically on evaluating the principal’s roles as driver of student growth and achievement through their leadership skills and ability to manage teacher effectiveness in their buildings. (IDOE, 2011, p. 11)

The demands to improve principal assessment methods and instruments for increased school effectiveness have become more prominent recently due to reform efforts in education. The results of my study indicate that overall, the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System is considered by both superintendents and principals to be an improved evaluation tool over models that had been utilized in the past. However, specific results suggested that even though superintendents agreed that RISE was an effective model for principal evaluation, collectively with principals, they would not recommend it to colleagues. Additionally, principals’ responses clearly indicated that they did not find RISE to be an effective tool for principal evaluation.

Regarding their overall perceptions of the effectiveness of RISE, there is disagreement between principals and superintendents. More principals than superintendents indicated that low fidelity of implementation of the protocols contributed to their lack of faith in the effectiveness of the model to accurately evaluate a principal’s job performance. One principal stated that the evaluation is based on perception rather than observation or objective measures. Another principal commented that that the system was only as good as the evaluator’s perception of the principal’s work, as the superintendent is often limited in what they actually are able to observe and know about the principal. Whether it is lack of training or lack of understanding that leads
to ineffective evaluative processes, the differences in perceptions between principals and superintendents are important findings in this study. These results indicated differences in perceptions between the two groups and suggested the potential need for revisions to the RISE model as well as state-led training initiatives.

**Leadership Effectiveness.** My final research question focused on the perception of superintendents and principals as to how well the RISE system supported leadership effectiveness. This section encompassed the considerations of the strengths and challenges of the RISE system as it pertained to supporting leadership effectiveness. Although there was strong evidence from these data to indicate that both groups believed leadership effectiveness to be supported by the RISE system, again, there was a statistically significant difference in the two groups’ mean levels of agreements. Superintendents’ levels of agreement were higher than principals in regard to the system supporting leadership effectiveness. Comments from superintendents indicated many felt it was an improved system for principal evaluation. Although principals were generally in agreement of support of RISE, their uncertainty was reflected in comments regarding both strengths and challenges of the RISE system. Statements from principals such as, “It measures us on things for which we do not have direct impact,” and “Using numbers to describe a non-quantifiable activity is challenging,” underscored concerns.

Attributes indicated by both groups as strengths supporting leadership effectiveness in the RISE system were that it was more thorough and specific, included a framework for guidance, had increased accountability, was more objective, facilitated communications, and was focused on data. However, for the strength indicating that RISE promoted communications; principals also perceived this to be a challenge, and commented that communications and feedback quality and quantity depended on the evaluator. This is concerning because it correlates to prior
research that indicated that evaluation systems have not consistently provided the necessary feedback to support the improvement of principals (NAESP, 2012).

Superintendents clearly indicated they appreciated the structure and the focus on accountability to clarify the expected actions of effective leadership with statements such as, “It is much more in depth and concentrates on leadership qualities more than our previous model,” and, “provides defined areas for principals to focus leadership behaviors.” Nevertheless, both groups shared concerns that the RISE system was perceived as too broad and impersonal, and that it created an unhealthy climate of competition among principals in the same district. Although the intention of the RISE system was to facilitate feedback to increase principal effectiveness, it appeared there were still many barriers to overcome in order for this to occur.

Both principals and superintendents indicated that providing evidence of practice through observations and artifacts had created more objectivity in principal evaluation processes and also helped increase understanding of levels of effectiveness. This was encouraging due to the fact that, historically, principal evaluations were often seen as being based on limited or no evidence other than the evaluator’s perception (Thomas et al., 2000). However, both groups indicated that having sufficient time to effectively implement the model was a barrier, which again alluded to concerns about lack of implementation fidelity.

The evaluation of principals and leadership assessment can be a fundamental part of a standards-based accountability system and school improvement (Goldring et al., 2009). Due to the complex role of the school principal it appears that only by a clear and reliable analysis of the level of effectiveness will a principal be able to improve their practice (Harrison & Peterson, 1988).
Implications

Research indicates that the effectiveness of the principal’s leadership is a primary factor in school and student achievement (Hallinge & Heck, 1998; King Rice, 2010; Leithwood et al., 2004). It is important to note that the results of this study indicated that superintendents and principals did not view the evaluation of principals utilizing the RISE system in the same ways. These results for this research is similar to the principal evaluation research of Thomas et al. (2000) who concluded that there were differences between how principals and superintendents viewed the importance and usefulness of the principal’s evaluation.

Although there is agreement in my study between the groups that the RISE system supports the improvement and effectiveness of principal leadership and that RISE is a better system of evaluation overall, the differences in their perceptions are statistically significant in almost all areas investigated. Similar to what Davis and Hensley (1999) found, principals in this study may view the evaluation process as something that is done to them. Principals’ views of the RISE system differ significantly from those of superintendents, possibly due in part to low implementation fidelity of the protocols, as reported by the principals.

“Being very time-consuming,” was indicated as a challenge to the implementation of the RISE system and this issue may play a role in implementation fidelity, as well as the overall dependability of the evaluation process. Some individual districts have reduced the number of required observations, revised the rubric, and made other modifications in attempts to make the time commitments more manageable. However, an important implication of this study is that revisions to the model at the state level may be needed in order to reduce the time commitments required for successful model implementation.
In addition, on-going training regarding the RISE Principal Evaluation System may be needed for a higher level of understanding and to increase inter-rater reliability. This may allow a more efficient use of time and support effective feedback in the evaluation process. Principals and superintendents should be able to gather needed evidence of practice in a timely manner that is not contrived but effective and evaluative to support principal practice. Although both principals and superintendents indicated that the RISE system supported leadership, only superintendents indicated that the RISE system is a more effective tool than previous systems of evaluation, and yet neither group would recommend the model to their colleagues.

The fact that districts continue to modify parts of or all of the RISE system indicated the lack of satisfaction and confidence in the system to properly evaluate principals. Although this research concluded that the RISE system is overall a better system of evaluation than previous evaluation models locally developed, it is not a consistent state-wide model that can be compared adequately from district to district. While the authority to modify the RISE system acknowledges local autonomy, it produces a lack of consistency and the lack of the ability to train evaluators effectively for inter-rater reliability to increase effectiveness. The perception of the lack of implementation fidelity contributes to lack of consistency, which does not allow for an effective process to measure principal leadership state-wide. Once again, this implies the need for state-level revision of RISE, with direct input from principals and superintendents who have used the model. Today’s accountability systems require evaluation systems with clearly defined observable indicators and protocols that can be the vehicle to provide the support necessary for principals to grow their practice (Marzano et al., 2005).
Limitations of Study

A limitation of my study was that it only involved principals and superintendents in one state—Indiana, and one evaluation model—RISE. Research on principal evaluation with a broader range of participants across the nation would increase one’s understanding of perceptions of practitioners regarding new evaluative models. Another limitation of my study was that although the demographic variables were examined through ANOVA, these statistical analyses did not inform this study to add meaning to the results. However, a more in-depth study within a particular demographic may uncover issues not ascertained in this research. For example, surveying only urban school principals and superintendents might provide a deeper understanding of their particular perceptions toward principal evaluation utilizing the RISE system.

