UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

The Perceived Effects of Teacher Evaluation Systems on Teacher Morale and Burnout in Los Angeles Charter Management Organizations

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

requirements for the degree Doctor of Education

by

Alyssa Kristine O'Grady

2020

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

The Perceived Effects of Teacher Evaluation Systems on Teacher Retention in Los Angeles Charter Management Organizations

by

Alyssa Kristine O'Grady

Doctor of Education

University of California, Los Angeles, 2020

Professor Jose Felipe Martinez, Chair

This study examined the impact of teacher evaluation systems used by different Charter Management Organizations (CMOs) across Los Angeles on teacher morale and burnout. The sample was composed of three administrators, three former teachers, and three current teachers from three different CMOs. The research design involved applying qualitative methods to identify aspects of the evaluation system that may lead to a change in teacher morale and burnout. Once interview data were collected from these participants, then identified patterns across the CMOs, the administrators, the current teachers, and the former teachers. The findings both support and extend what is understood about the impact of teacher evaluation systems on teacher morale, burnout, and potentially retention. One pattern identified throughout the study was the impact of a leader on an individual school site campus. Teachers and administrators felt that when evaluations focused on compliance, it was difficult to genuinely engage with and

invest in the system. However, when the evaluation system focused on helping teachers improve their practice and differentiate instruction for their students, teachers were willing and eager to engage in the system. The findings also showed that frequent observations, an administrator's strong contextualized knowledge, enhanced collaboration with other teachers and administrators, and perceived competency by their administrator were also factors influencing teachers' relationship to the evaluation system. The teachers who spoke of negative experiences with their evaluation system mentioned a lack of trust with their administrator, lack of consistency among coaches, and the creation of a competitive atmosphere. My findings suggest a relationship between different aspects of the evaluation system and teacher morale and burnout.

The dissertation of Alyssa Kristine O'Grady is approved.

Karen Hunter Quartz

Kimberly Gomez

Christina Christie

Jose Felipe Martinez, Committee Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2020

DEDICATION

I give this manuscript as a gift to my mother, Denise Wammack, who showed me that it's difficult to defeat someone who never gives up. Through my mother's resilience and ability to rise in times of hardship, I learned the importance of love and high expectations for all those I encounter, including myself. My mother believed in me, encouraged me, and supported me throughout my life. My passion for education and providing my students with the best education possible reflect everything that my mother has accomplished.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to thank my committee members, Dr. Tina Christie, Dr. Karen Hunter Quartz, and Dr. Kim Gomez, for their support throughout my research and up to the completion of this paper. I would also like to thank my Chair, Dr. Jose Felipe Martinez, for his support with feedback and revisions over the last 2 years in the Educational Leadership Program at UCLA. He went above and beyond as my chair, and I am truly grateful.

Finally, I must thank my husband, Billy O'Grady, whose belief in me and my abilities never wavered throughout this 3-year adventure. I am forever thankful to you, Billy, for supporting me on all of those days when I felt overwhelmed with my workload and questioned my capacity as a leader in education. With this paper, I hope to show you the impact of your continued support and belief in me. I am the luckiest wife in the world. I love you.

VITA

2011	B.A. Mathematics Occidental College Los Angeles, California
2012	Single Subject Teaching Credential Occidental College Los Angeles, California
2012	Mathematics Teacher Los Angeles International Charter High School Los Angeles, California
2013	Mathematics Teacher/Director of Instruction Alliance Tennenbaum Technology High School Los Angeles, California
2017	Masters and Administration Credential California State University Northridge Northridge, California
2017	Assistant Principal Alliance Neuwirth Leadership Academy Los Angeles, California
2020	Assistant Principal Woodworth-Monroe TK-8th Inglewood, California

CHAPTER 1: BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Teacher Turnover

Policymakers and educators are confronting a national teacher shortage that will require a projected 2.2 million new teachers within the decade (Gerald & Hussar, 1998). The shortage is due to a multitude of factors, including: higher birth rates, increased immigration, changes in class size policies, the anticipated retirement of 50% of the teaching force, and the fact that one in five new teachers will leave the profession within 3 years of entry (Henke, Chen, & Geis, 2000). School districts need to develop a stronger understanding of why teachers are leaving the profession, in order to improve their chances of retaining highly qualified teachers. To date, this has proven to be a challenge (Pratt & Booker, 2014). Teacher shortages reflect not only teachers leaving the profession, but also considerable movement of teachers from school to school and district to district (Johnson & Birkeland, 2003).

Teacher retention is critical for improving school and student performance. For the purpose of this research, teacher turnover is defined as teachers moving from a teaching position to a different role, moving from one school to another, and leaving the teaching profession altogether. Low retention can negatively affect a range of student academic and socio-emotional outcomes (Ronfeldt, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2013). Along with high teacher turnover rates, districts will have to endure high economic consequences. Research from the Chicago Public School District found the costs of recruiting, hiring, and training new teachers to the district to be approximately $86,000,000 a year (Barnes, Crowe, & Schaefer, 2008).

Importantly, the aforementioned issues with recruitment and retention exist concurrently with increased state and federal pressure to enhance teacher performance (Doherty & Jacobs, 2013), as policymakers move toward implementation of high stakes teacher evaluation systems

to improve instruction and learning. However, little thought has been given to how these evaluation systems are affecting teacher retention.

My study investigated whether new high stakes evaluation systems can become additive elements related to teacher morale and turnover. If this is the case, states could be hurting student achievement with the increased turnover as a result of these new evaluation systems. With the push for more school districts to enhance their teacher evaluation systems, school districts could be left with no qualified teachers to hire.

Why Are Teachers Leaving?

There is a significant amount of research suggesting that three key elements affect teacher retention: morale and burnout (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Loeb, Darling-Hammond, & Luczak, 2005), leadership style (Boyd et al., 2011; Brown & Wynn, 2007), and student body demographics (Boyd, Lankford, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2005; Loeb et al., 2005). Morale and burnout are both factors that have influenced teachers' decisions to leave their individual school sites (Lüleci & Çoruk, 2018). Morale is directly related to a teacher's work satisfaction and can negatively affect work production and relationships with students and staff (Govindarajan, 2012). Teachers experience burnout as exhaustion from their job as a result of factors like stress and workload (Demorouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2001). Importantly, high stakes evaluation systems involve extra work and stress for teachers (Leithwood, Menzies, Jantzi, & Leithwood, 1999); therefore, these systems could be an additional factor contributing to low morale and burnout. Although the idea of a system suggests uniformity throughout school sites and Charter Management Organizations (CMOs), it is important to mention that this uniformity may not exist. For example, one CMO may choose to evaluate teachers by compiling test score data, parent survey data, student survey data, and observation data. Another CMO may choose

to look solely at observation data. Additionally, how this system is implemented at one school site may look different than that at another school site. A principal at one school site may use the evaluations in a way that creates a safe learning environment where teachers feel comfortable trying new practices in the classroom. Another school site may use the evaluations for hiring decisions and create a competitive environment amongst teachers. Throughout this research, the term *system* will be used to define each school's individual choice regarding teacher evaluations.

A principal's leadership style and behavior can influence teacher retention (Kouzes & Posner, 2010). Teachers want to work for leaders who they perceive to be effective (Johnson, 2006; Johnson, Berg, & Donaldson, 2005; Ladd, 2011). Although there are inconsistencies in the research regarding the specific characteristics that constitute an effective principal, there is enough evidence to suggest that teachers' perceptions of their principals influence their decision to stay at a school site (Glynn & Raffaelli, 2010). Moreover, school leaders can implement teacher evaluation systems in dramatically different ways across school sites, which can have a positive and/or negative effect on teachers' perceptions of them as leaders.

A third factor related to teacher turnover concerns their students' characteristics. Large numbers of teachers are leaving schools in underserved communities and relocating to schools with higher-income and higher-achieving students because of the difference in workload **(**Boyd et al., 2005; Carroll, Reichardt, Guarino, & Mejia, 2000; Clotfelter, Ladd, & Vigdor, 2011; Hanushek, Kain, & Rivkin, 2004; Scafidi, Sjoquist, & Stinebrickner, 2007). In charter schools, teachers are leaving the profession or moving to traditional public schools at a significantly higher rate than teachers at traditional district schools (Bickmore & Dowell, 2018). Low morale and burnout are specific reasons why teachers in charter schools are leaving at higher rates.

Because charter schools have been quick to fully implement teacher evaluation systems, there may be reason to believe that these evaluations are tied to lower morale and increased burnout.

Teacher Evaluation Systems

Teacher evaluation systems could be an additional element interacting with the three aforementioned factors, as pressure increases from state and federal governments to enhance teacher performance in the context of a continuing teacher shortage. Over the past 2 decades, the U.S. Department of Education established new grant funding programs for states and districts that required enhanced monitoring and evaluation protocols for teachers. During that time, the Race to the Top and No Child Left Behind legislation established mandates and incentives for districts and states to develop more comprehensive systems to assess teacher performance in the classroom (Doherty & Jacobs, 2013). Traditional teaching methods have also transformed to meet requirements set forth by these and other state and federal programs. Educators are thus being increasingly scrutinized and subject to rigorous standards and consistent oversight. Teachers are assessed and evaluated in greater frequency and depth than ever before (Measures of Effective Teaching Project [MET], 2013), and some research has raised questions about the degree to which these practices can affect morale and teacher retention (Jacob, Vidyarthi, & Carroll, 2012a; Pratt & Booker, 2014). Despite growing concerns, there is limited research addressing the impact of teacher evaluations on retention (Robertson-Kraft & Zhang, 2018). The qualitative study described herein aims to provide evidence regarding how teacher evaluation systems directly affect teacher retention.

IMPACT, a strong resource for research pertaining to teacher evaluation systems and their effect on teacher retention, completed a study in District & Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) collecting data about staffing changes resulting from the implementation of new teacher

evaluation systems (Jacob et al., 2012b). The study found that nearly 13% of teachers rated either effective or highly effective voluntarily chose to leave their school site (Dee & Wyckoff, 2013). The research did not identify any variables that contributed to this statistic.

Charter Management Organizations and Teacher Evaluation

CMOs manage public charter schools in order to improve the schools in a particular community (EdSource, 2009). A CMO oversees multiple schools and is very similar to a district home office (Lake, Dusseault, Bowen, Demeritt, & Hill, 2010; Smith, Farrell, Wohlstetter, & Nayfack, 2009). Although charter schools were originally created by parents, teachers, and other community members, more recently they have been started by CMOs (Bulkley & Fisler, 2003; Henig, Holyoke, Brown, & Lacireno-Paquet, 2005). Because of the increased number of charter schools in the U.S., there has been increased attention and mounting pressure to strengthen oversight and ensure that these schools are producing comparable or better results for students in comparison to local district schools, specifically as with respect to student achievement and teacher performance (Lake et al., 2010).

Over half a billion dollars have been given to support the development of CMOs (National Alliance for Public Charter Schools, n.d.). There has also been strong federal financial support for charter schools and more specifically CMOs (U.S. Department of Education, 2010). Using this money, CMOs are expected to implement new educational initiatives in order to continue increasing student outcomes, and many of these initiatives have been focused on teacher evaluations. The Intensive Partnership for Effective Teaching (IP) funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation is one such example. The IP initiative sought to improve high school and college attendance rates in low-income areas in four of the largest CMOs in Los Angeles County. It helped identify evaluation levers that would enhance effective teaching

practices in the classroom and ultimately student outcomes (Stecher et al., 2018). From my own experience as an administrator and former teacher at one of these CMOs, I believe that the requirements of teacher evaluation in charter districts are stricter than in non-charter districts, and as a result many charter school educators are seeking transfers to districts with less demanding oversight and greater job security.

Gaps in Literature

There is limited research focused on the direct impact of teacher evaluations on retention. Although there is a much-needed focus on teacher effectiveness throughout the evaluation process, school administrators need to also focus on retaining qualified and effective teachers in the classroom. Although teachers who earn higher evaluation scores tend to be retained at higher rates than those who receive lower scores (Pratt & Booker, 2014), the percentage of effective and highly effective teachers leaving their school site or profession is a significant issue for districts. In particular, research has shown that student achievement weakens and there are inherent costs associated with replacing any staff member (Achinstein, Ogawa, Sexton, & Freitas, 2010; Allensworth, Ponisciak, & Mazzeo, 2009; Balu, Beteille, & Loeb, 2009; Guin, 2004; Ingersoll, 2001a; Johnson et al., 2005; Ronfeldt et al., 2013) Pratt and Booker (2014) identified additional factors contributing to retention, such as effective time use and the structure of the teacher evaluation system. In particular, they showed that teachers may be more inclined to stay at their school site if their performance is assessed objectively and the evaluation system is consistent.

In a study by Johnson and Birkeland (2003), teachers demonstrated that they were more likely to remain at their school sites if they received greater support in improving their practices. Although this study did not specifically address evaluation systems, it can be assumed that

teachers who are supported throughout the teacher evaluation process are more likely to succeed and be retained.

Robertson-Kraft and Zhang (2018) also discussed the variation of retention across school sites in regard to their teacher evaluation systems. They identified both individual and school characteristics that affect teacher experiences and may influence their retention, but added that more research was needed regarding how teacher evaluation systems may influence individuals and schools.

Overall, it is clear that the field needs a better understanding of how aspects of teacher evaluation systems may relate to teacher decisions to leave their school sites. The limited existent literature particularly warrants further research on factors like evaluation rigor, workload, effective use of time, support and feedback, and stress. Through qualitative interviews, this study examined how teacher evaluation systems interact with individual- and school-level factors to influence teacher retention at three Los Angeles-based CMOs.

Statement of the Project

This project investigated how evaluation systems influence retention according to former teachers, current teachers, and administrators at three of the four largest CMOs in Los Angeles.

Research Questions

1. What are the components and characteristics of teacher evaluation systems at three CMOs?
2. What are teachers' perceptions of their evaluation systems? Are teachers' perceptions similar or dissimilar across the CMOs?
3. Is there evidence that teacher evaluation systems influence teacher morale and retention across the CMOs?

4. Are there features or characteristics of evaluation systems that could explain any differences observed in teacher morale and retention?

Research Design

This project used a qualitative research design in order to document the understandings and experiences of current and former teachers, and administrators from three of the largest nine to 12 CMOs in the greater Los Angeles area. Teachers and administrators talked about their own experiences with teacher evaluation systems in their CMOs and the impact that these systems, along with other personal and school factors, can have on teacher morale and retention. Administrators also provided their perspective on the operation of the teacher evaluation system and how it affects teachers and administrators, as well as insight about how systems can offer support for teachers to increase retention. Administrators were asked to identify their demographics (race, age, etc.) during the interview in order to identify any patterns outside of the evaluation experience. For example, if all teachers who identify as female are having one experience, it may be fair to conclude that being a female may determine a teacher's evaluation experience.

The majority of data were collected from in-person interviews with teachers and administrators. The rationale for a qualitative study was that it was intended to help me understand and portray in depth the perspectives of two key actors affected by evaluation systems, as well as the direct impact these structures may have on teacher morale and retention.

Significance of Research

Education policy leaders and district leaders are accelerating the implementation of teacher evaluation systems nationwide with an intended goal of improving teacher practice. It is imperative that these leaders become aware of how these evaluation systems affect teacher

retention among qualified teachers. Prior research has demonstrated that teacher evaluation systems affect teacher retention, rendering this subject an issue meriting further research. If evaluation systems are not consistent, objective, and useful, then their use will lower morale among effective teachers, therefore increasing the likelihood that these teachers leave their school sites (Pratt & Booker, 2014). Furthermore, the IMPACT study identified that effective teacher retention is approximately 87% and anything lower could be classified as problematic (Jacob et al., 2012b). In order to confirm this hypothesis, this study involved interviews of current and former teachers regarding their interpretation of their CMOs evaluation system and whether those perceptions affect teacher retention.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future has called the U.S. teacher shortages a national crisis (National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 2003). Teacher attrition is a significant factor affecting teacher retention in the United States (Ingersoll, 2001b, 2004; Sutcher, Darling-Hammond, & Carver-Thomas, 2016), and every year, more than 15% of teachers leave their school site. The data also suggests that after 5 years' tenure, between 40-50% of teachers leave the profession. (Ingersoll, 2004). Federal Title II data indicates that from 2009-2010, teacher preparation programs across the United States produced 241,401 teachers; however, every year since then, the number of program completers has declined. In 2013-2014, there were only 180,706 teachers in the United States, representing a 25% decline (Martin & Mulvihill, 2016).

The movement of teachers away from a school or district can have negative implications for students, other teachers, school administrators, and the surrounding community (Goldhaber & Cowan, 2014). During the 2011-2012 school year, more than 15% of public school teachers either transitioned schools or left the profession completely. Furthermore, the rate of public school teachers who transitioned or left the profession doubled in 2012-2013, compared to 1990-1991 (Goldring, Taie, Riddles, & Owens, 2014).

This first section of this literature review synthesizes the research on teacher retention, specifically looking at the negative outcomes that accompany consistent teacher turnover at an individual school site. Second, it looks at the new teacher evaluation systems, focusing on how they affect morale and burnout and leadership style with regard to teacher retention. The third section examines current research that analyzes the relationship between the implementation of teacher evaluation systems and turnover. Lastly, this research defines and discusses the history

of CMOs in order to understand why CMOs were the ideal setting in which to answer the research questions.

Teacher Turnover

From 1982 until 2012, teacher turnover has increased to record numbers throughout public schools across the United States (Ingersoll & Merrill, 2012). Sixty percent of turnover is a result of teachers transferring to different schools, whereas 40% is due to teachers leaving the profession altogether (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2008). From 1988-1989 to 2008-2009, annual attrition from the teaching force as a whole rose by 41%, from an average attrition of 6.4% to an average of 9%. This percentage includes both teachers who moved between districts and schools and teachers who left the profession completely. Turnover rates in teaching are significantly higher than other occupations with a similar status and income (Ingersoll & Merrill, 2012); these turnover rates are even more pronounced in underserved communities (Allensworth et al., 2009; Hanushek et al., 2004; Hemphill & Nauer, 2009; Ingersoll, 2001b; Johnson et al., 2005; Marinell & Coca, 2013; Ronfeldt et al., 2013).

The turnover rate in underserved communities generally is 50% higher than in wealthier communities (Ingersoll, 2001a). Within 5 years, schools in these communities lose over half of their teaching staff (Allensworth et al., 2009; Hemphill & Nauer, 2009). One study from New York City found that 66% of teachers in middle schools exit within 5 years (Marinell & Coca, 2013). These schools are also more likely to experience inconsistent staffing and end up hiring inexperienced teachers (Hanushek et al., 2004; Hemphill & Nauer, 2009; Johnson et al., 2005). The struggle to find and retain quality teachers creates a cycle of consistent turnover at schools (Neild, Useem, Travers, & Lesnick, 2003).

It is not atypical for teachers to leave schools each year, voluntarily or involuntarily. Small rates of teacher turnover can affect schools in a positive way if the vacating teachers are considered ineffective in terms of instruction or have difficulties working with other colleagues. However, non-regrettable turnover only happens when there is an ample supply of effective teachers in the labor market and teacher pay is adequate (Fuller, Pendola, & Young, 2018). Once there is consistent turnover, it can influence classroom instruction and organizational costs, which negatively affects the school community and ultimately learning outcomes (Achinstein et al., 2010; Allensworth et al., 2009; Balu et al., 2009; Guin, 2004; Ingersoll, 2001b; Johnson et al., 2005; Ronfeldt et al., 2013).