Recommendations for Further Research

The literature review indicated a need for the study of current principal evaluation practices, in particular, in my home state of Indiana. This study focused on the Indiana RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System and the perceptions of this model as seen through the eyes of currently practicing principals and superintendents. Further studies are needed to delve deeper into the discrepancies between the perceptions of principals and superintendents in the evaluation process. In almost every area considered, there were statistically significant differences between principals’ and superintendents’ perceptions regarding the effectiveness of the RISE system.

Additional studies are also needed to further investigate local modifications of the RISE system, which might uncover potential practices or competencies that would enhance the effectiveness of the evaluation system. This might also assist in developing guidelines for
customization in order to develop more consistency state-wide. Finally, the need for greater collaboration between principals and superintendents in developing clear and concise criteria that can be consistently employed to attain the highest level of support for principal practice is another area for further research. This research could ultimately assist in increasing overall consistency in effectiveness and perceptions of the principal evaluation process.

**Conclusion**

This chapter summarized and interpreted key findings of this study. It also provided recommendations and suggestions for further research. The following are some final thoughts.

By conducting this study, I was able to gain a clearer understanding of the perceptions of principals and superintendents regarding the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System that was recently implemented as a state-wide model for principal evaluation in Indiana. Results indicated a clear delineation between superintendents and principals regarding the RISE system’s effectiveness to evaluate and support principals in their leadership roles. A dominant factor emerged that although the RISE System was perceived as a more effective tool for evaluating principals than locally-developed models utilized in prior years, however, it was not yet a system for evaluation that principals perceived to effect and inform their leadership effectiveness. A gap between superintendents’ and principals’ perceptions of effective evaluation processes continues to inform the need for ongoing support of principal practice. Although both superintendents and principals indicated that communication had increased with the implementation of the RISE system, my results indicated a certain lack of faith among principals in the evaluation process that may not be overcome without improved fidelity to the process.
Research has offered various definitions and expectations for the role of principal with studies showing links between principal effectiveness and school success (Leithwood et al., 2004; Marzano et al., 2005; Stronge et al., 2013). Although the Indiana RISE model has been implemented, and many districts have made modifications, there is still a struggle to implement a system of evaluation that is mutually acceptable and provides the results desired in this era of accountability. My study revealed a strong need to revise and align the RISE system to additional and more recent collaboratively researched leadership behaviors that may provide supportive and accountable measures for the role of principal. The responsibilities of a principal are multifaceted and both superintendents and principals stated that many indicators of the position are not addressed in the RISE system. In addition, it is important that both superintendents and principals regard the evaluation process as an objective implementation in order to accurately measure, support, and increase leadership effectiveness.

It is my hope that this research will provide insights into the perceptions of currently practicing superintendents and principals that potentially may guide revisions to the Indiana RISE model. This baseline understanding of the RISE Principal Evaluation System is important as it informs state-level decision making and also guides future comparative research. In addition, this research may be helpful in other states as they review and revise their systems for principal evaluation. Globally, this study has significance for educational researchers, practitioners, and policy makers because it increases understanding of emergent evaluation strategies used for school leaders, with potential recommendations for improving or sustaining practices. The advancement of excellent school leadership for all students in today’s society should be on-going and requires thoughtful examination of practice.
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APPENDIX A: DESIRED LEADERSHIP CHARACTERISTICS

1. Leadership in curriculum planning
2. Study and discussion of educational theory and current development in secondary education with the professional staff and school patrons
3. Organization of a program of studies appropriate to the needs of the pupils, community and nation
4. Development of guidance and counseling services
5. Management of auxiliary services such as health, transportation and cafeteria
6. Procurement and organizational of library and instructional facilities and services
7. Participation in the selection of teachers and organization of the faculty to provide high quality instruction
8. Development of conditions within the school conducive to high morale and development of good citizenship on the part of students
9. Development and maintenance of good faculty morale
10. Development and maintenance of an effective program of in-service education for the faculty
11. Development and maintenance of a sound program of extra classroom activities for all pupils
12. Organization of the school day and year so that the instructional program functions effectively
13. Organization and management of records and office routine needed for the effective educational and business management of the school
14. Provision of leadership for participation of citizens in school affairs
15. Interpretation of the program of the school to the community, the superintendent of schools, and the board of education

16. Participation in coordinating educational services for youth in the community

17. Management and supervision of the maintenance of the school plant and other physical facilities

18. Participation in the development of plans for future buildings

19. Maintenance of cooperative and effective relations with legal agencies, accrediting agencies and other educational institutions

20. Contributions to the advancement of the teaching profession

APPENDIX B: 21 LEADERSHIP RESPONSIBILITIES

Marzano et al. (2005) noted that principals had approximately a 6-11% greater impact on student achievement when engaging in the following actions:

1. **Affirmation** (.19) the principal systematically addresses both positive and negative performance of the students, staff, and school. Affirmation is the accountability of the principal for delivering the results and progress of school goals.

2. **Change Agent** (.25) the principal challenges the status quo. As a change agent, the principal is empowered to take risks and lead initiatives despite uncertain outcomes. Change agents are characterized by always considering better alternatives for everyday practices.

3. **Contingent Rewards** (.24) the principal recognizes and rewards staff accomplishments. Recognitions call attention to what is valued. The principal must be proactive in finding opportunities to provide contingent rewards of various staff performance.

4. **Communication** (.23) the principal establishes strong lines of communication with and among teachers and students.

5. **Culture** (.25) the principal fosters shared beliefs and a sense of community and cooperation.

6. **Discipline** (.27) the principal protects teachers from issues and influences that would detract from their teaching time or focus.

7. **Flexibility** (.28) the principal adapts his or her leadership behavior to the needs of the current situation and is comfortable with dissent.

8. **Focus** (.24) the principal establishes clear goals and keeps those goals in the forefront of the school’s attention.
9. **Ideals/Beliefs** (.22) the principal communicates and operates from strong ideals and beliefs about schooling.

10. **Input** (.25) the principal involves teachers in the design and implementation of important decisions and policies.