As mentioned previously, schools with higher turnover rates generally employ a large number of inexperienced teachers who are likely less effective than more tenured teachers (Grissom, 2011; Ost, 2014; Rivkin, Hanushek, & Kain, 2005). Schools with high turnover rates have to rearrange teaching assignments in order to accommodate staffing changes resulting from attrition and new teacher arrivals. These disruptions cause students to have inconsistent performance in their education programs (Guin, 2004) and will negatively affect learning (Allensworth et al., 2009; Balu et al., 2009; Boyd, Grossman, Lankford, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2006; Ingersoll, 2001a; Ronfeldt et al., 2013). Schools strive to retain quality teachers to strengthen relationships among teachers, students, and families. Stable and consistent relationships increase instructional quality, improve professional conduction, promote higher expectations of student behavior, and increase parent involvement. These factors have been shown to increase student achievement levels, especially for financially impoverished students (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Bryk, Sebring, Allensworth, Easton, & Luppescu, 2010; Ronfeldt et al., 2013).

When schools are able to cultivate strong relationships with their students, teachers are more likely to take on leadership roles and form professional learning communities, leading to higher job satisfaction and ultimately teacher retention. More experienced teachers will be more likely to mentor inexperienced teachers, providing the school with higher quality instruction (Loeb et al., 2005). High turnover rates can have a negative impact on a school's ability to attract quality teachers. For this reason, students from underserved schools are often taught by inexperienced teachers, who tend to be mostly ineffective (Borman & Dowling, 2008; Carroll et al., 2000; Clotfelter, Ladd, Vigdor, & Wheeler, 2007; Hanushek et al., 2004; Ingersoll, 2001a; Sanders & Rivers, 1996). High turnover rates at a school site have a negative impact on instruction, finance, and the organization as a whole, destabilizing the learning community and having a negative effect on student achievement (Achinstein et al., 2010; Allensworth et al., 2009; Balu et al., 2009; Guin, 2004; Ingersoll, 2001a; Johnson et al., 2005; Ronfeldt et al.. 2013a).

Research has been conducted on the relationship between teacher turnover and student achievement (Guin, 2004; Ingersoll, 2001b). In one study, Guin (2004) researched 66 elementary schools in a large urban district in order to identify the relationship between teacher turnover and the proportion of students meeting statewide standards on reading and math assessments. The correlations in this study were significant and negative, suggesting that teacher turnover led to low student performance. As a result, teacher evaluation systems were implemented to ensure high quality teaching practices in the classroom to improve student performance. If districts are implementing teacher evaluation systems with the intention of promoting student achievement, understanding the implications of effective teacher turnover is imperative.

The majority of research on teacher retention has focused on strategies for recruiting quality teachers into underserved communities. More effort and work need to be devoted to this problem in order to support and retain the teachers once they are employed (Ingersoll & May, 2011; Jacob et al., 2012a).

Why do Teachers Leave?

A significant body of work suggests that four primary areas lead to teacher retention and attrition: morale, burnout (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Loeb et al., 2005), leadership style (Boyd et al., 2011; Brown & Wynn, 207), and student body demographics (Boyd et al., 2005; Loeb et al., 2005). The following sections will define these four categories and outline how these factors influence teacher retention.

Teacher morale and burnout. Lüleci and Çoruk (2018) defined morale as an "emotional and spiritual sense that a person feels about his/her job" (p. 56). Lüleci and Çoruk say that low morale, burnout, and poor leadership can lead to an individual teacher having low morale, which can lead teachers to leave their school site. In this case, morale is a result of poor working conditions. Evans (2000) described morale as the satisfaction that a person feels when his/her needs and emotions are satisfied in relation to how much fulfillment the individual receives from his/her job. When teachers were asked specifically about why they were unhappy at their school site, the majority of teachers talked about their school morale in a negative manner (Geiger & Pivovarova, 2018). Several studies have identified low morale as a reason why a number of teachers were leaving or reported being dissatisfied with their school site (Arizona Department of Education, 2015; Geiger & Pivovarova, 2018; Mertler, 2016). In this study, low school morale refers to teachers who are unhappy at their school site.

Low morale may be characterized as being dissatisfied when one is at work and experiencing constant disappointment (Govindarajan, 2012). Evidence of low teacher morale at a school site may cause a reduction in productivity. It also may negatively affect student engagement and colleague relationships. The school as a whole may see larger rates of absenteeism for students and staff, as well as higher levels of exhaustion (Lüleci & Çoruk, 2018). Low morale and burnout are two influential factors for school sites when determining the school's level of retention. These two factors need to be monitored carefully in order to maintain the number of teachers at a school.

Chang (2009) defined burnout as a "symptom of emotional depletion with a loss of motivation and commitment" (p. 193). When teachers feel exhausted because of their job, these feelings can result in low levels of satisfaction, which can contribute to high burnout, turnover, and early retirement (Leithwood et al., 1999). From my experience, burnout can be the result of stress from a teacher evaluation system or the ongoing scrutiny that may result from these evaluations.

In education, most of the research about burnout has been done in conjunction with studying teacher stress (Smylie, 1999). In the early research, it became obvious that workload was the biggest indicator of burnout. Therefore, much of the current research has studied teacher burnout through the lens of increased stress at the workplace. One study used the demand-control model to explain that job stress occurs when there are high job demands and low job control. The job demand variables in this study included physical, psychological, social and organizational factors. For teaching, these factors can include job control, access to information, support from your supervisor, school climate, and social climate (Demorouti et al., 2001). Teacher evaluations encourage teachers to meet a series of indicators on a rubric during their

evaluation. In order to achieve these metrics, teachers have to create lesson plans before their evaluations (i.e., differentiate for all students including sub-groups, exemplars, targeted questions). This requires extra work from teachers that they generally do not complete on a daily basis. Extra work is also expected during the class (i.e., using exemplars to provide differentiated feedback, differentiation of all students including sub-groups, purposeful monitoring[1]). The frequency of teacher evaluation will dictate the amount of extra work that a teacher has to complete. Some schools have weekly observations and a few formal observations throughout the year to ensure that these practices are implemented on a daily basis.

In a second study, Blasé (1982) interviewed 43 teachers about teacher performance and motivation. He reviewed student-teacher relationships in order to study teacher performance. From this research, Blasé was able to conclude that teacher burnout is "prolonged job strain that results from the inadequacy of coping resources and the absence of equitable rewards in relation to the demands of work-related stressors" (p. 109). Burnout is a product of stress that relates directly the work environment. Administrators must require of their teachers a certain focus on the level of work. If school leaders are consistently expecting high levels of work from teachers during these teacher evaluations, they may overwork them to the point of burnout, increasing the number of teachers leaving the school site.

If teachers are able to feel supported in completing their work without feeling overwhelmed and respected as professionals, they will be not only less likely to experience burnout, but also better equipped to support their students (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2011).

[1] Purposeful monitoring is a strategy that some schools expect from their teachers. Teachers are expected to walk around with their task exemplar in hand. From the exemplar, teachers have pre-identified misconceptions and targeted questions for students based on misconceptions. When students are working independently, the teacher is quickly walking around the room providing students specific feedback based on the exemplar and asking them targeted questions. This practice is used to help support students and make sure that students are idle for minimal periods of time.

Administrators need to be aware of the level of burnout on their campus because if they are unaware of this, they may experience higher levels of teacher retention.

Leadership style. The second category identified through the research on teacher retention is related to leadership style. Research has identified leadership as a factor influencing teacher retention (Kouzes & Posner, 2010). More specifically, a principal's behavior and leadership style influence teacher retention. A study by Brown and Wynn (2009) investigated the relationship between retention and principals' behavior; factors such as being accessible, establishing trust with teachers, and being proactive were identified as characteristics that would lead to teacher retention. This relationship was found in another study by Maxwell (2007), who argued that the positive and negative effects at a school site were a result of the leadership at that site. Even though the importance of leadership has been a focus throughout research (Kouzes & Posner, 2010; Brown and Wynn, 2009; Hanushek, 2011), no definitive conclusion has been drawn regarding the specific characteristics of leaders that affect teacher retention (Glynn & Raffaelli, 2010). However, it is clear that teachers' perceptions of their principals have a great impact on their willingness to stay at their school site.

Principal quality affects all students at a school site, implying that the school culture directly reflects the principal's ability to lead (Hanushek, 2011). One study looked at the results of the Mississippi Teacher Low Morale and Burnout Survey, and the data from the survey indicated that the teachers' perceptions of their principal are directly correlated with their intent to stay (Berry & Fuller, 2008). In a second study, the data showed individual teachers' intentions to leave their current school site and identified that the most influential factor of teacher turnover is teachers' perception of their principal as a high-quality leader. If teachers perceive their leaders as effective, they are less likely to leave, especially at the high school level

(Ladd, 2011; Johnson, 2006; Johnson et al., 2005). From my experience, a leader at a school site can affect how a teacher evaluation system is implemented and managed. For example, a principal may require that weekly observations of the teachers take place in preparation for their formal evaluations. Another principal may require one observation a month. Some principals may also feel pressure to increase their teachers' scores over time, as a reflection of their own coaching ability, whereas other principals may feel it necessary to evaluate their teachers harshly in the hopes that they will improve teacher practice and limit stagnant practice. The social conditions of a school—such as the school's culture, the principal's leadership style, and the relationship between colleagues—are the most effective predictors of a teacher's job satisfaction and ultimately his/her choice to stay at a school site (Johnson, Kraft, & Papay, 2012).

Student body demographics. Many researchers have worked to identify the factors that influence whether teachers stay at their current school sites, specifically with regard to student demographics (Boyd et al., 2005; Carroll et al., 2000; Clotfelter et al., 2011; Hanushek et al., 2004; Scafidi et al., 2007). A larger number of teachers are leaving schools in lower-income and underserved communities. This turnover adds to the challenges already experienced by students in these communities, such as a lack of continuity in instruction, lack of adequate teaching expertise, inability to provide support and mentoring, and lost time and resources for replacement and training (Loeb et al., 2005). Generally, when teachers transfer schools, they move to schools serving fewer low-income, low-achieving minority students (Boyd et al., 2005; Carroll et al., 2000; Clotfelter et al., 2011; Hanushek et al., 2004; Scafidi et al., 2007).

Hanushek et al.'s 2004 research is the most frequently cited study about teacher retention in public schools. Many other researchers have used this research and modeled their work after Hanushek et al.'s (Boyd et al., 2005; Scafidi et al., 2007). In Hanushek et al.'s study, the

researchers investigated how salary and student body demographics influence teacher turnover in low-income elementary schools. The results of this study showed that when teachers transfer, they choose to work at schools with fewer academically and economically disadvantaged students. However, teachers were not leaving schools in low-income areas because of the students, but left because of the increased level of work connected to working in those areas. The research estimated that in order for the salary of teachers in low-incomes areas to be equitable with their high-income counterparts, the average salary differential would be 25-40% above current pay rates. This finding can be disheartening for districts serving low-income populations because there is little they can do to reduce turnover.

A study by Stuit and Smith (2010) found that in charter schools, teachers leave the profession and move between schools at significantly higher rates than teachers at traditional public schools. The probability of a charter school teacher leaving the profession versus staying at his/her same school site is 130% greater than that of a traditional public-school teacher. Additionally, the probability of a charter school teacher moving to another school is also 76% greater than a traditional school teacher. This study also found that dissatisfaction with low morale and burnout is a reason why voluntary teacher mobility is significantly higher in charter schools than in traditional public schools. The reason why teachers are leaving charter schools at much higher rates than traditional schools could be a result of their teacher evaluation systems.

Teacher Evaluation Systems

School districts have begun implementing teacher evaluation systems in order to enhance teacher performance in the classroom (Aaronson, Barrow, & Sander, 2007; Rivkin et al., 2005; Rockoff, 2004; Sanders & Rivers, 1996). However, there is little understanding regarding how these evaluation systems affect teacher morale and burnout: two factors that have been shown to

influence teacher retention (Pratt & Booker; 2014). Specifically, this is true at CMOs where there are already increased rates of teacher turnover and these evaluation systems are being implemented at an increased rate (Stuit & Smith, 2010). The following sections will look at the increased frequency with which schools are implementing these evaluation systems, how these evaluation systems are affecting morale and burnout, and the specific implications that morale and burnout have for CMOs regarding teacher retention.

Increasing frequency of evaluation systems. Teacher evaluation systems are increasingly being used as a measure of teacher performance. Evaluations measure teacher performance in the classroom in an attempt to positively influence student achievement (Doherty & Jacobs, 2013). More recently, research has spoken about the importance of teacher quality and its positive relationship with student development and student achievement (Aaronson et al., 2007; Rivkin et al., 2005; Rockoff, 2004; Sanders & Rivers, 1996). Districts and schools have worked to develop their own systems with the hope of improving teacher quality and ultimately student achievement.

Effect of evaluation systems on morale and burnout. From my experience working in schools as both a teacher and administrator, teacher evaluation systems can cause teachers to become overworked and burned out, which can negatively affect teacher retention. Research consistently identifies poor working conditions as a factor influencing teacher morale and burnout (Carlo et al., 2013; Elfers, Plecki, & Knapp, 2006; Ingersoll, 2003). Teachers in schools with better morale and less burnout reported greater satisfaction with their schools (Carlo et al., 2013; Hakanen, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2006; Ingersoll, 2012). The factors these teachers have identified in making their experience more positive included: mentoring opportunities, positive leadership, professional development, and good use of time (Geiger & Pivovarova, 2018). If

teachers are able to have positive experiences at their school site, they are more likely to stay at their school. Administrators must ensure that teachers are able to have positive experiences and that teachers are not subjected to low morale and burnout. If schools are able to implement teacher evaluation systems objectively and clearly, they may have the ability to positively influence school site culture and morale.

The characteristics of an organization or a school site have a direct influence on teacher retention (Laney, 2018). In a study by Ingersoll (2001b), 25% of teachers reported that they were dissatisfied with their job for one of the following: low salary, lack of support from the administration, student discipline problems, lack of student motivation, and lack of teacher influence over decision-making. This study investigated the recruitment and retention of elementary and secondary teachers. The data analyzed were from the National Center of Education Statistics' nationally representative Schools and Staffing Survey and the Teacher Follow-up Survey. Schools that had more autonomy for teachers in regard to classroom expectations and schools with higher input from their faculty in regard to school-wide decisions had lower turnover rates. All of these factors can show the direct impact of low morale and burnout on teacher retention.

In a second study, researchers surveyed teachers and determined that their perceptions of their overall school environment and the levels of respect they received are directly related to their intent to stay at their current school site. Researchers analyzed the results from the 2007 Ohio Teaching and Learning Conditions Survey, which examined teachers' perceptions of teaching and learning conditions in order to curtail the attrition rate. This study identified the importance of social elements (school environment and level of respect) at a school site. These

factors, categorized as low morale and burnout, were shown to have a negative effect on teacher retention (Berry & Fuller, 2007).

Another quantitative study looked at administrative data in North Carolina and compared it to a statewide survey given to all teachers that aimed to document how low morale and burnout related to retention. In this study, it became obvious that there were variations across schools with regard to low morale and burnout as perceived by the teachers. The teachers' responses in this study were also highly predictive of their individual intentions to leave or stay at their current schools. The research also looked at and compared intended and actual departure. Although more teachers intended to depart than actually did, low morale and burnout were dominant factors in both sample groups. The study also mentioned the potential negative effects of having teachers communicate their lack of satisfaction at a school site (Ladd, 2011). Low morale and burnout are directly related to teachers' intentions to leave a school site. If teachers experience low morale and burnout and choose to not leave a school site, some negative factors can still influence the culture, such as increased gossip and negative conversations among staff members. These factors can lead more teachers to leave in the future.

Teacher evaluation systems are a more recent factor influencing both teacher morale and attrition. Johnson and Birkeland (2003) interviewed teachers who were leaving their school sites, whether to pursue employment at other school sites or leave the education profession altogether. Their study found that the importance of achieving success could determine whether a teacher wanted to stay or leave their school site. Many teachers in the study spoke about inappropriate teaching assignments and an overwhelming workload. Low morale and burnout were consistent reasons why teachers were choosing to leave their school sites. Teachers who were choosing to move to another school site did so because of the shortcomings of their current

school. The research conducted in the current study shows how teacher evaluation systems affect workload, which may provide clearer insight into Johnson and Birkeland's 2003 study.

Charter Management Organizations. CMOs have been defined differently by different groups of people, making it difficult to achieve a shared understanding of the model. Even with these differences, it is clear that a CMO manages public charter schools (Miron & Urschel, 2009, 2010) in an attempt to better the schools in a community. Charter schools are generally non-profits and can be dependent on nonprofit/for-profit status (EdSource, 2009). A CMO usually has a home office that oversees multiple schools, much like a district home office. When a home office supports more than three schools, it is considered to be a CMO (Lake et al., 2010; Smith et al., 2009).

When the charter school movement was just beginning, most charter schools were opened by teachers, parents, and other community members as independent schools (Bulkley & Fisler, 2003; Henig et al., 2005). More recently, CMOs have joined the charter school movement. Aspire Public Schools, the first CMO in existence, was founded in 1990. By 2010, CMOs had grown to include 137 nonprofit management organizations with 793 charter schools serving more than 200,000 students (Miron & Urschel, 2010). Between 2007-2012, between 51 and 96 new CMO schools emerged every year, growing 12% annually. In urban areas such as New Orleans, Newark, Los Angeles, Chicago, Oakland, New York City, and Washington D.C., CMO schools represent one-third of the charter market (Lake et al., 2010). With the growth of charter schools, there has been increased oversight, ensuring that these schools are able to achieve enhanced student gains compared to local district schools. This means there is increased pressure on performance metrics, especially student achievement. Knowing that teachers are the

best predictor of student achievement, charter schools have put a large focus on enhancing teacher practice.

The growth of CMOs occurred as a response to trends in educational policy. Individual charter schools were not making the large-scale growth that was intended by charter reformers. Additionally, the academic performance of charter schools has been mixed (Kimball & Milanowski, 2009; Zimmer et al., 2009). Innovations required by state charter laws are, for the most part, not occurring in single charter schools (Lubienski, 2003; Wohlstetter, Wenning, & Briggs, 1995). However, in KIPP Charter Network, it was found that students' academic gains were large enough to reduce race- and income-based achievement gaps (Nichols-Barrer, Gleason, Gill, & Tuttle, 2010). Because of KIPP's strong performance, state government officials and community member began to pay attention to larger CMOs. Because CMOs have a home office, they are able to streamline many practices implemented at the school site level, ensuring that all schools under the CMO are able to be successful, not just individual schools.

The growth of CMOs can be attributed to foundation funding, which has been estimated to be over half a billion dollars (National Alliance for Public Charter Schools, n.d.). NewSchools Venture Fund (NSVF) invests in CMOs, and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation donated $18.5 million in order to support the work of CMOs as well (Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, 2009; NSVF, 2006). These contributions, along with efforts of other venture philanthropies, help CMOs grow by reducing start-up costs, ensuring quality facilities, and assuring home office support (Wohlsetter, Smith, Farrell, Hentschke, & Hirman, 2011). There has also been strong federal support for the replication of quality schools. The U.S. Department of Education gave $50 million toward the expansion of charter schools, specifically targeting CMOs (U.S. Department of Education, 2010). CMO expansion has also received

increased funding from the charter schools' program (CSP) and school facilities programs (National Alliance for Public Charter Schools, 2010). With this money, CMOs are able to implement new initiatives in order to increase school achievement outcomes. Some of these initiatives have included teacher evaluation systems, in the hopes that CMOs would be able to enhance teacher performance and, therefore, student achievement.

Through my own experience in education I have seen an example of the teacher evaluation systems at Alliance College-Ready Schools in Los Angeles. Their evaluation system includes weekly informal observations and feedback as well as quarterly formal observations and evaluation scores. Observers (principals and assistant principals) watch teachers for 15 minutes a week and identify an *action step* for each individual teacher. An action steps is defined as the single most important piece of feedback for the teacher that will help to improve his/her practice, ultimately improving his/her evaluation score. On a weekly basis, the observer will come in and check to ensure that the feedback from the previous week has been implemented in the teacher's practice. The evaluator records whether or not the teacher has implemented the feedback. Because Alliance has implemented merit-based pay, these quarterly evaluations scores are used to determine their teachers' salaries for the following year.

Overview of the Effective Teaching Grant. The Intensive Partnership for Effective Teaching (IP) initiative, which was designed and funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, was put into place to improve student outcomes (high school graduation and college attendance) within low-income student populations through the measure of teacher effectiveness. This initiative was implemented into four CMOs in Los Angeles (Alliance-College Ready, Aspire, PUC, and Green Dot), serving as a metric that encompasses both teacher contribution to student growth and an assessment of teaching practices based on an observational rubric. The

developers of this initiative identified these evaluation metrics, and believed that they would lead to more effective teaching over time. Ultimately, the study hoped that these metrics would lead to improvement in academic outcomes. RAND and the American Institutes of Research conducted a 6-year study analyzing the initiative and recording student outcomes (Stecher et al., 2018).

The Gates Foundation awarded grants to these CMOs during the 2009-2010 school year, and gave funding and support through the end of the 2015-2016 school year. This grant was paid incrementally, totaling more than $200 million and ranging from $3.8 million to $81 million annually. The CMOs represented from 2,500 students to about 7,500 students. At least 70% of the students were eligible for free or reduced lunch and at least 80% were from minority populations. Through this initiative, each CMO adopted an observational rubric establishing a common understanding for effective teaching. Each CMO trained their classroom observers and had expected observations on a regular basis. These evaluation systems composed scores based on classroom observations and measures of growth in student performance. Each site used these scores differently regarding HR matters such as recruitment, hiring, placement, transfer, tenure, dismissal, PD, and compensation. Through this grant, the expectations of the evaluation systems at the four CMOs were relatively similar. After the grant ended in 2014, changes were made to each of the evaluation systems. Teachers and administrators present for the changes made to the evaluation systems may have some insight regarding factors of the evaluation system that were connected to retention (Stecher et al., 2018). Although evaluation systems were implemented at all of the CMOs, the study found little difference between student scores from schools with a teacher evaluation system and those without an evaluation system.

All public schools are expected to implement these newly structured teacher evaluation systems. However, not all schools have been implementing them at the same rate. Because the majority of district schools are unionized, implementation at these schools has been slower. Since charter schools tend to not be unionized, their home office level employees are able to implement these evaluation systems at a faster rate. Because of this, the current study specifically investigated some of the largest CMOs in Los Angeles. Los Angeles County is the home of many independent charter schools and charter school networks (i.e., CMOs). The aim of this research was to understand the perspective of teachers regarding their individual evaluation systems.

Background of the Current State of the Teacher Evaluation Systems

The Race to the Top funds and the expectations laid out by the Department of Education, are causing school districts to pursue waivers from the No Child Left Behind law in order to meet the more rigorous teacher evaluation policies (Doherty & Jacobs, 2013). To accommodate these waivers, districts and states are spending a significant amount of funding to implement objective evaluation systems, putting pressure on districts to exhibit results immediately. This pressure to exhibit results can cause districts and schools to implement teacher evaluation systems at a rate that may yield negative implications. The evaluations may not be as well designed as they need to be, or evaluators may not be as prepared to evaluate teachers accurately. These issues can lead to low morale and higher levels of burnout at a school site.

Professional impact of teacher evaluation systems. Districts design evaluation rubrics and use teacher performance in order to make compensation and personnel decisions. As a result, the implementation of teacher evaluation systems has proven to be controversial and inconsistent between school districts. Even with an attempt at implementation, seven large urban

school districts decided to discontinue the evaluation systems because the teacher unions did not support the implementation (Zubrzycki, 2012). Districts and schools have expressed concerns about using teacher evaluations in order to assess performance, financial, and dismissal decisions (McNeil, 2013a, Weiss & Long, 2013). Districts and unions are concerned about potential negative reactions from teachers regarding the evaluation systems, especially in relation to retention. Teacher reactions can be toxic to school cultures and cause issues related to teacher morale. In addition, as districts quickly choose to implement these systems, teachers have become increasingly frustrated, leading to toxic relationships between teachers and their administrators regarding the implementation of teacher evaluation systems.

Burnout and low morale caused by evaluation systems. Administrators have historically evaluated teachers based on a series of factors, e.g. academic climate, monitoring and responding to student behavior, etc. Unfortunately, these traditional assessments have failed to measure a teacher's effectiveness by only classifying teachers as either satisfactory or unsatisfactory. These evaluations have provided schools and districts with little data on teachers' performance, especially since the majority of teachers have been classified as merely satisfactory (Weisberg, Sexton, Mulhern, & Keeling, 2009). Recently there has been more of an effort to assess teacher performance more accurately using scales that measure the quality of teacher performance, e.g., 1 = *ineffective*, 2 = *effective*, 3 = *highly effective*, 4 = *master* (Dee & Wyckoff, 2015). From my experience, these more detailed evaluation systems offer school sites a more comprehensive understanding of teachers' performance. Specifically, these detailed evaluation systems will identify a teacher's performance levels within indicators allowing teachers to understand their strengths and areas of improvement. Once these areas are identified, teachers with their administrator's support can work to improve their practice. Twenty-seven states now

require teacher evaluations to be structured based on different indicators focusing on student growth and achievement. There are also 44 states that require classroom observations as a part of their teacher evaluation systems (Doherty & Jacobs, 2013). From my experience, more schools and districts are working to implement these thorough teacher evaluations at their school sites in order to better understand teachers' practices and their effectiveness in the classroom. It will be a challenge for teachers to become acclimated to the new expectations required as a result of changes made to the evaluation systems. There are additional indicators on the evaluation rubric on which teachers must focus in order to achieve an effective rating. Rubrics that are more thorough can lead to more stress and an increased workload for the teacher. For teachers to score a specific rating, they are required to implement new teaching practices in their classrooms. The increased stress from their workload can lead to higher levels of burnout. If teachers are unable to be successful on these evaluations, they may have lower morale. As an assistant principal, I have found that I need to be an instructional leader in order for teachers to feel supported with these new rubrics and expectations. If they are not supported and end up not being successful during these evaluations, teachers' perceptions of their leadership abilities will be compromised.

Problems with the structures of teacher evaluation systems and how this affects burnout and morale. States have attempted to balance the position of both state and local districts in regard to teacher evaluation design and implementation. Eleven states currently mandate teacher evaluation systems. An additional 10 states provide teacher evaluation systems that districts may opt out of (generally they agree only to use an evaluation system that is similar in caliber), and 27 states provide a general criterion in which districts are allowed to opt out (only with an agreement they will create their own evaluation system that falls under state

guidelines). In 11 out of these 27 states, the state designs an evaluation model of their own and the districts are able to adopt that system instead of creating their own. In 37 states where the districts have the ability to create their own evaluation systems, fewer than 50% require state review and approval of their systems (Doherty & Jacobs, 2013). There is minimal consistency in terms of how these evaluation systems are implemented or structured. As such, it is difficult to understand if the implementation of these teacher evaluations is having a positive impact on student achievement. Equally, there is minimal research about any negative impact these systems may be having regarding teacher retention, specifically in relation to morale, burnout, and leadership style. It is important to research and collect data on how the implementation of teacher evaluation systems affect teachers across each CMO.

Public schools have generally struggled to create adequate systems to develop and evaluate teachers (Baker et al., 2010). Districts and schools have committed significant capital to train and develop their teachers' practice with little evidence indicating that these funds have been effective (Yoon, Duncan, Lee, Scarloss, & Shapley, 2007). These trainings for teachers have been focused on specific rubric indicators with the hope that they will lead to improved teacher practice in the classroom. However, none of the professional development that was provided to teachers was driven by individual teacher strengths and weaknesses (Weisberg et al., 2009). There is cause for concern that these evaluations are not enhancing teacher practice, yet teachers are obligated to participate in the evaluation process. If teachers are not given the resources and tools needed to be successful on these evaluations, they may become frustrated and, in turn, want to leave their school site. States and districts are generally not following best practices when using the current structures of evaluations, as evidenced by the lack of consistency across districts (Zubrzycki, 2012).

Researchers have been working diligently to better understand the reliability of the systems, especially since teacher effectiveness has been mostly dependent on observable measures such as classroom management and student engagement. Research has not consistently agreed on effective indicators to measure teacher performance. For example, one piece of research provides evidence demonstrating that a teacher evaluation system in Cincinnati was able to improve teacher performance. This study showed teachers who are evaluated are able to improve student achievement by a standard deviation greater than non-evaluated teachers (Taylor & Tyler, 2012). This finding offers evidence that evaluations have positive effects on student achievement. However, in order for teachers to be able to use these evaluations to improve their practice, the measures need to be consistently effective in measuring teacher performance (Dee & Wyckoff, 2015) and it is not guaranteed that these evaluation systems are improving teacher practice. School sites may witness other negative effects as a result of their implementation, such as lower morale and teacher burnout, which could affect teacher retention.

Abundant research has demonstrated that districts can communicate clear and objective standards while also using multiple sources of evaluation data and employing trained evaluators (Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Goe & Croft, 2009; MET, 2013; Pianta & Hamre, 2009). In a 3-year study by the MET, the structure of teacher evaluation was analyzed to better understand how to measure teacher performance effectively. This research showed that teacher effectiveness should be measured on improvement from student achievement data, classroom observations, and student surveys (MET, 2013). However, there is no consistency regarding how these evaluation systems are being implemented at the state and district level. It may be difficult for schools to ensure the same reliability that was found in studies like the MET.

There is a recent movement to expand teacher evaluation systems, even with the inconsistent research about their ability to measure teacher performance and student achievement. Evaluations that are being implemented at most school sites are pilots, and many public officials are having a difficult time with their implementation (McNeil, 2013b; Ujifusa, 2013). Teacher evaluations have experienced significant policy changes but have not yet been placed into consistent practice. This means there has been movement at the state level in terms of incentivizing teacher evaluation systems; however, districts have been slow to implement these systems. States have been working to bring growth in designing and implementing evaluation in the classroom. These evaluations will continue to become more rigorous and closely aligned with student achievement (Doherty & Jacobs, 2013).

The main goal that accompanies teacher evaluations is increased data to better inform personnel decisions such as professional development, tenure, and dismissals (Dee & Wyckoff, 2015). However, the implementation of these evaluation systems may have come before there is enough research to guarantee accuracy and reliability of these systems. There is research showing the inability of evaluation systems to measure teacher performance accurately (Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, 2011; Toch & Rothman, 2008; U.S. Department of Education, 2009; Weisberg et al., 2009). If evaluation systems are unable to measure teacher practice, schools may be failing to enhance student achievement and unintentionally causing quality teachers to leave their school or the profession. In addition, if teachers are expected to complete more work in preparation for the evaluations, teachers may be experiencing an increased workload and eventually burnout. If administrators who are completing these evaluations are unable to improve these teachers' practice with their evaluation feedback, the teachers' perceptions of the administration may become negative. Teachers may feel the administrators are inadequate in

terms of rating and improving teachers' practice, thus leading them to resign or transfer school sites.

Conclusion

Teacher turnover continues to increase to record numbers throughout public schools across the United States (Ingersoll & Merrill, 2012). It is important for state and district leaders to be aware of how teacher evaluation systems are affecting morale and burnout on individual school sites. If teacher evaluations are causing lower morale and higher levels of burnout, then schools may suffer from a decreased level of teacher retention during a period of time where there is already a teacher shortage (Leithwood et al., 1999). Specifically, for CMOs, there may be a greater impact with the increased implementation of these evaluation systems.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

This study strove to understand the relationship among teacher morale, retention, and the structure of CMOs' evaluation systems. Interviewing teachers and administrators enabled me to understand the perceptions of the evaluation system by different staff members at different levels. Qualitative research helped me to understand teacher and administrator perspectives on the issues of teacher morale, retention, and evaluation systems put into place by the CMOs. All public schools are expected to implement these newly structured teacher evaluation systems; however, not all schools have been implementing them at the same rate. Because the majority of district schools are unionized, the implementation at these schools has been slower. The aim of my research was to understand teachers' perspective regarding their individual evaluation systems.

Research Design and Rationale

I used a qualitative research design for this study. The goal of this research was to understand the similarities and differences between the evaluation systems within the Los Angeles CMOs and their relationship to teacher morale and retention. Interviewing teachers and administrators allowed me to understand their perceptions of the evaluation systems. Holstein and Gubrium (1995) argued, "Social researchers generate massive data by asking people to talk about their lives; results, findings, or knowledge come from conversations" (p. 2). These conversations/interviews provided a holistic understanding of these educators' experiences.

Regarding qualitative research, Seidman (2013) asserted that interviewing "is a basic mode of inquiry. Recounting narratives of experiences has been the major way throughout recorded history where humans have made sense of their experience" (p. 8). Although surveys and other quantitative methods might have helped me gain some general idea about why teachers

would choose to stay or leave their school site, they could not have helped me to gather an understanding of teachers' and administrators' specific experiences with their CMOs.

Strategies of Inquiry (Data Collection Methods)

Site and population. The population included current teachers, former teachers, and administrators from three of the four largest CMOs in Los Angeles (CMO A, CMO B, and CMO C). Interviews were conducted with former teachers, current teachers, and current administrators from the largest CMOs (CMO A, CMO B, and CMO C) in Los Angeles County.

Because all four of the CMOs were a part of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation grant, they were the ideal locations for this study. At the beginning of the grant, all four of the CMOs used the same evaluation system; since then, each CMO has made changes to their evaluation systems based on the input of their staff members. Because of this fact, the teachers and administrators were able to speak to the changes that were made from the initial evaluation system and why those changes were made. The teachers and administrators were also able to speak to how low morale and burnout amongst teachers were affected by these changes.

The 27 participants in this study were three former teachers, three current teachers, and three administrators at three of the four CMOs. This selection enabled the study to gain a strong understanding of each CMO's evaluation systems from the former teacher, current teacher, and administration perspective. The former teachers were able to give some understanding about why they chose to leave the organization. Current teachers offered insight into reasons that might cause them to leave their schools and/or reasons they choose to stay in their organizations. The current teachers also had some knowledge about the opinions of their coworkers about why they chose to stay or leave the organization. Administrators offered a unique perspective about how the evaluation systems have affected the teachers with whom they have worked. Some

administrators have also been teachers under the evaluation process and were able to explain how their opinions of how the evaluation systems changed or stayed the same when they went into administration.

As a faculty member of one of the CMOs, I had access to former teachers, current teachers, and administrators within my CMO. I also spoke to the Directors of Teacher Effectiveness at CMO A and CMO B. These directors all expressed interest in this study and agreed to help me make connections within their networks.

Since this study involved three of the four CMOs that have implemented evaluation systems, my research was able to provide a multi-case study about the successes and barriers CMOs face in regard to teacher retention when implementing evaluation systems. The three CMOs that were studied were given the pseudonyms of CMO A, CMO B, and CMO C. Three CMOs were chosen rather than four CMOs because of the time restrictions given in this study. CMO C and CMO D (the fourth largest CMO in Los Angeles) have made similar choices in their evaluation systems and are the most comparable regarding the structures of their organizations. Because of this fact, I decided to only incorporate CMO C into my study. I chose CMO C rather than CMO D because I have more access to administrators and teachers within the CMO C organization. By selecting CMOs that have been able to implement evaluation systems, other CMOs and districts that are less successful in evaluation system implementation will have models to follow.

Data collection methods. For this qualitative multi-site study, interviews were used as the data collection method. The interviews took place at the teachers' schools. The interviews lasted around 60 minutes each and were recorded. Interview questions asked participants about their experiences with their evaluation systems and if those experiences affected teacher morale

or burnout. The questions allowed for a comprehensive understanding of teacher experiences at different CMOs. Supplemental questions were created that helped probe the participants if further explanation about their experience was needed.

Data Analysis Methods

Interviews with the former teachers, current teachers, and administrators were recorded using an iPhone. During the interview, I took notes, and each interview was transcribed within 24 hours using an online transcribing service. Notes taken during the interview were added to the transcripts as comments. After each interview, I conducted an analysis regarding the transcript in order to better execute later interviews. Responses were categorized in order to identify themes and patterns that emerge, organizing them into two categories: factors of attainment and factors of attrition. Within those two categories, sub-categories were created, for example: morale, burnout, and leadership style. The data were then be coded and organized based on the subcategories that emerged naturally. Quotes were taken from the transcript that matched the subcategories and were added to the matrix. Once the matrix was organized, the findings from the subcategories were summarized. I also compared and contrasted each position across the networks. For example, the administrators were compared with the other administrators, the current teachers with the other current teachers, and the former teachers with the other former teachers.

Ethical Issues

When contacting schools to participate in this study, I made it clear that the goal of the study was not to criticize charter schools for their progress concerning teacher evaluations and retention, but rather to support them in retaining the teachers they have worked so hard to develop. All sites that participate in the study were given a problem statement detailing the need

for the study and how it would be conducted. Current teachers, former teachers, and administrators that participate in the study will be made aware of the intent and purpose of the study in an introductory letter. All school sites were given a copy of the findings so they could be sure that the information was presented in an accurate way. The findings also informed school sites about the success and challenges that other CMOs face regarding retention and their evaluation systems.

Ethical issues that need to be considered in the design of the study included ensuring that the identity of the school sites and participants were kept confidential. I went to great lengths to ensure participant's confidentiality. I addressed this by using pseudonyms for all CMOs, school sites, and participants. All participants who took part in interviews signed a consent form before participating. Any files containing the actual names of participants were password protected and destroyed once all interviews were transcribed.

Furthermore, in my study, I did not interview any teachers with whom I work since I have supervisory authority over them. None of the interviews were done during work time. As an assistant principal who works at one of the CMOs, I did not reveal my position to the teachers and administrators who are being interviewed. Because of this, I introduced myself as a UCLA graduate student researcher. If teachers and administrators viewed me as an administrator, they might have felt uncomfortable telling me their true feelings about their evaluation systems. Because the study was confidential, participants felt more comfortable telling me their authentic feelings about the teacher evaluation systems. When presenting the questions to the participants, I did not show my own bias regarding teacher evaluation systems. I listened and did not respond to any answers that I received.

Credibility and Trustworthiness

Initially, I intended to interview only current teachers to obtain answers to the research questions. However, after further consideration, I felt that I needed to interview former teachers and administrators in order to gain a more holistic and credible understanding of the subject matter. Incorporating these three groups also minimized any bias that may have been present in the interviews. Including multiple data points by interviewing current teachers, former teachers, and administrators helped minimize issues of bias and insufficient evidence. For example, current teachers may have felt pressure to be more positive when answering questions about their school site, whereas former teachers may have been more negative. Having multiple people and positions represented enhanced the credibility of the interviews. In addition, collecting multiple data points allowed me to triangulate data and compare the perspective of current teachers, former teachers, and administrators.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

This qualitative study engaged 27 staff members across three different CMOs: three former teachers, three current teachers, and three administrators from each CMO. The goal of the project was to better understand aspects of teacher evaluation systems that might influence teacher morale and burnout for employees at low-income schools. Specifically, the study addressed the following research questions:

1. What are the components and characteristics of teacher evaluation systems at three CMOs?
2. What are teachers' perceptions of their evaluation systems? Are teachers' perceptions similar or dissimilar across the CMOs?
3. Is there evidence that teacher evaluation systems influence teacher morale and retention across the CMOs?
4. Are there features or characteristics of evaluation systems that could explain any differences observed in teacher morale and retention?

Interviews were conducted over a 1-month period. In this chapter, I identify major themes in the transcripts to answer my research questions through the lens of both teachers and administrators. Before completing this research, I hypothesized that there would be a distinction between the perspectives of the former and current teachers at each of the CMOs. However, upon coding the transcripts, it was apparent that there was essentially no distinction between the responses of these two groups. Thus, for purposes of discussing the findings, these two groups are combined and distinctions are typically made only between teachers and administrators. A few interesting remaining distinctions between current and former teachers are noted in the analysis where relevant. Table 1 presents basic demographic information for the former

teachers, current teachers, and administrators interviewed for this study from CMO A, CMO B, and CMO C.