11. **Intellectual Stimulation** (.24) the principal ensures faculty and staff are aware of the most current theories and practices and makes the discussion of these a regular aspect of the school’s culture.

12. **Involvement in Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment** (.20) the principal is directly involved in the design and implementation of curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices.

13. **Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment** (.25) the principal is knowledgeable about current curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices.

14. **Monitoring/Evaluating** (.27) the principal monitors the effectiveness of school practices and their impact on student learning.

15. **Optimizer** (.20) the principal inspires and leads new and challenging innovations.

16. **Order** (.25) the principal establishes a set of standard operating procedures and routines.

17. **Outreach** (.27) the principal is an advocate and spokesperson for the school to all stakeholders.

18. **Relationships** (.18) the principal demonstrates an awareness of the personal aspects of teachers and staff.

19. **Resources** (.25) the principal provides teachers with materials and professional development necessary for the successful execution of their jobs.
20. **Situational Awareness** (.33) the principal is aware of the details and undercurrents in the running of the school and uses this information to address current and potential problems.

21. **Visibility** (.20) the principal has quality contact and interactions with teachers and students.

APPENDIX C: QUALITIES OF EFFECTIVE PRINCIPALS

- **Instructional Leadership**

  1. Principals of high-achieving schools have a clear vision and communicate to all stakeholders that learning is the school’s most important mission.

  2. Principals of high-achieving schools expect teachers and students to attain the school’s goals, and they are confident that their schools can meet their goals.

  3. Effective principals understand that they cannot reach instructional goals alone, so they distribute leadership across their schools, which in turn contributes to sustainable improvements within the school organization.

- **Human Resources Leadership**

  1. Selecting capable and committed teachers is the core of the administrator’s human resources responsibilities.

  2. Effective administrators create a culture in which new teachers are supported and mentored by others in the building and the administrators themselves are critical resources of effective instruction.

  3. Effective administrators provide the time, resources, and structure for meaningful professional development and recognize the teacher leadership within the building.

  4. Teachers leave the teaching profession for a variety of reasons, one of which is the lack of administrative support.

  5. The number of teachers who are incompetent is much larger than the number who are documented as such, leading to a serious disconnect between reality and the ideal purposes of an evaluation system.

  6. Teacher evaluation systems are integral to teacher improvement and overall school
improvement.

7. Teacher evaluation systems are integral to improvement in the classroom.

8. Poor implementation and a negative atmosphere in which the evaluation takes place have caused teacher evaluation systems to fail in their purposes of improvement and accountability.

- **Organizational Management**
  1. Maintaining a safe and orderly environment can affect teaching and learning positively and is therefore a fundamental responsibility of school administrators.
  2. Effective administrators make creative use of all resources—people, time, and money—to improve teaching and learning.
  3. Effective administrators use multiple forms of data to inform school planning.

- **Communication and Community Relations**
  1. An effective principal incorporates stakeholder views in a shared decision-making process and is a good listener.
  2. It is important for principals to engage in open and democratic dialogue with multiple stakeholders.
  3. Good communication is crucial to meeting school goals.
  4. Distributing leadership improves communication about the change process.

- **Professionalism**
  1. Effective principals are fair and honest, possess a high degree of integrity, and hold themselves to a high standard of ethics.
2. Effective principals are fair and honest, possess a high degree of integrity, and hold themselves to a high standard of ethics.

3. Effective principals communicate and model core values through their interactions with students and teachers. Most important, they model that they care for and have a genuine concern for children.

4. Principals who fail to perform their duties with competence and integrity and fail to cultivate relationships have low levels of trust in their schools.

5. Professional development that focuses on the roles and responsibilities as well as the nuances of context can positively affect a principal’s decision making.

APPENDIX D: PRINCIPAL ACTIONS AND BEHAVIORS

- **Continuous Improvement of Instruction**

  1. The school leader provides a clear vision as to how instruction should be addressed in the school.

  2. The school leader effectively supports and retains teachers who continually enhance their pedagogical skills through reflection and professional growth plans.

  3. The school leader is aware of predominant instructional practices throughout the school.

  4. The school leader ensures that teachers are provided with clear, ongoing evaluations of their pedagogical strengths and weaknesses that are based on multiple sources of data and are consistent with student achievement data.

  5. The school leader ensures that teachers are provided with job-embedded professional development that is directly related to their instructional growth goals.

- **School Climate**

  1. The school leader is recognized as the leader of the school who continually improves his or her professional practice.

  2. The school leader has the trust of the faculty and staff that his or her actions are guided by what is best for all student populations.

  3. The school leader ensures that faculty and staff perceive the school environment as safe and orderly.

  4. The school leader ensures that students, parents, and community perceive the school environment as safe and orderly.

  5. The school leader manages the fiscal, operational, and technological resources of the school in a way that focuses on effective instruction and the achievement of all students.
6. The school leader acknowledges the success of the whole school, as well as individuals

- **Data Driven Focus on Student Achievement**
  1. The school leader ensures clear and measurable goals are established and focused on critical needs regarding improving overall student achievement at the school level.
  2. The school leader ensures clear and measurable goals are established and focused on critical needs regarding improving achievement of individual students within the school.
  3. The school leader ensures that data are analyzed, interpreted, and used to regularly monitor progress toward school achievement goals.
  4. The school leader ensures that data are analyzed, interpreted, and used to regularly monitor progress toward achievement goals for individual students.

- **A Guaranteed and Viable Curriculum**
  1. The school leader ensures that the school curriculum and accompanying assessments adhere to state and district standards.
  2. The school leader ensures that the school curriculum is focused enough that it can be adequately addressed in the time available to teachers.
  3. The school leader ensures that all students have the opportunity to learn the critical

- **Cooperation and Collaboration**
  1. The school leader ensures that teachers have opportunities to observe and discuss effective teaching.
  2. The school leader ensures that teachers have formal roles in the decision-making process regarding school initiatives.
3. The school leader ensures that teacher teams and collaborative groups regularly interact to address common issues regarding curriculum, assessment, instruction, and the achievement of all students.

4. The school leader ensures that teachers and staff have formal ways to provide input regarding the optimal functioning of the school and delegates responsibilities appropriately.

5. The school leader ensures that students, parents, and community have formal ways to provide input regarding the optimal functioning of the school.

APPENDIX E: TEN CHARACTERISTICS OF A SERVANT LEADER

**Listening**: Leaders have traditionally been valued for their communication and decision-making skills. While these are also important skills for the Servant-Leader, they need to be reinforced by a deep commitment to listening intently to others. The Servant-Leader seeks to identify the will of the group, and helps clarify that will. He or she seeks to listen receptively to what is being said, and not said. Listening also encompasses getting in touch with one’s own inner voice, and seeking to understand what one’s body, spirit and mind are communicating. Listening, coupled with regular periods of reflection, is essential to the growth of the Servant-Leader.