Table 1

Sociodemographic Characteristics of Participants at Baseline

	Administrator		Current Teacher		Former Teacher	
Baseline characteristic	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Race						
Black	1	11	2	22	1	11
Asian	2	22	1	11	0	0
Hispanic	3	33	2	22	3	33
White	3	33	4	44	4	44
Other	0	0	0	0	1	11
Age						
25-30	1	11	2	22	2	22
31-35	4	44	5	55	5	56
36-40	2	22	2	22	1	11
41-50	2	22	0	0	1	11
Language Spoken						
English Only	2	22	3	33	5	56
English and Spanish	5	56	4	44	3	33
English, Spanish, and a third language	2	22	2	22	1	11
Years in Teaching						
0-5 years	2	22	4	44	2	22
6-10 years	6	67	3	33	6	66
11-15 years	0	0	1	11	1	11
16-20 years	1	11	1	11	0	0
Years in Administration						
0-5 years	7	78	x	x	x	x
6-10 years	2	22	x	x	x	x
School Level						
Middle school	4	45	5	56	4	44
High School	5	55	4	44	3	33
Both Middle and High School	0	0	0	0	2	22
Years at Current School Site						
0-5 years	x	x	5	56	x	x
6-10 years	x	x	4	44	x	x

Note. x = data were not collected for the specific group identified.

Given the small sample sizes in this study, it is challenging to compare demographics across positions (administrator, former teacher, and current teacher). There are no substantial

differences in race, age, and language spoken across the positions interviewed (current teachers, former teachers, and administrators). Even the largest gaps (e.g., 22% difference in teaching experience) corresponds to the difference between only two people. Descriptively, the nine former teachers interviewed have the most experience in the classroom, totaling over 71 years. Notably, the majority of administrators who were interviewed in this study have less than 5 years of experience as administrators, showing that the administrators at the CMOs are lacking experience before they are implementing the teacher evaluation systems. This lack of experience can have negative impacts on how teachers experience the evaluation system. Table 2 shows descriptive statistics separately by CMO. This table illustrates the demographics across CMOs are relatively similar. The only difference of note was the lower level of teaching experience from current teachers at CMO B. However, the difference disappears when former and current teachers are ultimately analyzed as one group.

Table 2

Sociodemographic Characteristics of Participants at Baseline Presented by CMO

	CMO A		CMO B		CMO C	
Baseline characteristic	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Race						
Black	1	11	1	11	2	22
Asian	2	22	1	11	0	0
Hispanic	1	11	4	44	3	33
White	5	56	3	33	3	33
Other	0	0	0	0	1	11
Age						
25-30	3	33	1	11	1	11
31-35	3	33	5	55	6	67
36-40	2	22	1	11	2	22
41-50	1	11	2	22	0	0
Language Spoken						
English Only	3	33	4	44	3	33
English and Spanish	2	22	5	55	5	56
English, Spanish, and a third language	4	44	0	0	1	11

(continued)

Baseline characteristic	CMO A		CMO B		CMO C	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Years in Teaching						
0-5 years	2	22	3	33	3	33
6-10 years	5	56	6	67	3	33
11-15 years	1	11	0	0	1	11
16-20 years	1	11	0	0	2	22
Years in Administration						
0-5 years	2	22	3	33	2	22
6-10 years	1	11	0	0	1	11
School Level						
Middle school	4	44	5	56	4	44
High School	4	44	3	33	5	56
Both Middle and High School	1	11	1	11	0	0
Years at Current School Site						
0-5 years	1	11	2	22	2	22
6-10 years	2	22	1	11	1	11

Note. x = data were not collected for the specific group identified.

The sample of teachers and administrators interviewed for this study was broadly representative of the demographics at each of the three CMOs (see Table 3 for demographics of teachers and administrators in the sample compared to the demographics at each CMO).

Table 3

Sociodemographic Characteristics of Participants at CMO Compared with Study

Baseline characteristic	CMO A		CMO B		CMO C	
	% in CMO	% in Study	% in CMO	% in Study	% in CMO	% in Study
Race						
Black	8	11	4	11	4	22
Asian	12	22	7	11	9	0
Hispanic	25	11	42	44	30	33
White	50	56	43	33	52	33
Other	5	0	4	0	5	11

This chapter presents the findings of this study organized along the four guiding research questions listed previously. Chapter 5 reviews the main trends in the findings in relation to the research questions, framework, and my personal and professional experience, draws implications for practice and theory, and raises questions for further study.

Research Question #1: Characteristics and Components of Teacher Evaluation Systems

Table 4 presents basic information about the teacher evaluation structures of CMO A, CMO B, CMO C, along with the original Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation evaluation system that originated these three CMO systems. In 2009, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation donated $18.5 million to the three CMOs (CMO A, CMO B, and CMO C) in order to enhance their teacher evaluation systems in an attempt to better teacher practice in the classroom. With this initiative, CMOs were expected to implement standardized evaluation systems at individual school sites matching the characteristics shown in the first column in Table 4.

Table 4

Evaluation System Characteristics

Teacher Evaluation Systems	Original Gates System	CMO A	CMO B	CMO C
Year of implementation	2009	2017	2017	2017
Number of Formal Observations	1	0	4	0 or 1
Merit-Based Pay (Salary or Bonus Structure)	Yes (Bonus)	No	Yes (Salary)	No
Number of Rubric Indicators	38	2-3 goals from 38 indicators	10	38
Number of Standards	17	17	6	17
Number of Domains	4	4	1	4
Scale Points for Each Score	4	4	4	4
Pre-Observation	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Post-Observation	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Teacher Rating (i.e., Master Teacher, Highly Effective, etc.)	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Student Assessment Scores	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Parent Satisfaction Survey	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Student Satisfaction Survey	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Evaluator	Assistant Principal or Principal	Assistant Principal or Principal	Assistant Principal or Principal	Assistant Principal or Principal
Length of Observation	60 min	No formal time period identified	45-60 min	45-60 min

When Observations Take Place	Spring	Spring	Fall (2) Winter (1) Spring (1)	Spring

CMO A, CMO B, and CMO C had all implemented the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation evaluation system in 2009. Starting in 2017, each CMO began making changes to their evaluation systems in order to better serve its specific needs. The Gates evaluation system model involved teachers being formally observed once a year using the College-Ready Promise Framework for Effective Teaching Rubric, listed in Appendix A. This framework was developed by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and comprises four domains, 17 standards, and 38 indicators.

Throughout the evaluation process, administrators (assistant principals and principals), have meetings throughout the evaluation process including: a pre-meeting to discuss the lesson plan and the debrief meeting at the end of the evaluation to discuss the teacher's scores. The administrator, in consultation with the teacher, pre-schedules the date of the in-class observation and the due date of the lesson plan for the observation that would be observed. Teachers are expected to turn in their lesson plan at least 3 days before their observation. Administrators then score the lesson plan in relation to the "Data-Driven Planning & Assessment" standard of the framework, shown in Appendix A, from Domain 1, which comprises five standards in the rubric ([a] establish standard-based learning objectives and assessments; [b] organize instructional plans to promote standards-based and cognitively engaged learning for students; [c] use student data to guide planning; [d] use knowledge of subject matter content/skills and learning processes to plan for student learning; and [e] design assessments to ensure student mastery).

Administrators then come into the teachers' classroom during their scheduled time to observe the pre-identified lesson. This in-class observation spans over the course of an hour and

the teachers are rated on the 38 different indicators, each on a 4-point scale by either an assistant principal or a principal. During that hour, administrators are expected to take notes regarding student and teacher behaviors in alignment with the rubric. Ideally, administrators are seeking evidence of each of the 38 indicators on the rubric. For example, if an evaluator was trying to collect evidence for the communicated learning objective, he/she may write down that the teacher communicated the objective aloud, the teacher asked the students what the objective for the day was and the students were able to recite the objective, or that students where completing assignments where it was obvious that they understood the objective as evidence. For the in-class observation, observers focus on a different set of eight standards in the rubrics from domains 2 and 3, focusing on classroom interactions. Domain 2 focuses on the classroom learning environment ([a] create a classroom/community culture of learning; [b] manage student behaviors through clear expectations and a balance of positive reinforcement, feedback, and redirection; [c] establish a culture of respect and rapport which supports students' emotional safety; and [d] use smooth and efficient transitions, routines, and procedures) and domain 3 focuses on instruction ([a] communicate learning objectives to students; [b] facilitates instructional cycle; [c] implement instructional strategies; and [d] monitor student learning during instruction). If administrators were unable to collect evidence for a specific standard, teachers would receive a 1 in that category. If administrators were able to collect evidence, teachers would receive a score from 1-4 based on the quality of the evidence and the specific description in the rubric.

After the in-person classroom observation is complete, administrators are expected to evaluate teachers based on their professional responsibilities, in relation to the final set of standards on the rubric:

1. Engaging in critical reflection, constantly revising practices to increase effectiveness;
2. Engaging in collaborative relationships with peers and share best practices and ensuring continuity in student learning;
3. Upholding and exhibiting the CMO norms and expectations; and
4. Developing two-way communication with families about student learning and achievement.

Administrators then score teachers based on these standards and share their scores with teachers 24 hours before their debrief meeting. During this meeting, administrators are expected to review all of the scores from the lesson planning, classroom observation, and professional responsibilities. This meeting also gives the teachers a time to provide any evidence that could potentially change their scores. For example, if a teacher received a 3 on an indicator, but had evidence, such as student work or a parent communication log, that showed they were performing at a level 4, the teacher could share that evidence with the administrator. During these meetings, the administrators and teachers would work together to ensure that all of the scores were an accurate representation of a teacher's practice.

Once teachers are scored, all 38 of the scores from the individual indicators are averaged in order for the teacher to have one overall score. Teachers who obtain average scores between a 3.5-4.0 are considered "master" teachers. If a teacher receives between 3.0-3.49 they are rated "highly effective." When teachers receive between a 2.5-3.0, they are considered "effective." If teachers receive between a 2.0-2.5, they are considered "emerging." When a teacher receives anything below a 2.0, they are considered "ineffective." The observational evaluation composes 60% of a teacher's rating every year. The other percentages include parent surveys (5%), student surveys (10%), and assessment data (25%). All of these scores are added together for an overall

score for the teacher and this score dictates a bonus up to $9,000 for teachers the following year (MET, 2013). Teachers who receive a master score would receive the full $9,000 bonus, teachers who receive "highly effective" would receive a $7,200, teachers who receive "effective" would receive a $5,400 bonus, teachers who score "emerging" would receive $3,600, and teachers who earn a score of "ineffective" would receive a $1,800 bonus. All teachers would receive these bonuses during December of the following year to ensure that they continued to work with their respective CMOs. If teachers moved districts or out of the profession, they would not receive their bonus.

Characteristics of the teacher evaluation system at CMO A. The majority of employees who were with CMO A during the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation grant were able to recall the Gates evaluation system. One administrator described the system as "one big pie with a lot of different components." The administrator mentioned that the different components of the evaluation included the scores from the "rubric during your evaluation…your assessment results, a student survey, a teacher survey, [and] family survey." The evaluator, a principal or assistant principal, would average a teacher's assigned scores and that "that number would show if you're emerging, highly effective or a master teacher." Teachers would then receive specific bonuses based on their evaluation rating.

When CMO A stepped away from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation grant, the organization made structural changes to their evaluation system and removed the bonus incentive system. The new structure includes teachers meeting with their administrator at the beginning of the school year and developing three goals. These goals are generally "related around your individual practices, as well as some school-wide goals that you are going to be focused on." Rather than having a structured rubric with intricate evaluation structures, teachers are

encouraged to select three goals and their feedback from administrators over the course of the year will relate to these three goals.

Teachers are able to identify their own areas of growth and determine their growth goals. Then, based on these goals, their observer, usually an assistant principal, completes the observation and tags evidence aligned to those growth goals, and then scores the teacher using the rubric. The teacher and the administrator "would joint score where do we think I am, and then how do I want to grow." This allows the teacher and the administrator to work collaboratively in order to determine areas of practice on which to focus.

At CMO A, two teachers and two administrators mentioned that CMO A's system was less structured and more collaborative than the other CMOs. An administrator at CMO A mentioned that:

> [CMO A] is less than what I hear about at [CMO B] and [CMO C] in that action steps were connected just to this one goal indicator, and it was less of, you're going to get a big score across all these different indicators. It's looking to see if you did or did not meet that particular growth target…slightly less structured than at [CMO B] or [CMO C].

The CMO A evaluation system "allows teachers to be the drivers of their own development with the support from the other administrators on staff."

Characteristics of the teacher evaluation system at CMO B. The evaluation system that was used under the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation grant included 30 indicators on which teachers were assessed during their observation. Now, in CMO B, teachers are only evaluated on 10 indicators. These indicators include: high expectations, positive and productive response to behavior, maximizing instructional time, content aligned to standards, criteria for successfully demonstrating attainment of the learning objectives, engaging scholars' curiosity

through challenging questioning, promoting scholar-to-scholar interactions through academic discourse, empowering students to do the "heavy lifting" of the cognitive learning experience, offering feedback for scholar growth, and assessing and responding to the progress of scholars' learning. A copy of the rubric for CMO B is labeled in Appendix B. CMO B also increased their observations to four times a year rather than one observation "to give a more holistic understanding of what is happening in teachers' classrooms throughout the year," according to one of CMO B's administrators. Two teachers mentioned the increased number of evaluations helped to eliminate some of the "dog and pony aspects of the evaluation." The two observations taking place in the "spring are weighted heavier than your fall, and there are 10 indicators and there's no lesson plan." Overall, the focus of the evaluation system is solely the classroom observation, and the system no longer includes the evaluation of a lesson plan.

Some other structures that the teachers appreciated under the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation evaluation included the opportunity to meet with their supervisors before the observations. Teachers used to have their administrators give them feedback on their lesson plan prior to the observations, which would help ensure that teachers had the structures in place to produce a quality lesson. Under the new CMO B evaluation system, teachers are no longer able to meet with their administrator before their formal observation, meaning that they are unable to receive feedback on their lesson plan until after the observation. Teachers believed that not working with their administrator regarding their lesson plan helped to eliminate the "dog and pony show part of the evaluation." When teachers completed their evaluations, they looked more like their day to day practice. However, one teacher mentioned that because she was unable to talk to an administrator about her lesson, the evaluation felt more like a "gotcha, rather than an opportunity to grow practice."

Characteristics of the teacher evaluation system at CMO C. When CMO C first rolled out an evaluation system under the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation grant, teachers had a pre-conference with their evaluator before the observation during which they would discuss their strengths and weaknesses. For teachers who were completing the observation for the first time, this would look like feedback from informal observations versus teachers who had been through the formal observation process while referring back to previous scores on the evaluation system. When the observations started, teachers were being evaluated with a "massive rubric," and the administrators were "scripting everything in the classroom." Once the observation was over, teachers would meet with their observer, generally an administrator, and discuss their ratings.

The structure of the evaluation system has stayed relatively similar to the original structures set up in the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation evaluation system in 2006. For example, teachers are still expected to complete pre-conference observations, teachers still have observations that are scored using a rubric, and teachers and administrators continue to debrief the scores after the observation. One difference from the original system is that if teachers prove to be effective in their classroom by scoring between a 3 and a 4, they are able to have an "off" year during which they are not evaluated using the formal observation process. For a teacher on an "off" year, their expectation is to identify goals or indicators on which they want to work over the course of the year. Content coaches from the home office and administrators on campus can help teachers develop these goal areas. One teacher in the interview indicated that she had received two "off" years in a row, one because of strong evaluation scores, and one because of the lack of available administration on campus.

Similarities and differences among the evaluations at the CMOs. Although the evaluation systems at the three organizations have a common origin and thus started out with

similar characteristics, distinct choices were made at each of the organizations since the initial implementation regarding merit-based pay, unionization, the evaluation rubric, and the frequency of evaluation. Out of the three organizations, CMO B is implementing a structure that is the closest to the initial evaluation system. CMO B is continuing to implement observations and debriefs for all teachers with the merit-based pay initiative. They made smaller changes, including slimming down the number of indicators that were being assessed in the original evaluation and changing merit-based pay from bonuses to salaries. Initially, teachers were making bonuses based on the how well they performed on the evaluation system, but now they are making a salary determined by their performance on the evaluation system.

CMO B is also currently completing evaluations four times a year. Two of the evaluations happen in Fall and the other two happen in Spring. The increase in evaluations was implemented to help ensure that the evaluations represented a holistic understanding of a teachers' practice at all points in the year. This choice also helps to eliminate the "dog and pony show" aspect of the evaluation. CMO B also removed the lesson planning part of the evaluation system. CMO B understands that since the most important aspect of teaching is influencing student achievement, their evaluation will focus solely on what is happening in the classroom, rather than on the planning.

Since the initial implementation, CMO C has become unionized and, as a result, teachers feel like they have more of a voice with regard to their evaluation system. With the help of the union, CMO C has removed the merit pay component of the evaluation system. The organization has also worked to add informal observations that happen more frequently and are less high-stakes. Administrators will come into the classrooms, observe the teacher, and give the teacher bite-sized feedback. CMO C has also differentiated the evaluation system for new and

more experienced teachers. New teachers will be informally observed more frequently and have their yearly formal evaluation. More experienced teachers, who have proven to be effective in the classroom based on past evaluation scores, are able to have "off years" where they are not observed formally at all.

Because of the unionization efforts, teachers feel they have more influence over the evaluation system. Since the time of their unionization, few changes have been made to their evaluation system, although the teachers interviewed mentioned that the administrators at CMO C still continue to try to observe teachers on a weekly basis. However, the practice of this implementation varies at individual school sites.

The CMO A evaluation system is the most different from the original evaluation system used under the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. CMO A uses elements of the original rubric; for example, teachers are expected to identify goals on which they want to work over the course of the year. These goals are co-created by the teacher and the administrator and worked on over the course of the year. These three different networks will provide opportunities for clarity in regard to the differences in morale and burnout as a reflection of the evaluation system. CMO A was also the first organization out of the three to eliminate the merit-based pay.

The CMO A evaluation system has turned into a system for coaching teachers on their practice. Teachers continue to self-identify goals based on the CMO A teaching practice rubric. They share these goals with their administrator, and their administrator is expected to come in and observe the teacher based on these specific goals. The amount of observations varies from school site to school site, and sometimes teacher to teacher. At the end of the year, the administrators are expected to draft evidence of teachers either meeting or not meeting the goals that were set at the beginning of the year.

Research Question 2: Teachers' Perceptions of the Evaluation System

This question was concerned with the perceptions of teachers and administrators regarding their evaluation system, and how these perceptions were similar and dissimilar across the three CMOs. The analysis revealed three important themes: clear expectations, teacher ownership, and a compliance versus formative focus. First, it was important to teachers in all networks that there was a level of clarity in regard to their evaluation systems. Not only did teachers expect a level of clarity with the rubric that was being used, but also they expected that their evaluators would have a clear understanding of individual expectations. Teachers also communicated that they wanted ownership over their own development. They wanted to make decisions that they felt would affect their classes, specifically their students, in a positive manner. Teachers also mentioned the evaluation system should not feel like an assessment of compliance, but rather a way to assess their practice accurately. These three themes and patterns are examined next.

Clear expectations. It was common through all three of the CMOs that transparency and clear expectations were an important part of the evaluation protocol. Teachers and administrators at CMO A consistently voiced that they appreciated having an evaluation system that used a common language. They said that it gives them the "same language" and a "common language regarding what good teaching looks like." However, some participants made comments in regard to the limits of the evaluation system because of its clarity. Teachers mentioned that depending on the administrator, the common language of the rubric would mean something different. Some administrators were very passionate about certain indicators on the rubric and wanted to see practices done a specific way, whereas, if you have a different administrator, the indicator might mean something different. Teachers also noticed that

administrators with different backgrounds made sense of the rubric in different ways. One teacher spoke about how she had an administrator with a mathematics background who wanted to see academic discourse through group work. She said that students were given a task and she was expected to walk around and support them. Another administrator with a history background said that it was more effective to see academic discourse through "think-pair-shares." She also mentioned that when she did "think-pair-shares for the administrator with the math background, she generally received lower scores. There is enough ambiguity in the rubric where administrators can have different expectations of teachers." She mentioned feeling as though "the target is always moving depending on who is evaluating you."