**Empathy**: The Servant-Leaders strives to understand and empathize with others. People need to be accepted and recognized for their special and unique spirits. One assumes the good intentions of co-workers and does not reject them as people, even when one is forced to refuse to accept their behavior or performance. The most successful Servant-Leaders are those who have become skilled empathetic listeners.

**Healing**: The healing of relationships is a powerful force for transformation and integration. One of the great strengths of Servant-Leadership is the potential for healing one’s self, and one’s relationship to others. Many people have broken spirits and have suffered from a variety of emotional hurts. Although this is a part of being human, the Servant-Leader recognizes that he or she has an opportunity to “help make whole” those with who they come in contact. IN the Servant as Lead, Greenleaf writes: “There is something subtle communicated to one who is being served and led if, implicit in the contract between servant-leader and led, is the understanding that the search for wholeness is something they share”.

Awareness: General awareness, and especially self-awareness, strengthens the Servant-Leader.

Making a commitment to foster awareness can be scary – you never know what you may discover! Awareness also aids one in understanding issues involving ethics and values. It lends itself to being able to view most situations from a more integrated, holistic position.

Persuasion: Another characteristic of Servant-Leaders is reliance upon persuasion, rather than using one’s positional authority, in making decisions within an organization. The Servant-Leader seeks to convince others, rather than coerce compliance. This particular element offers one of the clearest distinctions between the traditional authoritarian model and that of Servant-Leadership. The Servant-Leader is effective at building consensus within groups.

Conceptualization: Servant-Leaders seek to nurture their abilities to “dream great dreams”.

The ability to look at a problem or organization from a conceptualizing perspective means that one must think beyond day-to-day realities. For many managers this is a characteristic which requires discipline and practice. The manager who wishes to also be a Servant-Leader must stretch his or her thinking to encompass broader-based conceptual thinking.

Foresight: Closely related to conceptualization, the ability to foresee the likely outcome of a situation is hard to define, but easy to identify. Foresight is a characteristic which enables the Servant-Leader to understand the lessons from the past, the realities of the present, and the likely consequence of a decision for the future.
Stewardship: Stewardship is defined as holding something in trust for another. Servant-Leadership assumes first-and-foremost a commitment to serving the needs of others. It also emphasizes the use of openness and persuasion, rather than control.

Commitment to the Growth of People: Servant-Leaders believe that people have an intrinsic value beyond their tangible contributions as workers. They are deeply committed to the growth of each and every individual within his or her institution. They recognize the tremendous responsibility to do everything within his or her power to nurture the personal, professional and spiritual growth of employees.

Building Community: The Servant Leader sense that much has been lost in recent human history as a result of the shift from local communities to large institutions as the primary shaper of human lives. They seek to identify some means for building community among those who work within a given institution.

APPENDIX F: ALLOWABLE MODIFICATIONS TO RISE

Corporations that follow the RISE guidelines and use both this resource and the Principal Effectiveness Rubric (PER) exactly as written are considered to be using the RISE Indiana Principal Evaluation System. This RISE principal system should be considered separate from the RISE Indiana Teacher Evaluation System.

If a corporation chooses to make minor edits to the RISE principal system from the minimum requirements stated below, the system must then be titled “(Corporation name) RISE for Principals,” and should be labeled as such on all materials. These minimum requirements for the RISE principal system are as follows:

Professional Practice Component

- Use of the Principal Effectiveness Rubric (PER) with all domains and competencies
- Scoring weights for both Professional Practice domains (50% each domain)

Measures of Student Learning

- Two measures of student learning as outlined in the RISE principal system (A-F Accountability and Administrative Student Learning Objectives)
- All minimum requirements around Administrative Student Learning Objectives, including:
  1. Have two goals
  2. Must be measurable
  3. Must be collaboratively set by administrator and evaluator
  4. May be district or school based
  5. Must be based on student learning measures (student data)
  6. Can be growth or achievement
7. May be based on the whole school population or subgroup populations

**Summative Scoring**

- Weights assigned to components of the summative model

If a corporation chooses to deviate from any of the minimum requirements of the most recent version of the RISE principal evaluation system (found at [https://www.riseindiana.org](https://www.riseindiana.org)), the corporation may no longer use the name “RISE.” Corporations can give any alternative title to their system, and may choose to note that the system has been “adapted from Indiana RISE.”
APPENDIX G: INDIANA PRINCIPAL EFFECTIVENESS RUBRIC
## Domain 1: Teacher Effectiveness

Great principals know that teacher quality is the most important in-school factor relating to student achievement. Principals drive effectiveness through (1) their role as a human capital manager and (2) by providing instructional leadership. Ultimately, principals are evaluated by their ability to drive teacher development and improvement based on a system that credibly differentiates the performance of teachers based on rigorous, fair definitions of teacher effectiveness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Highly Effective (1)</th>
<th>Effective (2)</th>
<th>Improvement Needed (3)</th>
<th>Ineffective (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1 Human Capital Manager</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 Hiring and retention</td>
<td>At Level 2, a principal fulfills the criteria for Level 2 and additionally:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Monitoring the effectiveness of the system and approaching it that are used to recruit and hire teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Demonstrating the ability to increase the majority of teacher effectiveness as evidenced by gains in student achievement and teacher evaluation results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Articulating, recruiting, and leveraging the personal characteristics associated with the school’s stated value (e.g., aligning individuals to fill rigorous school culture).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2 Evaluation of teachers</td>
<td>At Level 2, a principal fulfills the criteria for Level 2 and additionally:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Monitoring the use of time and evaluation procedures to consistently improve the evaluation process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Principals recruit, hire, and support effective teachers by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Consistently using teachers’ displaced levels of effectiveness as the primary factor in recruiting, hiring, and assigning duties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Demonstrating ability to increase the majority of teacher effectiveness as evidenced by gains in student achievement and growth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Aligning personnel decisions with the vision and mission of the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 For new teachers, the use of student teaching recommendations and data results to entirely appropriate.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>1.1.3 Professional Development</strong></th>
<th>Highly Effective (1)</th>
<th>Effective (2)</th>
<th>Improvement Needed (3)</th>
<th>Ineffective (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At Level 2, a principal fulfills the criteria for Level 2 and additionally:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Frequently creating learning opportunities for high-performing teachers to support their performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Monitoring the impact of implemented learning opportunities on student achievement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- faculties and creatively orchestrating professional learning opportunities in order to maximize time and resources dedicated to learning opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Principals orchestrate professional learning opportunities to staff needs by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Providing learning opportunities to teachers aligned to professional needs based on student academic performance data and teacher evaluation results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Providing learning opportunities in a variety of formats such as instructional coaching, workshops, team meetings, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Providing differentiated learning opportunities to teachers based on evaluation results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Principals need to orchestrate professional learning opportunities to tailor to staff needs by: |              |               |                        |                 |
| - Providing learning opportunities to match professional needs based on student academic performance data and teacher evaluation results. |              |               |                        |                 |
| - Providing learning opportunities in a variety of formats such as instructional coaching, workshops, team meetings, etc. |              |               |                        |                 |
| - Providing differentiated learning opportunities to teachers based on evaluation results. |              |               |                        |                 |