The administrators at CMO B talked about the importance of going over the rubric with teachers and calibrating on the individual indicators and scores. It was important to the administrators that there was clarity for their teachers in regard to what was expected. Administrators from CMO B also made it a point to differentiate for teachers with different levels of experience. For example, one administrator mentioned that he tries to be very transparent when speaking to first year teachers about the evaluation. He goes over the rubric with the "first-year teachers and calibrates with them what each indicator looks like in" practice and also what the expectation is for first-year teachers in regard to scores. CMO B administrators also mentioned giving teachers the opportunity to "look over scores and come prepared for a meeting in order to discuss scores." This practice allows teachers to come prepared to discuss their scores and ask questions about the evidence collected and scores assigned.

Teachers in the CMO B network did mention that there were some concerns with the "evaluation systems being an accurate measure of performance," because in their experience

"different evaluators yielded different observation scores and feedback." Another teacher in the CMO B network noted that "everyone has a different interpretation of what some and most means [vocabulary used in the rubric]. That also looks different depending on what your class size is." This lack of clarity to the rubric has caused some confusion and frustration for teachers.

Teachers at CMO C expressed some similar sentiments. Teachers mentioned that there were times during their observations when they felt that they performed better than the scores they received. After this discrepancy, teachers had conversations that were handled in different ways. The teachers who had evaluators say "let's look at the rubric together" and then walk them through the scoring process felt more comfortable with the evaluation process. In contrast, teachers who communicated feeling a lack of clarity in regard to the scoring communicated a lack of trust in the evaluation process as a whole. Teachers mentioned feeling uneasy when there were "weaker administrators who were not unbiased and were not as well trained." Some teachers had also mentioned that there were comments that they heard from "peers at other schools…[who] had a lot of issues and didn't buy in as much to the system." The staff member who served as an observer on campus dictated the experiences of teachers and the evaluation system.

Teacher ownership. At CMO A, none of the teachers were able to accurately describe the origins of their evaluation systems. Two former teachers were able to name where the original evaluation came from but were unsure of how teachers' voices affected the final product of their evaluation system. The teachers mentioned that the system came from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation in order to enhance teacher practice but were unsure how teacher voice influenced how the evaluation system was implemented. Overall, the teachers from CMO A felt like there was space in their evaluation system for teacher ownership. One teacher

mentioned that teachers "rate themselves in the areas." Teachers generally could identify the areas where they are "the weakest and try to grow in them." At CMO A, teachers are able to take control of their learning by identifying their own growth areas and developing a plan with their coach in order to enhance their practice in the identified area.

All of the administrators at CMO A were able to share the origins of the teacher evaluation systems accurately. Two of the three administrators at CMO A were in teaching positions at CMO A during the time of the original teacher evaluation system implementation. The administrators mentioned that once the original evaluation system was implemented, CMO A asked themselves "based on teacher feedback and some other things, how do we want to change this?." Based on teacher feedback, CMO A pulled away from the merit-based pay aspects of the grant before the time the grant was even completed. Teachers also voiced that they didn't want a punitive evaluation system that could potentially be used for hiring and firing. As a result, CMO A created goals for teachers and trained administrators to develop plans based on teachers' identified goals. CMO A continued using the same "30 indicators that were part of the original college ready teaching framework," but how they implemented these indicators was completely changed based on teacher feedback. One administrator mentioned that "you took a little bit of lead from the teacher, then it was like collaborative decision making about what the coaching was going to be." One of the teacher goals came from the organization, one came from the site leader, and one came from the individual teachers. This procedure allowed the CMO and site levels to develop overarching goals based on the need of the organization and the school site while also giving teachers the opportunity to make decisions that are best for their students.

At CMO B, the majority of current and former teachers described the evaluation system as a "top down" system. Most teachers were able to communicate that there was a structure in

place with CMO B where the intention was to receive teacher feedback. However, teachers expressed a lack of distrust about their voices being represented in that structure. One teacher mentioned that there was an "executive council that was consulting everyone at home office on what teachers wanted;" however, they were unsure "how much that voice represented what everybody else wanted." Another teacher mentioned that there was a lack of conscience in the evaluation system "because I remember…the rollout and there was a lot of confusion so I don't know if that was a home office thing or if it was just that our administrators weren't sure what was going on either." The lack of cohesion that was seen after the roll out of the teacher evaluation system insinuated that there was a lack of understanding of the system by staff members working at the school sites.

CMO B teachers believed the system was being used to make hiring and firing decisions. They also mentioned that a lot of power and trust was given to administrators throughout this process. For example, one teacher mentioned that she felt like she was performing a lot better than she previously had on her evaluations because the administration liked her. She mentioned that "if your administrator likes you, you generally do well." Another teacher mentioned that she felt like CMO B did not want teachers involved in the development of the evaluation system because it was a system that was used to fire "bad" teachers. She also mentioned that CMO B is afraid of becoming LAUSD, where they are forced to keep ineffective teachers in the classroom. This teacher mentioned that "CMO B wants to be able to get rid of ineffective teachers and this is the way they do it." This teacher's belief is that the expectations of the evaluation system would have been "watered down" if they asked for teacher input.

In contrast, two of the three administrators from CMO B believed their evaluation system was "based on a lot of feedback from teachers and admin about how they felt about what was

fair" in regard to teaching practice and expectations. The third administrator mentioned that he believed the "CMOs sort of had a home office crew built it." He noted that an executive council provided input on the original evaluation system, but any changes made after the original document and collaboration with teachers "was certainly not done." This administrator also stated that after the decisions were made at the home office level, administrators and teachers were given "two or three PDs [professional developments]" where they "got into groups and broke down the indicators, so that there was a common language about what they were implementing." There was mixed evidence from the CMO B administration in regard to the level of teacher input in the teacher evaluation systems. Although all administrators were aware of the executive council's involvement in the making of the teacher evaluation system, there were varying levels as to whether or not this was "enough" teacher voice in the process.

At CMO C, the majority of teachers mentioned that there were multiple opportunities for teachers to give feedback to the evaluation system before its implementation. One teacher noted that she felt like CMO C listened with "a lot of teacher empathy…about the rubric and what indicators are the most effective for students and then observation for feedback versus observation for evaluation." Two teachers also mentioned that they felt that the CMO C union played an instrumental part in ensuring teacher voice throughout the implementation of the teacher evaluation system. One teacher voiced that the

> teachers' union weighed in pretty heavily. I [she] was a union rep and so I [she] got to go to meetings about it [the evaluation system], but we [the union reps] really weighed in on observations for feedback for moving teacher practice versus evaluation.

Because of the work of the network and the union, teachers were able to have multiple opportunities to voice their opinion about the evaluation system. This allowed teachers to feel more comfortable and engaged in the evaluation process.

A few teachers mentioned that they had little to no knowledge regarding the origins of the evaluation system and had little opportunity to provide input to its implementation. One teacher mentioned:

> I know it's based off Danielson's Framework, but it always seemed to me that whenever I did my own kind of research on the framework it didn't really feel like that was the purpose that it was used for, if that makes sense. I've always read it as a tool to help develop and train teachers, not a full-on evaluation system tool. I've always read like that's the cautionary tale of it.

A second teacher mentioned that:

> when it [the evaluation system] was ramping up, they [CMO C] didn't go into the history or the methodology or the research that supported the framework. They just basically said like, "We're moving to this framework, here's how we're going to do that and we're going to get, you know, teacher input for whatever that means." And that was under CMO C with a union.

Although it was not the opinion of the majority of the teachers that were interviewed, teachers were questioning the validity of the evaluation system and the level of teacher involvement in the evaluation system implementation. Like CMO B, there were questions from teachers, and one teacher mentioned that "I don't think teachers know like, 'This is why we're doing the rubric, this is where it's coming from, this is how it was developed, this is how it's supposed to help me,' and all that type of stuff."

All of the CMO C administrators that were interviewed agreed that CMO C worked to ensure that there was teacher voice throughout the evaluation system development and implementation. One administrator said,

> one of the great things about them is they're very much about a partnership since the beginning, what, 20 years ago almost. The organization was built with the idea that teachers and admin worked together collaboratively on all the big decision-making that takes place.

A second administrator talked about CMO C having "committees ongoing that work on it [the evaluation system], look at it, reflect on the language of the rubric, and adjust it. The entire thing was born and has continued to develop in a partnership." Administrators as a whole felt confident that CMO C involved teachers in the development of the evaluation structure.

Compliance versus formative focus. All teachers and administrators at CMO A mentioned the compliance aspects of the CMO A evaluation system. A few teachers and administrators reported being frustrated by the compliance aspect of the evaluation system because they felt like the intentions of the networks was focused more on "checking boxes" rather than making decisions that were best for their students. One teacher mentioned that he would develop his initial goals within his evaluation by identifying areas in which he knew he could develop rather than areas that have proven to be weaknesses. He mentioned that he "wouldn't want to set a goal or an expectation of myself that I knew I couldn't keep, or an area that I wouldn't be able to grow in." This teacher seemed to be more concerned about strategically showing administrators that he was improving through his evaluation rather than genuinely working to improve his practice for the good of his students. A second teacher noted they felt they were "jumping through the hoops and checking [their] boxes, then [their] score

would go up." This means in order for this teacher to receive strong scores on the evaluation, they had to make the lesson a "dog and pony show." This teacher also mentioned that they didn't feel like the practices were enhancing their classroom, but rather insisted that the teacher was completing practices for the sake of the evaluation. When interviewing CMO A teachers, it became obvious that the teacher evaluation system was thought of as something teachers needed to "get through" rather than a system that they felt would improve their practice.

CMO A administrators talked about the need to complete the evaluations as a method of oversight from their home office. One administrator mentioned that the board members look at the evaluations to ensure that schools seems to be supporting teacher development, which encourages schools to complete teacher evaluation systems in a compliant manner. This caused the administrator to believe that the board of trustees doesn't even "care about teacher development" but rather is "just checking off boxes." If administrators feel like the expectations regarding teacher evaluations are solely compliance-based, there is little motivation for administrators to focus on using these evaluation systems to develop teacher practice.

Two CMO A administrators also talked about their concerns with the teacher evaluation systems being used as a means of teacher non-renewal. One administrator described the pressure that he felt to complete more work when teachers were not meeting their goals. He talked about how when teachers weren't performing, he had to "step up [his] coaching for them and support them more." The administrators mentioned that because the system was so compliance-based and it was easy to "fake" the evaluation and get strong ratings, they didn't feel like it was an accurate measure for hiring and firing.

All of the CMO B administrators also mentioned that parts of the evaluation systems were more compliance-based rather than focused on teacher improvement. One administrator

said that the evaluation system is very "much just check boxes to see you're doing it or you didn't. And it was a lot of gotchas like, 'Oh you didn't have this.'" The additional component of merit-based pay is another factor adding to the compliance-based feeling of the evaluation system. One administrator also mentioned the conflict of interest that comes with being a teacher's coach and also their evaluator. It's inappropriate for an administrator to be:

> [In] charge of the budget, [because] it's very possible for person to be like, oh, I'm going to rate them low so I can save money this year, which is super shady, but there's nothing preventing that from happening right now.

There were also concerns about having the same person coaching teachers and being in charge of whether or not they are renewed. The concern focused on whether one person can coach and support a teacher while also potentially planning to not renew them. From the administrator comments, there was also reason to believe that teachers did not trust their evaluators as coaches when they entered their classrooms. One administrator mentioned that for

> some teachers they'll feel it as a "gotcha." And so, every time that there's an administrator in the room…I wonder sometimes if they are like thinking of the dog and pony show, they're putting on their best show, but it's not a consistent practice.

These concerns of inauthentic practice in the classroom could potentially ruin the effectiveness of the evaluations and coaching.

The teachers at CMO C also mentioned aspects of their evaluation systems that felt linked to compliance. CMO C teachers consistently mentioned that because CMO C had strayed away from the merit pay aspects of the evaluation system, they felt their classroom observations were more authentic to their daily practice. One teacher in CMO C also brought up a concern that the CMO B teachers mentioned, regarding the issue of having a "principal in charge of the

budget and teacher evaluations. That was a huge conflict of interest." There were also consistent comments from the teachers regarding how they wanted to have feedback and that they didn't "think [the evaluation] should be a once year dog and pony show. [They] just think people should give you feedback on your practice." Overall, teachers were happy with the changes that the network made in regard to their evaluation system. Most of the teachers commented about the evaluation systems not feeling punitive. One teacher mentioned that

> the biggest mistake a network could make is tying teacher pay to the evaluation…Another issue I've seen is when an admin or teacher, whatever, anyone's using it punitively or a teacher thinks it's used punitively so they do something that they don't do on a daily basis and you're not getting real feedback.

These sentiments were shared among the majority of teachers who were being interviewed.

The CMO C administrators who were interviewed talked a lot about the limits of the rubric being used in the evaluation system. Two administrators felt like the evaluation system was effective for new teachers, but once teachers had more advanced levels of practice, there were limitations to the system. One administrator mentioned that, for advanced teachers, it feels like, "here's the box. Let's make sure we're staying within the box. Let's make sure that we're doing everything that's within this box, whether it is the right thing to do for kids or not. This is the box." Thus, for more advanced teachers, the evaluation can prove to limit a teacher's development and stifle creatively and risk-taking in his/her classroom.

Research Question 3: Influence of Teacher Evaluation System over Morale and Retention

The third question was concerned with identifying whether teacher evaluation systems influence teacher morale and retention across the CMOs. Throughout all three networks, comments from teachers and administrators highlighted the pressures of the evaluation system,

the impact of the evaluation system when making decisions in the best interest of students, and the differences of evaluation implementation based on leadership. The next section examines some important common threads, as well as differences by position and network.

Pressures related to the evaluation. The CMO A teachers consistently discussed the unnecessary pressures that the evaluation put on teachers, particularly new teachers. A few teachers mentioned that they had witnessed new teachers "break down and feel overwhelmed" because of their evaluations. Although the teachers talked about how the evaluations were not the only reason why teachers were feeling overwhelmed, but it served as a contributing factor. The majority of teachers said that they have had conversations with new teachers about to whether they wanted to stay in the profession in response to the expectations placed by the evaluation system. Teachers feel like the system is "just too much." One teacher even mentioned she knew teachers who have left CMO A to go work at one of the most prestigious private schools and has communicated that their expectations are a lot less than they were at CMO A. Another teacher mentioned that the evaluation system adds to teachers' already heavy workload. He said that between "the expected work load and the overwhelming pressures of the evaluation system without the needed coaching support is just too hard to do." It was obvious when talking to teachers from the CMO A network that they felt overwhelmed by their workload. It did not seem like the evaluation system was the sole factor that made them feel overwhelmed. However, it was a contributing factor to their overall workload.

The administrators within CMO A reported noticing a large difference in regard to the pressures of the evaluation from when it first started under the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation until now. One administrator mentioned that "it has been less of a show and teachers feel a lot less stressed by it." The decisions that were made to drive the CMO away from a

formal observation process to identifying goals for individual teachers created less of an atmosphere regarding high stakes. A second administrator mentioned that in the shift "evaluations were stressed significantly less." Administrators felt the new system focused on enhancing teacher practice rather than forcing teachers to perform in a specific manner.

All CMO B teachers reported that they still felt a lot of pressure about the expectations placed on their performance through the evaluation system. One teacher mentioned that on top of her already heavy workload, "I think that our administrators placed so much emphasis on those observations that it became impossible to remain calm during them, because it felt like your entire livelihood was at stake." The added pressure of merit-based pay proved to be an additional factor that contributed to the importance and high-stakes of the evaluation system. A second teacher noted that changes had been made to the system that made the evaluations even more stressful. She mentioned that:

> not only that but this past year, when they started implementing bite-sized feedback in the classroom, that made it even worse. Teachers felt like they were not doing a good job on a daily basis, because every time an administrator would come in and give us that bite site's feedback, again it was really, really superficial, and it usually had nothing to do with our practice. It wasn't going to help us in any way. But if the next time they came in, and we hadn't implemented it, then we were the ones who were going to get written up as a result of that.

It was apparent in the interviews that teachers had seen teachers receive negative feedback and were asked to leave because of their performance on the evaluation systems. Teachers hesitated to believe that the evaluation systems were an attempt to improve teacher practice but rather a practice to remove teachers that weren't performing up to CMO B standards.

CMO B administrators talked about the importance of the accountability piece of the teacher evaluation system and some of the unwillingness to be coached that they have experienced from the teachers. One administrator mentioned that "the accountability piece is so interesting because teachers generally want more accountability but not always for themselves." He also emphasized the importance of putting strong teachers in front of students on a daily basis. The administrators from CMO B believed that there may be an added pressure for teachers, but the more "that administrators are calibrated with teachers in regard to expectations," the lower the pressure teachers should feel. A second administrator mentioned that in his experience, "teachers didn't want to be coached, because it feels painful." He also mentioned that he believes his teachers feel that way in regard to coaching because there have been "a lot of spoons or cooks in the kitchen…and it's not working out so well." This lack of clarity about expectations has caused teachers to have an aversion to coaching and being evaluated on their practice. With more consistency in coaching and expectations, teachers should feel calmer during their observations. The third administrator mentioned the importance of having

> stable teachers, and you're [administrators] working with them every week, or every couple of weeks… I [he] think [thinks] it would take a lot of mystery out of the process. I [he] think [thinks] it would take out a lot of fear. When you have your administrator observing you, your job's on the line. We [administrators] pretend it's not, but let's not be coy.

Having that consistent coaching from an administrator can help teachers understand their specific expectations and will also allow a teacher to feel less stressed when completing his/her evaluations.

At CMO C, all teachers also discussed the pressures that they experienced from the teacher evaluation system. One teacher mentioned that "any time there is anyone telling you about your practice. It's… I think difficult… I think it invites a lot of scrutiny or nervousness or anxiety." A second teacher gave a few examples about a "rock star teacher" who felt like she needed to put on a "dog and pony show." This teacher believed that the observations "should just be like what you do every day. For some people, it's high anxiety events that they saw as being disconnected from what was happening every day." A second teacher mentioned that "is very stressful, especially when you have an on year, and you know that you're being evaluated based on this one plan, this one lesson plan sometimes for your formal." She also talked about the stress that comes with her administrator not "quite know[ing] the standards. And [she is] being questioned about things that I am trying in my classroom or things that maybe they're not very aware and informed of…and [she] get[s] dinged." Administrators' areas of incompetency can add to the lack of clarity of the overall system. If teachers do not feel like their administrators have a true understanding of their content, it can be difficult for teachers to trust the evaluation process. Three teachers mentioned that they consistently feel like their administrators are saying, "Come on, come on, this isn't good enough. Let's keep going. Let's work harder." In response to this approach, teachers feel like they are "trying the best [they] can and this isn't good enough." One teacher mentioned the importance of showing their administration that they have a growth mindset while suppressing their feelings of inadequacy as a result of the evaluation system. Although teachers want to improve their practice, they believed that the pressures and high expectations of the evaluation system caused them to respond poorly during the evaluation system.

The CMO C administrators all served as previous CMO C teachers and spoke about their own experiences when asked about the pressures of the evaluation system. One administrator mentioned the improvements that have been made to overall systems. He mentioned that he "got to experience the twice-a-year formal observation anxiety, and then was able to enjoy the less overabundant process as it evolved." The administrators were all aware of the anxiety that the evaluation systems caused for their teachers and were adjusting their practice to help support their teachers.

Ability to make choices that are best for their classroom. Teachers at CMO A discussed the compliance aspect of the teacher evaluation system, especially regarding the disconnect between the evaluation system and its influence on student learning. This wasted time and energy, ultimately having a negative impact on teacher morale. One teacher mentioned that his observations were generally a "little last-minute thing that the principal or AP or somebody pops in, they sit there for not too long." Another teacher expressed concern that administrators had no "regard to scope, or sequence, my [their] lesson plan, and very rarely do I [they] get feedback. It's my opinion, it's checking boxes for them [the administration]." Although a few teachers alluded to having "some good conversations," the majority of teachers said that the quality coaching happened in their first years of teaching. Overall, the teachers believed that the evaluations are just a "bunch of inefficient time-wasting hoops to get anything done." One teacher mentioned that he believes that this compliance lens has "gotten worse" over time. He mentioned that the CMO A "organization has got the high beams and super-lenses on us [the teachers]. And I think that's sort of what has made things more on edge." Another teacher mentioned that, teachers in the organization have a "disgruntled people feeling like they're being asked to do too much. Every time they try and do something…there's always nine million hoops

to jump through. It's just turning into a not fun place to be." The inability for teachers to make decisions that they feel are best for their students is causing morale to be lowered in the network as a whole.

CMO B teachers also noted that the evaluation system can get in the way of teachers doing what they know is best for their students. One teacher talked about how the evaluation systems made teachers feel "like we don't know what we are doing." The evaluation can cause teachers to feel like they need to follow the directions of their administrators and not trust their own instincts regarding their own classroom. A second teacher mentioned that the feedback that she was expected to implement was "given to [her] by, again, people who didn't understand what was going on in [her] classroom." She talked about how there were instances of her performing well on her evaluations, because her "observer had no idea what was going on in [her] classroom. [The observer] did not understand the content." Another teacher also talked about how she knew there were teachers who experienced the opposite issue, where

> really, really, really good teachers were not becoming master teachers when they absolutely deserved it, but then you have teachers who we know have zero classroom control, do not lesson plan, and are planning during their actual lesson. They're the ones receiving master teacher status simply because they know who they need to make happy. It was really bad.

All of the teachers discussed their level of frustration in regard to the biases of the evaluation system. The majority of teachers also talked about how it was important for them to "just do what your administrator wants you to do" in an attempt to increase their scores. Teachers did not necessarily feel they were able to make decisions that were best for their students. Teachers related experiences where administrators would come into their classroom saying, "You need to

change your lesson plan today, and you need to have like an exceptional lesson plan today because blah blah blah is coming." Teachers felt like they weren't encouraged to have authentic observations but rather teach a lesson that "looked good" when they were being observed. One teacher talked about why she entered education:

> [I] did it because this is something I'm very passionate about. I want to help students pave their own way, make it to college, graduate, and break the "school to prison pipeline" and every other negative statistic out there. Students need to be at the center of the work that teachers are doing and if evaluation systems are not enhancing teacher practice for the sake of student learning, then they are not benefitting schools.

At CMO C, the teachers talked about how the evaluation systems were "baked into the culture of the school." Two teachers mentioned that the evaluations were "just a part of the routine and feedback was just part of the way that the admin team interacted." One teacher mentioned that at her school site, there were constant conversations about how the evaluation system "could move teacher practice" and she felt there was an emphasis on enhancing teacher performance for student gains. Another mentioned that she had had different experiences at different CMO C schools and she felt it was important to have "a positive environment where you're giving people feedback, because we all care about moving student performance and want to celebrate and acknowledge the great work that teachers are doing." When she experienced that type of environment, she felt it was "a lot less stressful." It was important to the majority of teachers that "evaluations should be used in order to move teacher practice." If the evaluations are working, there will be increases in "student scores and the school should be closing the achievement gap." The majority of teachers also acknowledged that if the environment and culture of the evaluation are stressful, it will negatively impact the system as a whole. A few

teachers did talk about their stressful experience, mentioning that at their school sites there is an "obsession with numbers [that] hasn't…given away the same outcomes that obsession with great teaching has given." Overall, the teachers agreed that strong teaching practices for student growth needs to be at the center of teacher evaluation systems. If networks are focusing too much on the evaluation scores, rather than improving teacher practices, schools will not see the outcomes needed to ensure student growth. Some teachers at CMO C mentioned how the union played a part in their relationship with the teacher evaluation system. If teachers don't like the system, then they can "go to [their] union representative and then take it to the executive council." The union had an effect on teachers' feelings about the teacher evaluation system as a whole. Teachers felt like they had the option to voice their concerns with the system when initiatives were implemented that were not in the best interest of teachers and their students.

Research Question 4: Characteristics that Explain Differences Observed Across Systems

The final research question in the study centers on examining whether the particularities of the evaluation systems in place in the three CMOs can explain the differences observed in relation to teacher morale and burnout. Analysis of interview data revealed two common threads. First, leadership influenced teacher experiences with the evaluation system (specifically the perceived competency of the administrator who offers coaching). Second, high-stakes or merit-based pay structures proved to be a factor that negatively affected teachers' and administrative viewpoints regarding the evaluation system.

Leadership. Overall, CMO A teachers and administrators voiced that they were the least burned out in regard to their evaluation system. As a group, they were also the least likely to say there was a negative relationship between the teacher evaluation system and teacher morale.

However, the majority of teachers also communicated that CMO A teachers were having different experiences based on their school sites and leaders.

One teacher noted that the way that her principal rolled out the evaluation system at her school site caused the teachers to be "really competitive with each other and not necessarily in a positive way." This competitive culture caused individuals to become burned out and lowered the morale of the school. She mentioned that the principal would favor the teachers who had stronger scores or had proved to have stronger practice in their classroom. Because of this, teachers were hesitant to share their best practices and help lower performing teachers improve their practice. The evaluation system "pushed people apart and had them hiding things from each other and becoming competitive." The way in which the evaluation system was used at the school site did not foster a community of trust, but rather caused teachers to be competitive with one another, which ultimately can hurt instruction for all students.

A few teachers also described a perceived lack of administrator competency among teachers that caused a sense of lowered morale. One teacher spoke about how her coaching always felt like "another thing to do" and she was struggling to see the "benefit to [her] practice." She mentioned that feedback that she received was never clear and how she was constantly "forced to guess" her feedback when she was in a debrief meeting. A second teacher mentioned that she received "pluses and deltas…but the change was never met with a strategy." Although she was clear about where the issues were in her practice, she was not clear about how to fix them. When she spoke to her administrator about specific strategies to influence her practice, she was given "more ambiguous feedback." When working under administrators who are perceived as incompetent, it becomes very difficult for teachers to be invested in their

coaching and growing their capacity. This frustration can cause teachers' morale to lower, eventually causing them to leave their specific school site.

The majority of teachers at CMO B also mentioned that there was a lack of perceived competency among their administrative coaches. One teacher mentioned that

> [When] your administrators or when your observers don't know anything about the content that they're observing, it makes it difficult for teachers to improve, which is why I say those scores are extremely subjective, because how am I supposed to learn from someone who's never been in the classroom?

Teachers consistently mentioned the importance of being coached by someone who works in their content area and has been proven to be effective in the classroom. A second teacher mentioned that she was being coached by "someone who just went into administration because they couldn't cut it in the classroom." She went on to note that it was frustrating to be coached by someone who did not know how to be effective in the classroom. Teachers spoke about how this perceiving their administrator as incompetent caused a lowered sense of morale among teachers.

One teacher also mentioned the lack of trust, which is an identified characteristic of a strong leader, that was built between her and her supporting administrator. She talked about how she felt like higher expectations were set at her school site for teachers than for administrators. Because of the lack of relationship between the teacher and her administrator, the teacher mentioned that it was difficult to "trust this administrator as my [her] coach." She went on to state, "If you're not building trust and good relationships with your staff, then you're going to have a difficult time getting people to buy into your efforts." If administrators lack strong

relationships with the teachers they are coaching, it will limit their effectiveness as a leader and will not encourage their teachers to be invested in coaching and improving their practice.

Another CMO B teacher talked about the differences in coaching experiences that she had received from CMO B over the years. She talked about how her "new CMO B school does [doing] it better than her previous CMO B school" because they use the evaluation system to improve teacher practice rather than as a punitive system. She talked about how at her previous school, the system constantly made her feel like she wasn't good enough. At the new school, the evaluation system was used to improve her confidence. This teacher mentioned that she left her previous CMO B school site because of low morale and her inability to improve her teacher practice.

At CMO C, teachers spoke about their mixed experiences with the evaluation system in relation to their coaching administrators. One teacher spoke about her "awesome experience" with her math coach who she categorized as a "super effective instructional coach." She spoke about how she was able to identify areas on the rubric on which she wanted to focus, and he would help her "get from a score of a 3 to a 4." This teacher also mentioned that she was not invested in the teacher evaluation system until she worked with this specific administrator and was able to see the benefits of the system. Her administrators were also "giving [her] coaching on areas he knew I was working on in a totally non-evaluative way, and that was really awesome." Her relationship with her coach and the perceived competency helped her to have an effective coaching relationship, which allowed her to improve her practice. This teacher also mentioned the "high morale" at her school site because of these relationships. A second teacher talked about the strong morale that she experienced because of her administration staff. She mentioned that the administrators were invested in their work and wanted to "grow leaders from

within." This means the administrators owned their teachers' development and took that development as a reflection of their own practice. Because of this practice, "Teachers felt a lot of satisfaction in their work." These strong relationships between administrators and teachers caused teachers to want to enhance their practice with the teacher evaluation system and grow their capacity in order to better serve their students.

Merit-based evaluation systems. All teachers and administrators in each of the CMOs had negative reactions about the merit-based pay systems that were being used at all three of their networks. Although CMO C and CMO A only had the merit-based pay system for a short period of time, teachers and administrators still brought the merit-based pay system up as a point of contention. Teachers and administrators from both CMO A and CMO C mentioned the stress and burnout their teachers felt when merit-based pay was being used as a component of their evaluation system. Teachers and administrators from CMO B, which is still using the merit-based pay system, talked about the current negative impact of merit-based pay on teacher morale and burnout. Three teachers spoke about merit-based pay being a reason that they or another teacher they knew left the organization.

At CMO A, all teachers discussed that when "the evaluation system was tied to the merit pay, it caused tension between teachers, and impacted morale." Teachers and administrators also expressed "because it was tied to money, there were more conversations needed regarding the accuracy of the evaluation system." One administrator brought up the fact that the "schools didn't even have money to support the effort of merit-based pay." These were just a few of the many concerns brought up by the teachers and administrators regarding the implementation of the evaluation system in their network.

Now that CMO A no longer uses a merit-based pay system, teachers feel like "because their evaluation didn't dictate a teacher's income…it actually helped teachers feel like it was more about growing and strengthening their practice." One administrator mentioned that the change "made teachers not feel like the evaluation system was a compliance piece." When they had merit-based pay, both teachers and administrators felt they were completing the evaluation as a means of compliance. The changes away from merit-based pay allowed both administrators and teachers to focus solely on developing teacher capacities in the classroom without worrying about any impact on their salary.

Although the comments were mostly positive in regard to the lack of merit-based pay within the network, some administrators brought up some negative aspects of not having merit-based pay. One administrator mentioned that he noticed a shift in regard to teacher practice being "placed on the backburner instead of at the forefront." He mentioned that he believes that teacher practice needs to be at the center of his work, and teachers were less invested in developing their practice when you are not "handing out cash." A second administrator mentioned that the evaluation system no longer affects morale at CMO A because the teachers "barely even look at it." He talked about how the lack of merit-based pay has caused teachers to not be invested in their own development. This administrator talked about the little impact that the evaluation system has as a whole.

Overall, the teachers and administrators at CMO B talked about the lowered morale and heightened levels of burnout that the teachers experience as a result of the merit-based pay teacher evaluation system. A few administrators spoke about the conflict of interest they are experiencing as both coaches and evaluators. One participant mentioned that it can be unethical for an administrator to be in charge of both the budget and teacher's performance. It would be

possible for an administrator to say "I'm going to rate a teacher really low, so I can save money this year. This is super shady, but there's nothing preventing that from happening right now." This conflict of interest can cause teachers to not trust the evaluation system or their coaching administrators.

A few teachers also mentioned that the evaluation system has become a "game" to many teachers. One teacher mentioned that

> teachers have learned to perfect a certain type of lesson. Whether a Socratic seminar could be represented the day of the evaluation or a participation quiz could be given. In that way, it's interesting enough that it does push teachers to think about, okay, when that day comes, what are the techniques and the tools that I can use to make sure I get the highest scores? Maybe because my salary is at stake.

A few other teachers mentioned that the evaluation system works to "not self-motivate teachers, but externally motivate teachers to try to get higher scores on the rubric." This idea of the rubric identifying "the perfect lesson" came up in multiple conversations with teachers. Teachers feel the rubric limits their ability to create and execute new and innovative lessons for their students.

Teachers also mentioned the anxiety and burnout that they felt as a result of the evaluation system. One teacher said that "for me at the very least, it stresses me out and it gives me anxiety." A few teachers alluded to their wanting to have "more free conversations about things they want to improve on during the school year, that is not dictated by what somebody else thinks a perfect classroom might look like." CMO B teachers consistently talked about having more freedom to create lessons that will benefit their students rather than help them score well on the rubric. Teachers also mentioned that the evaluation system made them feel defeated in their work. One teacher noted that the evaluation system inherently has administrators look for

"something wrong." Through this structure of constantly wanting to do better, "it just creates a lot of stress and pressure in a career field that is already stressful enough." This anxiety and stress causes teachers to become frustrated with the evaluation system and feel the burnout that is so commonly connected to turnover.

At CMO C, there was less of a conversation regarding the impacts of merit-based pay. Like CMO A, CMO C had worked to remove merit-based pay in partnership with their union. However, the majority of teachers at CMO C also mentioned the negative impacts of merit-based pay. They said their union collected the teachers' thoughts about merit-based pay through a series of focus groups, ultimately leading to the dismissal of merit-based pay. One teacher also mentioned conflict of interest in regard to evaluators also being in charge of the school budget, stating, "If your principal's in charge of the budget and they're also your evaluator, there lies a huge conflict of interest." This assertion insinuates that administrators could lower teachers' scores in an attempt to spend less money from their budget.

The majority of teachers at CMO C mentioned the positive experiences they were now having with the evaluation system since their compensation is no longer tied to pay. One teacher mentioned that "a lot of teacher voice was given to the system, because it wasn't tied to pay, I think it was a really positive experience for me." A second teacher mentioned that now that the evaluations are no longer tied to pay, teachers "aren't doing a once a year dog and pony show." Teacher practice is more authentic on a daily basis, and the focus is more on improving authentic practice. This was a shift of culture through the entire organization that now focuses on improving teacher practice.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings from this study both support and extend what is understood about the impact of teacher evaluation systems on teacher morale, burnout, and retention. I investigated the characteristics of teacher evaluation systems at three CMOs and asked teachers and administrators about their perception of their CMO's evaluation system, as well as the impact of this system on burnout and morale. The literature suggests that there is reason for concern that when schools implement teacher evaluation systems, particularly if they are tied to merit pay, there can be negative effects on teacher morale, burnout, and ultimately retention. My findings support these concerns. Because the purpose of these evaluations is to retain high quality teachers in the classroom, it is important that school sites are working to eliminate the aspects of the evaluation system that may contribute to lower morale and high levels of burnout. In this chapter, I first summarize the findings germane to the four research questions underlying this study, and their contribution and significance to the larger body of literature on teacher evaluation systems. I offer recommendations and considerations for CMOs and school-based leadership teams who seek support in implementing teacher evaluation systems at their school sites. Finally, I identify the strengths and limitations in the study's design and consider areas for future research,

Summary of Findings

Characteristics and components of teacher evaluation systems. Although the evaluation systems at CMO A, CMO B, and CMO C started out similarly, each of the organizations made distinct choices that made the evaluation systems interesting to study. These choices had an impact on the levels of morale and burnout of their teaching staff. Some of the differences in their systems included merit-based pay, unionization, the evaluation rubric, and

the frequency of the evaluation. Looking at the three organizations, CMO B has retained the most consistency in their original evaluation structure. CMO B has focused on continuing to have high expectations for their teachers through the use of an evaluation system but has not communicated with teachers about the negative impact it has on a teacher's morale and burnout. All teachers who were interviewed were unhappy about different aspects of the evaluation system and mentioned that they didn't have a consistent platform to voice these concerns. When teachers and administrators are unable to voice their opinions and concerns, they will become frustrated with the organization and their school site, which ultimately decreases morale. CMO B continues to have observations and debriefs for all teachers along with merit-based pay. Teachers consistently voiced their frustration about merit-based pay. Although merit-based pay is used to give incentives to teachers to enhance their practices, most teachers feel pressured to create "dog and pony shows'' in order to maintain or increase their salary. Merit-based pay doesn't enhance a teacher's practice, but rather creates a culture of burnout because teachers are expected to work harder for an increased salary rather than to enhance their students' understanding of content. Some small positive changes that CMO B implemented included reducing the number of indicators on their rubric and changing the merit-based pay from bonuses to salaries. This decision helped to decrease teachers' workload. Instead of preparing lessons that incorporated 30 indicators, teachers only had to prepare for 10. Additionally, eliminating the lesson planning component decreased the amount of pre-work that teachers were expected to complete, allowing the evaluation lessons to be more like everyday lessons. This practice reduced the workload for teachers, helping to support their morale and keeping them at their school sites. In the original Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation evaluation initiative, teachers were earning bonuses based on their ratings from the evaluation system, but now the year after

the evaluation, teachers would see a change in their salary. CMO B made this decision, increasing the amount of money that teachers received on a yearly basis. Although teachers were happy about this decision, the amount of money that teachers received has little impact on their overall morale at their school site. CMO B also ensured that teachers' salaries could only go up and never decrease based on ratings. Teachers mentioned that this decision made them feel less stress about their yearly income, ultimately leading to decreased levels of burnout.

The teachers at CMO C, who have become fully unionized since the initial implementation of the evaluation, feel like they have more of a voice in regard to their evaluation systems. Working with the union, CMO C teachers have been able to eliminate merit-based pay as a factor of the evaluation system. Having a union has increased teachers' morale at CMO C. They feel as if they have a place where they can voice their opinions and their beliefs are taken into account. CMO C has also added more low-stakes informal observations as a way of better supporting teachers for their formal observations. Administrators complete these informal observations and provide teachers with bite-sized feedback. This change has also decreased teacher burnout. Teachers no longer feel like they only have one high-stakes evaluation in which they need to produce the perfect lesson. Since the observations are happening on a weekly basis, they are an authentic way for teachers to receive feedback on their practice. The evaluation systems have also become differentiated for newer and more experienced teachers. New teachers are observed more informally and have a once a year formal observation. In contrast, more experienced teachers who have proven to be effective in the classroom based on past evaluation scores may be allowed to defer their yearly formal observation. This decision to differentiate feedback based on teacher experience has also benefited teachers' workload. Teachers who have proven themselves to be effective are not expected to prepare for a formal

observation every year. They have an opportunity to work on their own practice in their classroom without experiencing the burnout caused by frequent evaluations.

The CMO A evaluation system has the most changes from the original Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation evaluation system. Some of the elements of the evaluation system that CMO A has continued to use include having teachers identify their own gaps and create goals. These goals are created by both the teacher and the administrator and are addressed over the course of the year. Teachers from CMO A mentioned that these changes came about because the CMO gave a platform for teachers to communicate their own opinions of the evaluation system and make changes. Through these platforms, CMO A altered the evaluation system in order to enhance teacher morale and decrease their overall workload. CMO A was also the first of the three CMOs to do away with merit-based pay, based on recommendations from teachers. Teachers consistently felt that CMO A listened to their issues regarding the evaluation system and made changes, ultimately leading to increased morale. These differences at all three of the CMOs helped to lay the foundation for teachers' perceptions of their specific CMO's evaluation system and its connection to morale and burnout.