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>1.1.4 Leadership and Talent Development</strong></th>
<th>Highly Effective (1)</th>
<th>Effective (2)</th>
<th>Improvement Needed (3)</th>
<th>Ineffective (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At Level 2, a principal fulfills the criteria for Level 2 and additionally:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Encouraging and supporting teacher leadership and progression in career ladder.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Continuing opportunities for emerging leaders to distinguish themselves and gain the authority to complete the task.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Recognizing and elevating emerging leaders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal develops leadership and talent by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Designing and implementing succession plans (e.g., career ladders) leading to high positions in the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Providing internal and external opportunities to mentor emerging leaders, promoting support and encouragement of leadership and growth as evidenced by the creation of and assignment to leadership positions or learning opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Principals need to develop leadership and talent by: |              |               |                        |                 |
| - Designing and implementing succession plans (e.g., career ladders) leading to high positions in the school. |              |               |                        |                 |
| - Providing internal and external opportunities to mentor emerging leaders, promoting support and encouragement of leadership and growth as evidenced by the creation of and assignment to leadership positions or learning opportunities. |              |               |                        |                 |

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>1.1.5 Delegation</strong></th>
<th>Highly Effective (1)</th>
<th>Effective (2)</th>
<th>Improvement Needed (3)</th>
<th>Ineffective (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At Level 2, a principal fulfills the criteria for Level 2 and additionally:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Encouraging and supporting staff members to seek out responsibilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Encouraging and supporting staff in a fashion that develops their ability to manage tasks and responsibilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal delegates tasks and responsibilities appropriately by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Seeking out and selecting staff members for increased responsibilities based on their qualifications, performance, and/or effectiveness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Monitoring the progress towards success of those who have been delegated and assigned.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Providing support to staff members as needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Principals need to delegate tasks and responsibilities appropriately by: |              |               |                        |                 |
| - Seeking out and selecting staff members for increased responsibilities based on their qualifications, performance, and/or effectiveness. |              |               |                        |                 |
| - Monitoring the progress towards success of those who have been delegated and assigned. |              |               |                        |                 |
| - Providing support to staff members as needed. |              |               |                        |                 |

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Highly Effective (H)</th>
<th>Effective (E)</th>
<th>Improvement Necessary (IN)</th>
<th>Ineffective (I)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1.1.4 Strategic assignment**<sup>1</sup> | At Level 4, principal fulfills the criteria for Level 3 and additionally:  
- Leveraging teacher effectiveness to further generate student success by assigning teachers and staff to professional learning communities or the like that complement individual strengths and minimize weaknesses.  
- Principals use staff placement to support instruction by strategically aligning teachers and staff to employment positions based on qualifications, performance, and demonstrated effectiveness (where possible) in a way that supports school goals and maximizes achievement for all students.  
- Principals use staff placement to support instruction by systematically assigning teachers and staff to employment positions based on several factors without adversely affecting student academic needs.  | Principals use staff placement to support instruction by systematically assigning teachers and staff to employment positions based on several factors without adversely affecting student academic needs.  
- Principals use staff placement to support instruction by systematically assigning teachers and staff to employment positions based on several factors without adversely affecting student academic needs.  | Principals use staff placement to support instruction by systematically assigning teachers and staff to employment positions based on several factors without adversely affecting student academic needs.  
- Principals use staff placement to support instruction by systematically assigning teachers and staff to employment positions based on several factors without adversely affecting student academic needs.  |

**1.1.7 Addressing teachers who are in need of improvement or ineffectiveness**<sup>1</sup> At Level 4, principal fulfills the criteria for Level 3 and additionally:  
- Issuing a frequent communication with teacher on remediation plans to ensure necessary support.  
- Tracking remediation plans in order to inform future decisions about the effectiveness of certain supports.  
- Principals address teachers in need of improvement or ineffectiveness by:  
  - Developing remediation plans that address the cause of ineffectiveness in a clear and direct manner.  
  - Monitoring the success of remediation plans.  
  - Following statutory and contractual language in counselling or recommending for dismissal.  
- Principals address teachers in need of improvement or ineffectiveness by:  
  - Issuing a frequent communication with teacher on remediation plans to ensure necessary support.  
  - Tracking remediation plans in order to inform future decisions about the effectiveness of certain supports.  
- Principals address teachers in need of improvement or ineffectiveness by:  
  - Issuing a frequent communication with teacher on remediation plans to ensure necessary support.  
  - Tracking remediation plans in order to inform future decisions about the effectiveness of certain supports.  |

**1.2.1 Mission and vision** At Level 4, principal fulfills the criteria for Level 3 and additionally:  
- Defining the shared vision and mission of the school and its mission.  
- Monitoring and measuring progress toward the school's vision and mission.  
- Principals support a school-wide instructional vision and mission by:  
  - Creating a vision and mission that is clear and aligned with the school's values and goals.  
  - Ensuring that instruction is aligned with the vision and mission.  
  - Cultivating commitments and ownership of the school's vision and mission within and across the school.  
- Principals support a school-wide instructional vision and mission by:  
  - Creating a vision and mission that is clear and aligned with the school's values and goals.  
  - Ensuring that instruction is aligned with the vision and mission.  
  - Cultivating commitments and ownership of the school's vision and mission within and across the school.  
- Principals support a school-wide instructional vision and mission by:  
  - Creating a vision and mission that is clear and aligned with the school's values and goals.  
  - Ensuring that instruction is aligned with the vision and mission.  
  - Cultivating commitments and ownership of the school's vision and mission within and across the school.  |

**1.2.2 Classroom observations** At Level 4, principal fulfills the criteria for Level 3 and additionally:  
- Creating systems and schedules ensuring all teacher observations are conducted.  
- Principals use classroom observations to support student academic achievement by:  
  - Visiting all classrooms frequently to observe instruction;  
  - Monitoring the impact of feedback provided to teachers.  
- Principals use classroom observations to support student academic achievement by:  
  - Visiting all classrooms frequently to observe instruction;  
  - Monitoring the impact of feedback provided to teachers.  
- Principals use classroom observations to support student academic achievement by:  
  - Visiting all classrooms frequently to observe instruction;  
  - Monitoring the impact of feedback provided to teachers.  |