Teachers' perceptions of the evaluation system. Teachers at all CMOs communicated the importance of having clear expectations, teacher ownership, and quality of the evaluation as essential aspects of their evaluation systems. Teachers felt a decrease in morale and an increase in burnout when their administrators and evaluation systems were unclear. It is important for teachers to have a clear understanding of not only the evaluation but also what is expected from them. This is especially true since there seemed to be different expectations from administrators and school sites. When teachers had an administrator who was able to offer this sense of clarity, they had a better experience with the evaluation system as a whole. This finding is consistent

with the research regarding the importance of clear and objective standards for teacher evaluations (Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Goe & Croft, 2009; MET, 2013; Pianta & Hamre, 2009). This research also emphasizes the importance of training evaluators on the system in order to ensure consistency in the implementation of the evaluation system. Teachers who were interviewed in this study had a wide experience of clear expectations from their evaluator and CMO. The CMO B teachers had high expectations from their CMO and their evaluation. There was a connection between this expected clarity and the importance of the evaluation. For example, CMO B uses merit-based pay and conducts hiring/firing based on their evaluations. CMO A teachers had the lowest expectations in regards to clarity. Their system overall had teachers choose their own goals. Teachers indicated that they chose goals that were easy for them to meet. Also, at CMO A, teachers mentioned that the evaluation system was rarely used for hiring and firing. Leithwood et al. (1999) spoke about the increased work and stress that teachers experience when they have high stakes evaluations, which I found consistently throughout my research. The teachers from CMO B seemed to talk about increased burnout and low morale that came as a product of their merit-based pay system.

Teachers at all three CMOs expressed that they wanted to play an active role in their evaluation systems. It was important to teachers to be were able to collaborate with their administrators in regard to their development. Teachers who were able to identify their own gaps and create plans to grow their own practice experienced higher levels of motivation and commitment, which Chang (2009) suggested are major factors that contribute to lower levels of burnout. When teachers feel motivated and committed to their work, they will experience higher levels of morale and are more likely to stay at their school sites.

For all the teachers who were interviewed, it was important the evaluation system did not come off as compliance-based and evaluative, but rather effective at enhancing teacher practice to promote student outcomes. The evaluative aspects of the evaluation system contributed to the stress that teachers felt, which is a known contributor to burnout (Smylie, 1999). Teachers also mentioned feeling exhausted throughout the evaluation process, especially when they were asked to complete extra work that they did not normally complete. Lüleci and Çoruk (2018) also found that this increased level of exhaustion can lead to higher levels of burnout and lower levels of morale.

The influence of teacher evaluation system over morale and retention. Throughout the interviews, participants mentioned lower morale and increased burnout felt by both teachers and administrators in regard to the pressure of the evaluation system. They disliked the aspects of the evaluation system that kept educators from being able to make decisions that are best for their students. Teachers voiced that they had become overwhelmed by their evaluations, and some teachers even became emotional during the process. There was an expectation that teachers had to perform on the date of their evaluation, and if they were unable to, they were labeled as ineffective teachers. They experienced burnout and exhaustion from their job as a result of factors like stress and workload (Demorouti et al., 2001). High stakes evaluation systems involve extra work and stress for teachers (Leithwood et al., 1999), and thus these systems could be an additional factor contributing to low morale and burnout. Teachers also mentioned the amount of additional pre-work required through the evaluation process. This extra work caused teachers to feel burnout, especially since they were doing extra work just for the evaluation rather than to enhance their students' learning. Consistent with the research by Johnson et al. (2012), administrators at CMOs that implemented merit-based pay also described

the pressure that they felt during the evaluation. They felt a large amount of responsibility to give teachers high scores so that the teachers could be paid a higher salary.

The administrators and teachers stressed that the evaluations can be "a dog and pony show" rather than a true representation of teachers practice in the classroom. If evaluation systems are not consistent, objective, and useful, then their use will lower morale among effective teachers, thereby increasing the likelihood that these teachers will leave their school sites (Pratt & Booker, 2014). Teachers mentioned that they had to create lesson plans using a template for their administrators before their observation. These templates increased the amount of time that teachers had to prepare for their evaluation systems, ultimately leading to higher levels of burnout. Especially since teachers were only using these templates for the evaluation process, they contributed to the "dog and pony show" aspects of the evaluation, leading to lower levels of morale. Teachers also noted that there were certain lessons that a teacher could implement in the classroom in order to receive a higher score on the evaluations such as Socratic seminars. This led to lower levels of morale because teachers felt they needed to change their teaching practices in order to receive better scores. Some teachers mentioned that an evaluation came at the beginning of a unit where a Socratic seminar didn't make sense, and teachers would choose to review a previous unit during their evaluation so they could implement a Socratic seminar. Teachers who decided to move to the next unit would receive lower scores because they could not teach the type of lesson that would score well on the rubric. Again, teachers felt like they were unable to make decisions that would increase student learning, but were forced to make decisions to score well on their evaluation, lowering their morale. Additionally, the increased workload, which had no real positive impact on teacher practice except on the day of the evaluation, led to increased burnout.

Characteristics of teacher evaluation systems that explain differences observed in teacher morale and burnout. Leadership capacity is one of the main factors influencing teacher retention (Kouzes & Posner, 2010). In a study by Brown and Wynn (2009), the relationship between retention and principals' behavior was studied and factors such as being accessible, establishing trust with teachers, and being proactive were identified as characteristics that would lead to teacher retention. The way that leaders implement their evaluation system at their school site will have an effect on how teachers respond to the evaluation system. Administrators who implemented the evaluation without any flexibility had teachers with lower levels of morale. Administrators who proved to be more flexible made leadership decisions such as changing the date of the evaluation to observe a lesson that better corresponds to the rubric, identifying strong practices in the classroom that are not necessarily outlined in the rubric. and using flexibility when rating teachers using the rubric.

All of the teachers interviewed who had a negative perception of their administrators' capacity spoke about having a negative relationship with the evaluation system. Teachers who had a positive perception of their administrator had a positive relationship with the evaluation system. They spoke to the fact that other schools and teachers had a negative relationship with the evaluation system because of their administrator's perceived incompetence. This finding shows that teachers' perceptions of their evaluation systems were also a direct reflection of their administrators' perceived leadership capacity.

Teachers described administrators who were unable to grow their teaching capacity with the use of the evaluation system, decreased their levels of morale, and heightened their levels of burnout. When teachers implemented the evaluation system and it felt like a compliance piece rather than a way to develop a teacher practice, it became frustrating for teachers and felt like an

additional task on top of their already heavy workload. If teachers are unable to see the benefit of teacher evaluation systems, then it will lower their morale and investment in the evaluation process. With the additional requirements of the evaluation system, teachers will feel burned out without seeing any positive impacts on student learning.

Three teachers mentioned that administrators developed stronger relationships with teachers who scored the best on the evaluation, causing others to feel left out of the community. This encouraged a culture of competition rather than collaboration. This competitive culture can cause lower morale if teachers do not feel like they are performing well on the evaluation. Teachers may also feel an increased level of burnout because they are unable to collaborate with their peers and have the added pressure of performing at a high level on their evaluations.

Merit-based pay continued to be a factor that negatively affected teacher and administrator opinions of the evaluation system. Teachers mentioned that the increased stress they felt when their evaluation systems was connected to their pay. CMOs that continue to have merit-based pay as a factor of their evaluation system will see a decrease in their teachers' morale. However, CMO B's change to only allow teachers to go up in salary will help to reduce the lowered morale that they experienced when implementing merit-based pay. CMOs that eliminated merit-based pay listened to their teachers' voices about its negative effects. Although the initial result of merit-based pay worked to lower morale, eliminating merit-based pay helped to restore the CMO's levels of morale.

Teachers and administrators under merit-based pay discussed their evaluations as high-stakes. Because teachers' salaries were determined by their performance on the evaluation, teachers felt more stress and an increased workload, which is consistent with the research by Leithwood et al. (1999). Teachers were encouraged to have more "dog and pony show"

observations rather than showing their authentic teaching practice during an evaluation. Teachers spoke about how they had to complete more work for their evaluation in order to ensure that they incorporated all aspects of their CMO's rubric. This increased work caused the teacher to feel more burnt out and have a morale.

Significance of Findings

A few aspects of this research have the potential for making a meaningful contribution to our knowledge of teacher evaluation systems and their impact on teacher school experiences, professional morale and burnout, and teacher retention. Teacher evaluation systems were put into place to evaluate teacher practice and maintain effective teachers in the classroom. However, it is important to note that certain factors within the teacher evaluation system can be working against its own original intention, and could be causing higher rates of burnout and lower rates of morale. Because we know that higher rates of burnout and lower rates of morale cause a reduction in retention rates (Pratt & Booker, 2014), we can infer that certain aspects of the evaluation system could be causing teachers to leave their school sites and the profession. Specifically, if the goal of merit-based pay is to ultimately retain effective teachers in the classroom by paying effective teachers more money, it is important that CMOs and school sites are aware of the negative aspects of these merit-based pay initiatives.

Consistently in the findings, teachers and administrators distinguished between a compliance-based and formative focus in evaluation systems. When teachers felt the evaluation system was focused on compliance, they found it difficult to invest in the process and eventually tended to feel overworked and burnt out. These teachers did not feel that the evaluation system had a positive impact on their classroom and ultimately student learning. Conversely, teachers were more engaged when they perceived the evaluation system as focused on allowing them to

grow their practice and enhance student learning: a formative focused evaluation. They consistently mentioned that they wanted to grow their practice and be the best teachers for their students; however, they did not necessarily believe that the compliance evaluation system was the structure in which they would be able to achieve those results. From my own experience as a teacher under one of these evaluation systems, I felt there was a lack of consistency in the quality of coaching I received from my evaluators. Some were very clear regarding best practices that they wanted to see in my classroom and quick to share strong instructional practices that worked in their own classrooms. Others had little content knowledge about what I was teaching and had very little to offer in terms of feedback. As an evaluator, I know my coaching became stronger and clearer as I gained experience in classrooms. My coaching was weaker in classrooms where I lacked content knowledge. When I lacked content knowledge, I struggled to give specific feedback or offer my own experiences.

Another issue that arose from this study is the impact of leaders on an individual campus. Teachers mentioned that how their leaders implemented the evaluation system had a drastic effect on how their teachers felt about the system. Teachers who responded positively to the evaluation system mentioned that there was a level of transparency, enhanced collaboration with other teachers and administrators, and perceived competency from their administrator. The teachers who spoke of negative experiences with their evaluation system mentioned a lack of trust with their administrator, lack of consistency between coaches, and the creation of a competitive atmosphere. Although much research has focused on the importance of leadership, there is little consensus around the specific characteristics of leaders that affect teacher retention (Glynn & Raffaelli, 2010). However, it is clear that teachers' perceptions of their principal have a great impact on their views regarding evaluation systems and the contributions to their overall

levels of morale and burnout. My findings relate to research from Kouzes and Posner (2010) showing that principal behavior and leadership style influence teacher retention, as well as Brown and Wynn's (2009) findings of leadership factors contributing to retention (accessibility, trust, and proactivity).

Recommendations for CMOs and School Leadership Teams

My study highlights themes that may help CMOs and school sites assess the potential impact that their evaluation systems have on the levels of morale and burnout of their teachers. By understanding elements that can contribute to lowered levels of morale and higher levels of burnout, schools could avoid potentially losing effective teachers in the process.

As CMOs and school communities work to enhance the quality of teacher practice through the use of teacher evaluation systems, there should be an effort not only by the school communities but also the CMOs to monitor their teachers' level of morale and burnout. Because the CMOs generally implement system-wide evaluations, they should encourage their school site leaders to make changes to aspects of the evaluation system to support their individual school site. In this section, I discuss a few recommendations for both CMOs and school site leadership derived from this project that could be beneficial for enhancing teacher practice, increasing morale, and decreasing burnout.

Recommendation #1: Eliminate merit-based pay. The research of Leithwood et al. (1999) and others (Demorouti et al., 2001; Govindarajan, 2012; Lüleci & Çoruk, 2018) suggests that high-stakes evaluation systems involve extra work and stress for teachers. The majority of teachers in this study reported experiencing a heightened level of stress because their evaluations dictated their salaries. Because of the burnout caused by merit-based pay, teachers ultimately thought about leaving their school site, and some actually left their school site or the profession

altogether. Teachers also believe that merit-based pay caused the evaluations to feel much more focused on compliance than on improving teacher practice. This sentiment was also echoed at the administrative level. Compliance-focused evaluation systems created incentives for teachers to perform "dog and pony shows," rather than make thoughtful decisions to benefit deeper student understanding of the content.

Throughout the interviews, merit-based pay proved to be a major topic of contention for teachers. Teachers also felt it contributed significantly to their workload. The possibility that salaries could change from year to year based on an evaluation gave some teachers an overwhelming sense of stress. My own experience as a teacher under this system corroborates these reports; I felt a heightened sense of stress and anxiety when completing my evaluations. As a teacher under the evaluation system, I quickly improved my practice and generally benefited from the evaluation system's merit-based pay. With this improvement came a lot of stress and burnout that ultimately encouraged me to take an administrative position within my CMO. To a certain extent, I do feel like the stress that came with the evaluation system was productive and perhaps even appropriate. As an administrator now, I see teachers feeling similarly when going through the evaluation system. If CMOs are able to manage the stress that teachers experience through the evaluation cycle while still enhancing teacher practice at a quick rate, they will be able to maintain the teachers they have developed.

As an administrator under the evaluation system, I have assigned teachers scores that were higher and lower than their day-to-day average levels of teaching. I am very aware that there are teachers who put on a "dog and pony show" and these teachers generally receive inflated scores. I have also seen teachers who have a consistently strong practice in the classroom try a different way of teaching or teach a lesson at the beginning of a unit where their

scores are ultimately lower than it might be their day-to-day practice. Knowing that teachers' scores and ultimately their salary has decreased because they took a risk or taught content that was ideal for the rubric is not a consequence teachers should face.

In order to avoid evaluation systems feeling like inauthentic, burdensome, and stressful assessments of practice, CMOs should consider eliminating the use of merit-based pay systems. If administrators are not able to record authentic samples of practice from their teachers during the evaluation, they could potentially be rewarding and penalizing teachers on an evaluation that does not represent their day-to-day practice. Eliminating merit-based pay can help encourage teachers to perform using their typical day-to-day practice during their evaluation. However, it is important to note that eliminating merit-based pay is not the only possibility for receiving more authentic evaluations. Some of the issues of bias and error that are discussed can also be eliminated by not announcing the observation time and visiting classrooms more often. Changing these aspects of the evaluation system would make it difficult for teachers to create lessons that are not typical of day-to-day practice. At CMO B, teachers believed their teaching practice felt more authentic when they were evaluated four times per year rather than just once per year. Moreover, from the perspective of formative evaluation, allowing administrators to collect accurate evaluation data from their teachers will ultimately provide them with what they need to enhance their practice. Merit-based pay in conjunction with limited classroom visits and resources can get in the way of teachers working to develop their teaching practice, which can ultimately influence the level of instruction that is given to students. Although, I personally had a good experience as a teacher with merit-based pay, weighing the pros and cons, I still conclude and recommend that systems should eliminate merit-based pay.

Recommendation #2: Focus systems on improving teacher practice. Educators are being increasingly scrutinized and held to rigorous standards and constant oversight. Teachers are assessed and evaluated in greater frequency and depth than ever before (MET, 2013). The primary focus of all evaluation systems is to improve teaching practice. As the pressure continues from state and federal governments to enhance teacher performance in the context of a continuing teacher shortage (Doherty & Jacobs, 2013), it is important that CMOs and school sites look to enhance teacher practice. Throughout the interviews I conducted, teachers communicated that they appreciated being coached by their administrator. Some teachers mentioned being coached as frequently as once a week in order to improve their practice. Teachers would rather have coaching sessions frequently than have a formal observation a few times a year. This practice will also help teachers to receive feedback on authentic classroom practice rather than perform the "dog and pony show" in once a year observations. Teachers will consistently receive coaching and be able to improve their practice without feeling the lowering of morale and increased burnout that may come as a result of teacher evaluations.

As mentioned previously, teachers prefer evaluation systems focused broadly on enhancing their teaching practices, as opposed to a narrower compliance focus. When teachers felt the evaluation system was just "checking off boxes," they became burnt out and overwhelmed. They also perceived a disconnect between the work they were required to complete and the impact of this work on student achievement. Teachers who had positive experiences with the evaluation system mentioned that the system was able to improve their practice.

As a teacher, I had experiences where I felt the evaluation was focused on compliance, but also others where I was able to grow my practice tremendously. The former led to

frustration; in fact, I felt as though my practice was declining as I focused on different aspects of the evaluation that I knew would help me score well. I was not making decisions in the best interest of my students, but rather choices that would enhance my evaluation score. As I was placed with different coaches, I focused more on growing my practice rather than on compliance. I took more risks, incorporating feedback from my coach, and was able to try different practices with my students. These changes occurred as my CMO moved to four formal evaluations over the course of the year and weekly formative observations. The increase in observations caused me to look at my authentic practices and make realistic decisions that would enhance student learning. Because my coach was in my classroom so frequently, they had a strong understanding of my practice. This understanding allowed my coach to give me effective and actionable feedback. I also perceived my coach to be competent in his own teaching abilities and believed he had the capacity to grow my teaching practice.

Administrators should focus on acting as coaches to help enhance their teachers' practice rather than creating a culture of compliance with the evaluation. If teachers are being coached on a weekly basis and supported through their development, they will grow their capacity without the negative effects of increased burnout and lowered morale. Teachers will not feel as if they are constantly being assessed, but instead will feel supported in the practice in order to enhance instruction for students. This will happen when teachers are constantly being assessed and merit-based pay is eliminated as a component of the evaluation system.

Recommendation #3: Flexibility with evaluation systems based on school and student needs. School sites need to feel free to differentiate the rubric and the evaluation system for their individual needs. One teacher who was interviewed mentioned that the evaluation system may not make sense for a school that has a negative culture. An evaluation system may

not be the solution for a school that struggles with student attendance, where students have no relationships with or trust in any of their teachers. This school may need to focus on building a strong relationship between students and their teachers before they can begin thinking about enhancing teacher practice.

Administrators need to be flexible when using the rubric and evaluating teachers. Not every indicator may make sense for every classroom. Administrators also need to have a deep understanding of their student populations and use the evaluation rubric as a tool. For example, one of the standards on the rubric may relate to creating a classroom/community culture of learning. In order to receive a 4, the highest score on the rubric, there has to be evidence that students assume responsibility or take initiative for producing high quality work and holding themselves and each other to high standards of performance. Administrators need to understand that this standard should and will not look the same in a 12th grade AP English class as it does in ninth-grade math support class. This is especially true if an observation is taking place in October when teachers have not had enough time to set up their classrooms to have a true impact on student learning. This was a sentiment that was shared by teachers and administrators across all three CMOs.

Although teachers should have a level of clarity in regard to what strong classrooms look like, it may look different working with their specific classes and students. If administrators are unable to differentiate the evaluation for their students and staff, teachers may feel like their administrator is unable to lead effectively. Some examples of differentiation may include having teachers focus on specific indicators, rather than the whole rubric. These indicators may be identified as areas that, when improved, will have a large impact on student learning. Administrators may even set different expectations from the rubric based on individual students,

grade levels, and contents. For example, when I taught a ninth grade math support class, there were individual students who had IEPs (Individualized Education Plans) and other students who had negative relationships with math. Some of these students were allowed to get up during class and go get water. Other students were able to ask for a 5 minute break if they became frustrated with the math content. Because of this, there were times in my classroom where the classroom expectations sections of the evaluation would have produced low scores. Generally, classrooms that score strongly in behavior management have 100% of their students engaged in the content. However, because my administrator and I worked together to create these plans for the best interest of our students, the expectations for strong classroom expectations were individualized for my specific classroom. Differentiating the evaluation allowed me as a teacher to make decisions that were in the best interest of my students rather than making decisions to score well on the rubric. Because my evaluator knew my students and coached me consistently, he understood what strong classroom expectations looked like in my classroom.