**1.3.3 Teacher collaboration** At Level 4, principal fulfills the criteria for Level 3 and additionally:  
- Monitoring collaborative efforts to achieve a common goal on student learning;  
- Tracking best collaborative practices to solve specific challenges.  
- Principals support teacher collaboration by:  
  - Establishing a culture of collaboration without a clear or explicit focus on student learning and achievement.  
  - Supporting and encouraging teamwork and collaboration in a limited number of ways.  
- Principals support teacher collaboration by:  
  - Establishing a culture of collaboration without a clear or explicit focus on student learning and achievement.  
  - Supporting and encouraging teamwork and collaboration in a limited number of ways.  
- Principals support teacher collaboration by:  
  - Establishing a culture of collaboration without a clear or explicit focus on student learning and achievement.  
  - Supporting and encouraging teamwork and collaboration in a limited number of ways.  |

---

<sup>1</sup> This indicator obviously assumes there is a leader to make these decisions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Rigorous Student Learning Objectives</th>
<th>Rigorous Student Learning Objectives</th>
<th>Rigorous Student Learning Objectives</th>
<th>Rigorous Student Learning Objectives</th>
<th>Rigorous Student Learning Objectives</th>
<th>Rigorous Student Learning Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1</td>
<td>Planning and developing student learning objectives</td>
<td>At Level 4, a principal fulfills the criteria for Level 3 and additionally:</td>
<td>Utilizing rigorous SLOs to define and evaluate a school’s culture and scope of work; ensuring that students are aware of and engaged in the rigor of the SLOs; communicating the academic expectations inherent in the SLOs; empowering teachers, staff, and students to participate in the monitoring of student progress towards SLOs; and revising the use and design of teacher and school-wide tracking tools.</td>
<td>Principals support the planning and development of student learning objectives (RIG: E) by:</td>
<td>Organizing and leading opportunities for collaboration with departments and across grade levels in developing SLOs;</td>
<td>Organizing and leading opportunities for collaboration with departments and across grade levels in developing SLOs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.2</td>
<td>Rigorous student learning objectives</td>
<td>At Level 4, a principal fulfills the criteria for Level 3 and additionally:</td>
<td>Utilizing rigorous SLOs to define and evaluate a school’s culture and scope of work; ensuring that students are aware of and engaged in the rigor of the SLOs; communicating the academic expectations inherent in the SLOs; empowering teachers, staff, and students to participate in the monitoring of student progress towards SLOs; and revising the use and design of teacher and school-wide tracking tools.</td>
<td>Principals support rigorous SLOs by:</td>
<td>Ensuring that SLOs reflect stated outcomes;</td>
<td>Ensuring that SLOs reflect stated outcomes;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.3</td>
<td>Instructional time</td>
<td>At Level 4, a principal fulfills the criteria for Level 3 and additionally:</td>
<td>Systematically monitors the use of instructional time to create innovative opportunities for increased student achievement and/or enhanced instructional time.</td>
<td>Principals support instructional time by:</td>
<td>Removing all sources of distractions from instructional time;</td>
<td>Removing all sources of distractions from instructional time;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 2: Leadership Actions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Great principals are deliberate in making decisions to raise student outcomes and drive teacher effectiveness. Certain leadership actions are critical to achieving transformative results: (1) modeling the personal behavior that sets the tone for all student and adult relationships in the school; (2) building relationships to ensure all key stakeholders work effectively with one another; and (3) developing a school-wide culture of achievement aligned to the school’s vision of success for every student.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1</td>
<td>Personal behavior</td>
<td>At Level 4, a principal fulfills the criteria for Level 3 and additionally:</td>
<td>Anticipates and communicates appropriate behaviors to teachers and students; encourages students and colleagues to display professional, ethical, and respectful behavior at all times; and</td>
<td>Principals support the professional behavior of others by:</td>
<td>Failing to model the appropriate behavior at all times;</td>
<td>Failing to model the appropriate behavior at all times;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring use of time to identify areas that are not effectively utilized;</td>
<td>Failing to model the appropriate behavior at all times;</td>
<td>Encouraging and coordinating the display of professional, ethical, and respectful behavior at all times;</td>
<td>Encouraging and coordinating the display of professional, ethical, and respectful behavior at all times;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td>Time management</td>
<td>At Level 4, a principal fulfills the criteria for Level 3 and additionally:</td>
<td>Monitoring progress toward student outcomes daily, weekly, and annually; and</td>
<td>Principals manage time effectively by:</td>
<td>Establishing clear, measurable, and timely expectations;</td>
<td>Establishing clear, measurable, and timely expectations;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring use of time in the classroom, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3</td>
<td>Using feedback to improve student performance</td>
<td>At Level 4, a principal fulfills the criteria for Level 3 and additionally:</td>
<td>Developing and implementing systematic mechanisms that generate feedback and advice from students, teachers, parents, community members, and other stakeholders to improve student performance; and</td>
<td>Principals use feedback to improve student performance by:</td>
<td>Actively soliciting feedback and help from all stakeholders;</td>
<td>Actively soliciting feedback and help from all stakeholders;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimating the frequency of feedback and advice through which feedback can be generated; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final - 8/1/2012</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
<td>Highly Effective (H)</td>
<td>Effective (E)</td>
<td>Improvement Necessary (I)</td>
<td>Ineffective (L)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1 Building Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1a Focus of Urgency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Level 4, a principal fulfills the criteria for Level 3 and additionally:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ensuring the culture of urgency is sustainable by observing progress while maintaining a focus on continual improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal displays initiative and persistence by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Consistently achieving expected goals;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Taking on voluntary responsibilities that contribute to school success;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Taking risks to support students in achieving results by identifying and frequently attempting to remove the school’s most significant obstacles to student achievement;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Building and maintaining partnerships with groups and organizations with the intent of increasing student achievement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal displays initiative and persistence by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Actively working with students in achieving expected goals;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Occasionally taking on additional, voluntary responsibilities that contribute to school success;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Occasionally taking risks to support students in achieving results by identifying and frequently attempting to remove the school’s most significant obstacles to student achievement;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Building and maintaining partnerships with groups and organizations with the intent of increasing student achievement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal does not display initiative and persistence by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rarely or never achieving expected goals;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rarely or never taking on additional, voluntary responsibilities that contribute to school success;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rarely or never taking risks to support students in achieving results;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rarely building and maintaining partnerships with groups and organizations with the intent of increasing student achievement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1b Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Level 4, a principal fulfills the criteria for Level 3 and additionally:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To the extent possible, communicating key concepts in real time;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Training the impact of interactions with stakeholders, ensuring approach and expanding scope of communications when appropriate;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Monitoring the success of different approaches to communicating to identify the most appropriate channel or communicating in specific situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal skills and clearly communicates for:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Meaning key concepts, such as the school’s goals, needs, plans, success, and failures;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Interacting with a variety of stakeholders, including students, families, community groups, central office, teachers, and others;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Utilizing a variety of means and approaches of communicating, such as face-to-face conversations, newsletters, websites, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal skills and clearly communicates for:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Meaning key concepts, such as the school’s goals, needs, plans, success, and failures;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Interacting with a variety of stakeholders, including students, families, community groups, central office, teachers, and others;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Utilizing a limited number of means and approaches of communicating.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal does not clearly communicate for:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rarely or never communicating key concepts;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Interacting with a limited number of stakeholders and having to refer to several key groups and organizations;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Not utilizing a variety of means or approaches to communicating.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Improvement Needed</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1 High expectations At Level 3 and additionally:</td>
<td>Incorporating community members and other partner groups into the establishment and support of high academic and behavior expectations;</td>
<td>Benchmarking expectations to the performance of the state’s highest performing schools;</td>
<td>Creating systems and approaches to monitor the level of academic and behavior expectations;</td>
<td>Ensuring a culture in which students are able to clearly articulate their diverse personal academic goals;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal creates and supports high academic and behavior expectations by:</td>
<td>- Empowering teachers and staff to set high and demanding academic and behavior expectations for every student;</td>
<td>- Empowering students to set high and demanding expectations for themselves;</td>
<td>- Ensuring that students are consistently learning, respecting, and on task;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Setting clear academic and behavior expectations for all students;</td>
<td>- Ensuring that students are consistently learning, respecting, and on task;</td>
<td>- Setting clear expectations for student academic and behavior and establishing consistent practices across classrooms;</td>
<td>- Ensuring the use of practices with proven effectiveness in creating success for all students, including those with diverse characteristics and needs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2 Academic rigor At Level 3 and additionally:</td>
<td>Creating systems to monitor the progress towards rigorous academic goals ensuring sets are calibrated when goals are met and new goals reflect achievements.</td>
<td>Principal establishes academic rigor by:</td>
<td>- Creating ambitious academic goals and priorities that are accepted as fixed and inviolable.</td>
<td>Principal establishes academic rigor by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Creating academic goals that are realistic and achievable.</td>
<td>- Creating academic goals that are realistic and achievable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Creating academic goals that are realistic and achievable.</td>
<td>- Consistently set and achieve ambitious academic goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.3 Data usage in teams At Level 3 and additionally:</td>
<td>Data used as basis of decision-making is transparent and communicated to all stakeholders;</td>
<td>Principal utilizes data by:</td>
<td>- Occasionally supporting and/or orchestrating team collaboration for data analysis;</td>
<td>- Occasionally supporting and/or orchestrating team collaboration for data analysis;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Monitoring the use of data in formulating action plans to identify areas where additional data is needed.</td>
<td>- Occasional use of data in the decision-making process.</td>
<td>- Occasionally developing and supporting others in formulating action plans for implementation that are based on data analysis.</td>
<td>- Occasionally developing and supporting others in formulating action plans for implementation that are based on data analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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Study Title
RISE: EVALUATION OF PRINCIPALS IN INDIANA

Study Purpose and Rationale
The RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System is a state developed model of principal evaluation that was developed in 2011 to meet the changing requirements of the evaluation law in Indiana. School systems have the option of utilizing this model or selecting another model of principal evaluation to meet the requirements of the law. This study will investigate the use of the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System utilized for principals in Indiana, the perceptions of superintendents and principals in regard to the effectiveness ratings and the potential connections to identifying effective school principals. This study seeks to add administrators’ voices to the developing professional dialogue about effective leadership evaluation.

Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria
All principals and superintendents approximately age 30 – 70 years old that are members of the Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents and the Indiana Association of School Principals and utilize the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System will be included. Principals and superintendents that are members of the IAPSS and IASP that do not utilize the RISE System will be excluded.

Participation Procedures and Duration
The following survey was designed to gain perceptions of Indiana superintendents and principals utilizing the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System in understanding its purpose in evaluating leadership effectiveness. The information you provide remains anonymous in relationship to the study. None of the results are singled out in the study. The survey should take no more than 10 minutes in which to complete. I appreciate your input in helping me study the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System.

Data Confidentiality or Anonymity
All data will be maintained as anonymous and no identifying information such as names will appear in any publication or presentation of this data.

Storage of Data
Data is collected through the use of the instrument survey program, and analysis is conducted through Ball State University. Data is sent to the primary researcher, and is organized and stored
on the principal investigator’s computer. Upon completion of the study, the data will be stored for 3 years, and then destroyed.

**Risks or Discomforts**
There are no anticipated risks for participating in this study.

**Benefits**
The direct benefit is to the educational leaders and policy makers in Indiana and throughout the United States. Educational leaders have direct influence to potentially change evaluation practices.

**Voluntary Participation**
Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you are free to withdraw your permission at any time for any reason without penalty or prejudice from the investigator. Please feel free to ask any questions of the investigator before signing this form and at any time during the study.

**IRB Contact Information**
For questions about your rights as a research subject, please contact Director, Office of Research Integrity, Ball State University, Muncie, IN 47306, (765) 285-5070, irb@bsu.edu.

**Study Title**
RISE: EVALUATION OF PRINCIPALS IN INDIANA;

**Consent**
By clicking on the “arrow button” within the survey instrument, you agree to participate in this research project entitled, “RISE: EVALUATION OF PRINCIPALS IN INDIANA.” I have had the study explained to me and my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I have read the description of this project and give my consent to participate. I understand that I will receive a copy of this informed consent form to keep for future reference.

**Researcher Contact Information**

---

**Principal Investigator:**
Kelly A. Andrews, Ed.S.
Doctoral Candidate Ed. Leadership Teachers College
Ball State University
Muncie, IN 47306
Telephone: (765) 973-3441
Email: kaandrews2@bsu.edu

**Dissertation Committee Chair:**
Dr. Lori Boyland, Ed. D.
Educational Leadership Teachers College
Ball State University
Muncie, IN 47306
Telephone: (765) 285-8488
Email: lgboyland@bsu.edu
Dear Indiana Superintendent or Principal:

My name is Kelly A. Andrews and I am a doctoral candidate in the Educational Leadership Department at Ball State University. I am asking you to participate in a research study entitled:

**RISE: Evaluation of Principals in Indiana**

As RISE is a relatively new principal evaluation system, the time is right to evaluate the perceptions of those utilizing the system as it was developed or modified. The purpose of this study is to investigate superintendent and principal perceptions of utilizing RISE regarding principal evaluation procedures.

The information you provide remains anonymous and your identity will not be recorded or revealed. The survey should take about 10 minutes to complete. I appreciate your input in helping me research the perceptions of superintendents and principals in regard to the use of the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System.

The link to access the survey instrument:

https://bsu.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_41m3RYRc1vmYNvv

When you open the link, it will take you to the Informed Consent. By clicking on the arrow at the bottom of the page, you will give your consent for participation and continue by answering the questions.

Thank you for your consideration to participate in this survey. If you have any questions, please don’t hesitate to contact me.

Principal Investigator: Kelly A. Andrews, Ed. S.
Faculty Advisor: Dr. Lori Boyland, Ed. D.
Doctoral Candidate Ed. Leadership Educational Leadership
Teachers College Teachers College
Ball State University Ball State University
Muncie, IN 47306 Muncie, IN 47306
Telephone: (765) 973-3441 Telephone: (765) 285-8488
Email: kaandrews2@bsu.edu Email: lgboyland@bsu.edu
APPENDIX J: RISE PRINCIPAL EVALUATION IN INDIANA SURVEY

This research study is to assess the perceptions of superintendents and principals on the utilization of the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System as developed or modified in regard to leadership effectiveness of principals. All responses will be anonymous and reported as group data only.

Demographic Data: Please indicate your response for each question:

1. Gender:  
   - □ Male  
   - □ Female

2. Age:  
   - □ 30 or less  
   - □ 31-40  
   - □ 41-50  
   - □ 51-60  
   - □ 61-70  
   - □ 71+

3. Your current position:  
   - □ Elementary Principal  
   - □ Middle School Principal  
   - □ High School Principal  
   - □ Superintendent  
   - □ Asst. Superintendent  
   - □ Other Central Office w/Principal Evaluation Duties

4. Total years in current position:  
   - □ 3 or less  
   - □ 4-10  
   - □ 11-15  
   - □ 16-25  
   - □ Over 25

5. Total years as superintendent:  
   - □ 3 or less  
   - □ 4-10  
   - □ 11-15  
   - □ 16-25  
   - □ Over 25

6. Total years as principal:  
   - □ 3 or less  
   - □ 4-10  
   - □ 11-15  
   - □ 16-25  
   - □ Over 25

7. Highest degree earned:  
   - □ MA or MS  
   - □ Ed. S  
   - □ Ed. D or PhD

8. Race/Ethnicity:  
   - □ Black  
   - □ White  
   - □ Hispanic/Latino  
   - □ Native American/Alaskan  
   - □ Asian  
   - □ Other

9. Community population:  
   - □ 10,000 or less  
   - □ 10,001 – 25,000  
   - □ Over 25,000

10. School Community Designation:  
    - □ Rural  
    - □ Urban  
    - □ Suburban
11. Superintendent – District Enrollment
☐ Under 1000  ☐ 1001 - 2000  ☐ 2001 - 3000  ☐ 3001 - 6000  ☐ 6001 - 9000
☐ 9001 – 12,000  ☐ 12,000 +

12. Principal – School Enrollment
☐ Under 200  ☐ 201 - 500  ☐ 501 - 800  ☐ 801 - 1000  ☐ 1001+

13. Percent of students on free/reduced meals
☐ 20% or less  ☐ 21 – 40%  ☐ 41 – 60%  ☐ 61 – 80%  ☐ 80%+

The design of the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System consists of an annual summative evaluation in one of four categories: Highly Effective, Effective, Needs Improvement, or Ineffective. Two major components, Professional Practice and Student Learning are weighted equally at 50% each.

1. **Professional Practice** consists of three competencies each
   a. **Domain 1:** Teacher Effectiveness
      - Human Capital Manager
      - Instructional Leadership
      - Leading indicators of Student Learning
   b. **Domain 2:** Leadership Actions
      - Personal Behavior
      - Building Relationships
      - Culture of Achievement

2. **Student Learning** consists of:
   a. A-F Accountability Grade
   b. Administrative Student Learning Objectives

Please answer the following questions regarding your perceptions of the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I believe the RISE System supports the improvement of a principal in regard to:</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Overall Leadership Effectiveness</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Human Capital Management</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Instructional Leadership</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Student Learning</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Personal Behavior</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Culture of Achievement</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. Rank the following competencies in the order of importance. 1=Most Important, 6=Least Important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Capital Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture of Achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The protocol recommended by the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System is:

- a beginning of the year conference,
- two direct observations with oral and written feedback,
- a collection of evidence, mapping it to the rubric
- a review to assign a summative rating in one of the four rating categories.

The minimum requirements for the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System are:

- Use of the Principal Effectiveness Rubric with all domains and competencies
- Scoring weights for both Professional Practice domains (50% each)
- Two measures of student learning (A-F Accountability and Student Learning Objectives)
- All minimum requirements in regard to Administrative SLO’s:
  - Two goals
  - Measureable
  - Collaboratively set by principal and evaluator
  - District or school based goals
  - Based on student data
  - Growth or achievement
  - Based on school or subgroup populations
- Weights assigned to components of the summative model
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please answer the following questions:</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. My school district utilized the RISE System for principal evaluation as originally developed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. My school district utilizes a modified RISE System for principal evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please list all modifications to RISE that your school implemented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
28. Compared to the evaluation system my district previously used, describe how the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System supports leadership effectiveness in principals.

29. Compared to the evaluation system my district previously used, describe the strengths of the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System.

30. Compared to the evaluation system my district previously used, describe the challenges of the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System.
### APPENDIX K: RESEARCH QUESTIONS/SURVEY ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Corresponding Survey Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent do Indiana superintendents and principals perceive that the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System supports improvement of principal leadership?</td>
<td>14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What competencies do Indiana’s superintendents and principals identify as most important in principal evaluation?</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. If a school district implemented allowable modifications to the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System, what modifications were most commonly made?</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What are Indiana’s superintendents’ and principals’ perceptions regarding the levels of fidelity of implementation of the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System?</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What are Indiana’s superintendents’ and principals’ ratings of effectiveness of the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System as a tool for evaluating principals?</td>
<td>26, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To what extent do Indiana superintendents and principals perceive that the RISE Principal Evaluation and Development System supports leadership effectiveness in principals?</td>
<td>25, 28, 29, 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>