As a teacher, my administrator told me that a strong level of practice could still result in a 3 score because of the grade level of the students and the specific needs of the class. Although I naturally strive for the highest scores, it made sense to me that my classroom may have specific needs that aren't identified as a 4 on the rubric. This practice allowed me to strive for 3s instead of 4s in some areas on the rubric, which had a specific impact for me and my students.

Recommendation #4: Administrators need strong contextualized knowledge and frequent observations. For administrators that are evaluators, it is important to be clear with individual teachers about what strong practice in the classroom looks like. Administrators need to talk with their teachers about the individual CMO or district rubric. All the teachers in this study who thought their administrator was clear about expectations also reported having positive

experiences (e.g., feeling confident, transparent process, ability to be successful on the evaluation) with the evaluation system. For every aspect of instruction assessed with the rubric, it is important that the evaluator is able to provide strong examples of practice. If an evaluator is assessing a teacher on academic discourse, it is important to provide different structures to help support academic discourse (e.g., "turn and talks" or group work.) The administrator should then work with the teacher on a weekly basis with these structures to ensure that the teacher is able to implement them with quality. Just because a teacher implements a "turn and talk" does not necessarily mean that there is high level academic discourse happening in the classroom. The teacher and the administrator need to discuss what strong quality looks like, considering the time of year, grade level, etc., and how frequently these practices should be happening in the classroom.

As a teacher under the evaluation system, the best experience I had with an evaluator took place when I was given clear expectations with regards to the evaluation rubric. He was able to transparent about the evaluation process because he understood what strong instruction looked like in a classroom. My evaluator was also in my classroom frequently, which allowed him to give me specific, targeted, and individualized feedback that strengthened my classroom. He sat with me and was very clear about what he wanted to see in my classroom. My evaluator would then come into my classroom and give me one targeted piece of feedback based on my implementation of the practice. I felt clear on how to improve, and also felt I had a coach to support me. That year, I was able to grow my practice more than any other year.

Recommendation #5: CMOs need to develop evaluators capacity to coach and evaluate. As a teacher and an evaluator, I can speak to the lack of consistency from one evaluator to another. As a teacher, it was challenging every year when my administrator would

change, to understand the new expectations of my new evaluator. My scores across indicators were never consistent among different evaluators. Although I learned different practices from different evaluators, I experienced higher burnout and lower morale because I lacked consistency in the evaluation. Conversely, as one of four administrators who evaluated teachers on my school site, I frequently heard teachers complain about the lack of consistency across evaluators. Teachers would also mention that they received certain scores from previous evaluators on specific classroom practices and were not seeing similar scores from me. This lack of consistency frustrated teachers and caused them to be less invested in the process, ultimately hurting morale and increasing teacher burnout.

It is important that all evaluators are competent in their ability to coach and effectively rate teachers' practices. Teachers throughout the study mentioned that teachers who an evaluator perceived as incompetent inhibited those teachers' ability to improve. Because of this, all evaluators in a CMO or district should be calibrated regarding what strong teaching practice looks like. Before administrators are able to evaluate teachers, they should be expected to watch a video of a teacher and evaluate the teacher's performance using the CMO or district rubric. This assessment should demonstrate there is a clear understanding of what strong practice looks like in the classroom across school sites. Principals also need to provide a diverse set of evaluators on campus. The evaluators should have different academic backgrounds including teaching math, English, history, etc. In this way, schools can intentionally place administrators to coach teachers in their own content areas.

It is also important that evaluators are calibrated on their own school sites. Throughout the study, teachers indicated that there was a lack of consistency among evaluators, causing teachers to feel burned out and show lowered morale. An earlier recommendation spoke to the

importance of evaluators being flexible and making decisions regarding the evaluation that made sense for their teachers. It is important that individual schools are calibrated regarding what strong teaching practice looks like at their individual school sites. Evaluators on a campus should complete walk-throughs where they are expected to evaluate teachers across the school site together. Then they will be able to have conversations with one another regarding the practices that they saw in the classroom, which will help the evaluators understand the ways in which other administrators on their campus are evaluating. These calibrations will also eliminate the differences that teachers see from evaluator to evaluator.

Study Limitations

Because little research has been conducted on the effects of teacher evaluation systems on morale, burnout, and retention, this study offers some preliminary data in our overall understanding of the effects of teacher evaluation on these important indicators. This study found some consistent findings across the three CMOs and their evaluation systems. Because of these findings, we can conclude that some factors within the evaluation system can lead to the lowering of morale and increasing burnout. Even with this correlation, there are limitations that should be noted.

One of the limitations of qualitative research is the inability to generalize findings to a broader population. This study included former teachers, current teachers, and administrators at three different CMOs in Los Angeles in order to gain a diverse perspective of teachers' experiences at different charter school networks. However, teachers who experience widely different evaluation systems, belong to a traditional public-school district, or serve students who are vastly different from the students identified in this study may have different experiences with their evaluation systems. Because the sample size in this study is closely aligned with the overall

demographics for charter school teachers in Los Angeles, we can assume that the teachers and administrators interviewed in the study are representative of charter school teachers within Los Angeles.

The teachers and administrators who were chosen to be a part of this interview were identified by their network's superintendents. Because of this, superintendents chose teachers and administrators who were higher performing and "fit in" with the specific network. These teachers would be more likely to have positive experiences with the evaluation systems because of their relationships with administrators and their ability to score well on the evaluation. If teachers were chosen that did not perform well on the evaluations, there may have been more responses to the research questions. There is also a limitation in my research that comes as a result of me being an assistant principal within one of the CMOs. Due to this circumstance, I have my own views on the evaluation systems because I was a teacher and administrator using one of the teacher evaluation systems. Although I was aware of my own bias throughout the research, this bias needs to be acknowledged. I believe evaluation systems can be used to enhance teacher practice. From my own experience, the evaluation system provided me with clear expectations regarding teacher practice. Although I was able to grow my practice tremendously, certain aspects of the evaluation system caused me to feel overworked and less enthusiastic about my work. Although I appreciate the aspects of the evaluation that helped me grow my practice, I was inspired to complete research that identified the aspects of the evaluation system that did not contribute to teachers' positive development. I believe in consistent coaching from administrators but do not really have an opinion regarding merit-based pay. As a teacher who was able to benefit from merit-based pay, I appreciated the extra money I received from what felt like my hard work. I also believe that leaders who are able to implement

evaluation systems as a method of improving teacher practice rather than hiring/firing purposes will make growing teacher practice a more positive experience. Additionally, because I had worked with CMO B, I felt the teachers and administrators I interviewed were more comfortable talking to me about their evaluation system. Because I was an outsider to both CMO A and CMO C, participants were more hesitant to speak about their evaluation systems.

Recommendations for Future Research

Pratt and Booker (2014) suggested that researchers should continue to explore the relationship between teacher evaluation systems and teacher retention as a whole. Although this study was able to interview teachers and administrators within three different CMOs in Los Angeles, it would be beneficial to continue this research throughout different cities and systems. It would be helpful to look at the impacts of evaluation systems with morale and burnout in school districts rather than just CMOs. The opportunity also exists to collect quantitative data showing the impact of evaluation scores and retention rates at different school sites, CMOs, and districts. This qualitative data would shed additional light on the ways in which evaluation systems and merit-based pay are helping (or not helping) to keep effective teachers in the classroom. Since it is important for evaluation systems to both enhance teacher practice and maintain strong teachers in the classroom, more research with CMOs and districts that have been able to effectively grow teacher practice and retain effective teachers would be helpful.

Johnson and Birkeland's noteworthy 2003 study found that teachers were more likely to remain at their school sites if they received greater support in improving their practices. Future research may want to investigate the systems that are set up at different districts and CMOs that enhance teacher practice. The structures that are put into place to develop teacher practice may also have an effect on a teacher's willingness to stay at his/her school site. Robertson-Kraft and

Zhang (2018) also discussed the variation of retention across school sites in regard to their teacher evaluation system. It is important to identify both individual and school characteristics that affect teacher experiences and influence their retention. Understanding this, it may be interesting to study different leaders and their use of the evaluation system in connection with the retention rates that they experience.

This study illuminates some of the challenges with the evaluation system at different CMOs. However, school sites and CMOs can do a great deal to be proactive about their work with teachers, as outlined in the recommendations section. In particular, they can use the evaluation to enhance teacher performance rather than as a tool for hiring and firing. If teachers are receiving coaching and feedback from their administrators and feel they are bettering their practice for their students, they may not experience as much burnout and low morale.

APPENDIX A

THE COLLEGE-READY PROMISE FRAMEWORK FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING RUBRIC (USED IN BILL AND MELINDA GATES FOUNDATION EVALUATION SYSTEM, CMO A, AND CMO B)

Domain 1: Data-Driven Planning & Assessment				
Standard	**Level I**	**Level II**	**Level III**	**Level IV**
1.1 Establish standards-based learning objectives and assessments	**A. Selection of learning objectives**			
	Learning objective(s) are missing a specific level of cognition or content. AND Learning objective(s) are misaligned with progress toward mastery of content standards.	Learning objective(s) are missing either a specific level of cognition or content. OR Learning objective(s) are misaligned with progress toward mastery of content standards.	Learning objective(s) include both a specific level of cognition and content. AND Learning objective(s) are aligned to and progress toward mastery of content standards.	*All of level 3 and...* Learning objective(s) exceed level of cognitive demand required by content standards.
	B. Measurability of learning objectives			
	Proving behavior does not measure the independent mastery of the learning objective(s).	Proving behavior measures the independent mastery of the learning objective(s). AND Proving behavior uses only general criteria for measuring success.	Proving behavior measures the independent mastery of the learning objective(s). AND Proving behavior includes specific criteria (quantitative or qualitative) for measuring success.	*All of level 3 and...* Independent mastery of the proving behavior is measured by multiple methods.
1.2 Organize instructional plans to promote standards-based, cognitively engaging learning for students	**A. Designing and sequencing of learning experiences**			
	The design of the learning experiences is not aligned to the learning objective(s). AND Learning experiences are not sequenced to enable students to demonstrate independent mastery of the learning objective(s) through the gradual release of responsibility.	The design of the learning experiences is not aligned to the learning objective(s). OR Learning experiences are not sequenced to enable students to demonstrate independent mastery of the learning objective(s) through the gradual release of responsibility.	The design of the learning experiences is aligned to the learning objective(s). AND The design of the learning experiences is sequenced to enable students to demonstrate independent mastery of the learning objective(s) through the gradual release of responsibility.	All of level 3 and… The design of the learning experiences is differentiated to meet the needs of subgroups of students.
	B. Creating cognitively engaging learning experiences for students			
	Instructional plans do not provide opportunity for cognitively engaging earning experiences at students' various ZPD levels throughout the lesson cycle.	The teacher inconsistently plans cognitively engaging learning experiences at students' various ZPD levels throughout the lesson cycle. OR Instructional plans include cognitively engaging learning experiences at students' various ZPD levels but without appropriate time and support throughout the lesson cycle.	Instructional plans include cognitively engaging learning experiences at students' various ZPD levels throughout the lesson cycle and each learning experience provides appropriate time and support.	*All of level 3 and...* All of level 3 and… Instructional plans provide differentiated cognitively engaging learning experiences at students' various ZPD levels for subgroups of students.
1.3 Use student data to guide planning	**A. Lesson design guided by data**			
	The teacher does not use student data to guide or inform planning.	The teacher uses student data to inform planning of content organization ***or*** instructional strategies. OR The teacher uses student data to inform planning that meets the needs of the whole class.	The teacher uses student data to inform planning of content organization ***and*** instructional strategies. AND The teacher uses student data to inform planning that meets the needs of subgroups of students.	*All of level 3 and...* The teacher cites instructional strategies to meet the needs of individual students.
1.4 Use knowledge of subject matter content/skills and learning processes to plan for student learning	**A. Knowledge of subject matter to identify pre-requisite knowledge & skills**			
	The teacher does not accurately identify or address the prerequisite knowledge and skills to achieve the standard/learning objective(s). OR The teacher does not include opportunities to activate prerequisite knowledge. OR The teacher does not include strategies to address potential gaps for whole class of students.	The teacher identifies some prerequisite knowledge and skills to achieve the standard/learning objective(s), but key prerequisite knowledge may not be identified. OR The teacher includes opportunities to activate prerequisite knowledge. AND The teacher includes strategies to address potential gaps for the whole class of students.	The teacher accurately identifies the prerequisite knowledge and skills to achieve the standard/learning objective(s). AND The teacher includes opportunities to activate prerequisite knowledge. AND The teacher includes strategies to address potential gaps for subgroups of students.	*All of level 3 and...* The teacher includes strategies to address potential gaps for individual students.
	B. Addresses common content misconceptions			
	The teacher does not anticipate common student misconceptions and does not include strategies to ensure students	The teacher anticipates common student content misconceptions ***but does not*** include strategies to ensure	The teacher anticipates common student misconceptions ***and*** includes strategies that ensure students	*All of level 3 and...* The teacher includes opportunities for

	recognize and address these misconceptions to master the standard/learning objective(s).	students recognize and address these misconceptions to master the standard/learning objective(s).	recognize and address these misconceptions to master the standard/learning objective(s).	students to uncover and correct their own additional misconceptions.

1.5 Design assessments to ensure student mastery	**A. Selection and progression of formative assessments**			
	Formative assessments are not aligned to the learning objective(s). OR Formative assessments are not planned.	The formative assessments are inconsistently aligned to the learning objective(s). OR Formative assessments do not yield actionable data. OR Formative assessments are planned for a single component of the lesson cycle.	Different types of formative assessments are selected to yield actionable data about progress toward mastery of the learning objective(s). AND Formative assessments are planned for different components of the lesson cycle, progressing toward student mastery of the learning objective(s).	*All of level 3 and…* The formative assessments are differentiated to yield actionable data about subgroups of students.
	B. Planned response to assessment data			
	The teacher has not planned to adjust instruction based on the data from formative assessments.	The teacher inconsistently plans to adjust instruction based on the data from formative assessments.	The teacher plans to adjust instruction based on the data from each formative assessment.	*All of level 3 and…* The teacher plans include strategies that will be used with student subgroups defined by different levels of performance on each formative assessment.
	C. Self-Monitoring			
	The teacher does not plan for students to engage in self-monitoring of their own progress or thinking.	The teacher's plan includes limited opportunities for self-monitor their progress or thinking.	The teacher plans self-monitoring exercises with clear criteria for students to assess their progress toward deeper mastery of the objective(s).	The teacher plans student self-evaluation exercises with clear standards-aligned rubrics or criteria. AND The teacher describes protocols for students to set goals based on the results of the evaluation exercises.

Domain 2: Classroom Learning Environment				
Standard	**Level I**	**Level II**	**Level III**	**Level IV**
2.1 Creates a classroom/community culture of learning				**A. Value of effort and challenge**
	The teacher's words and actions provide little or no encouragement for academic learning or convey low expectations for student effort. Students do not consistently persist in completing assigned work.	The teacher's words and actions emphasize compliance and completion of work. Students seek to complete **tasks** without consistent focus on learning or persistence toward quality work.	The teacher's words and actions promote belief in student ability and high expectations for student effort. Students consistently expend effort **to learn** and persist in producing high quality work.	*All of level 3 and...* Students assume responsibility or take initiative for producing high quality work, holding themselves, and each other, to high standards of performance.
2.2 Manage student behavior through clear expectations and a balance of positive reinforcement, feedback, and redirection				**A. Behavioral expectations**
	It is evident that the teacher did not teach standards for student behavior. OR Student behavior does not contribute to an academic environment.	The teacher inconsistently communicates standards for student behavior. OR Student behavior inconsistently contributes to an academic environment.	The teacher consistently communicates clear, high standards for student behavior. AND Student behavior consistently contributes to an academic environment.	The teacher has established clear, high standards for student behavior. Without being prompted, students articulate or demonstrate high behavioral expectations that support the classroom's academic environment.
				B. Response to behavior
	The teacher does not respond to misbehavior when necessary, or the response is repressive or disrespectful of student dignity.	The teacher's verbal or non-verbal response to student behavior is inconsistent. OR Teacher's verbal or non-verbal response is focused on the whole-class. OR Teacher emphasizes consequences over positive reinforcement.	The teacher's verbal or non-verbal response to student behavior is consistent, respectful, proactive, and includes redirection, feedback or positive reinforcement to specific students.	Classroom exhibits no need for teachers or students to redirect negative behavior. OR Students appropriately respond to, redirect, provide feedback, or provide positive reinforcement to each other's behavior.
2.3 Establish a culture of respect and rapport which supports students' emotional safety				**A. Interactions between teacher and students**
	The teacher's interactions with some students are negative, demeaning, or inappropriate to the age and needs of the students in the class. OR Students exhibit disrespect for the teacher.	The teacher's interactions with students inconsistently demonstrate respect and positivity; are inconsistently appropriate for the age and needs of students; or inconsistently support student growth. OR Students inconsistently exhibit respect for the teacher.	The teacher's interactions with students are respectful, positive, and appropriate for the age and needs of the students and support student growth. AND Students exhibit respect for the teacher.	*All of level 3 and…* The teacher's interactions demonstrate a positive rapport with individual students.
				B. Student interactions with each other
	Student interactions are impolite and disrespectful, which interferes with learning for some students.	Student interactions are generally polite and respectful, but students do not support each other's learning.	Student interactions are polite and respectful, and students support each other's learning.	*All of level 3 and...* Students encourage each other individually.
2.4 Use smooth and efficient transitions, routines, and procedures				**A. Routines, procedures, and transitions**
	The teacher has not established or does not implement routines, procedures, and transitions, resulting in a loss of instructional time.	The teacher has established some routines, procedures, and transitions; however, some may be missing or inconsistently implemented, resulting in the loss of instructional time.	The teacher has established and implements routines, procedures, and transitions that maximize instructional time.	*All of level 3 and...* With minimal prompting, students effectively facilitate some routines, procedures, and transitions.

Domain 3: Instruction				
Standard	**Level I**	**Level II**	**Level III**	**Level IV**
3.1 Communicate learning objectives to students	**A. Communication of the learning objectives of the lesson**			
	The teacher does not explain the learning objective(s).	The teacher explains the college-ready learning objective(s) but does not refer to the objective(s) throughout the lesson. OR Students cannot articulate what they are expected to learn.	The teacher explains the college-ready learning objective(s) and refers back to it throughout the lesson. AND The teacher explains the relevance of the learning objective(s) to college-readiness. AND Students are able to articulate what they are expected to learn.	*All of level 3 and...* Students are able to articulate the relevance of the college-ready learning objective(s) within or outside of the discipline.
	B. Connections to prior and future learning experiences			
	The teacher does not make connections between current learning objective(s) and the students' prior or future learning.	The teacher makes connections between the current learning objective(s) and the students' prior ***or*** future learning. OR The teacher makes connections to prior ***and*** future learning but the connections are vague or based on connections to assessments and grades.	The teacher makes connections between the current learning objective(s) and the students' prior ***and*** future learning to further student understanding of the content material.	The teacher facilitates as students build connections between the current learning objective(s) and their prior ***and*** future learning.
	C. Criteria for success			
	The teacher does not mention criteria for successfully demonstrating attainment of the learning objective(s).	The teacher mentions but does not clearly explain the criteria for successfully demonstrating attainment of the learning objective(s). OR Students are unable to articulate the criteria for successfully demonstrating attainment of the learning objective(s).	The teacher clearly articulates the criteria for successfully demonstrating attainment of the lesson objective(s). AND Students are able to articulate the criteria for successfully demonstrating attainment of the learning objective(s).	*All of level 3 and...* The teacher solicits student discussion to define or affirm the criteria for successfully demonstrating attainment of the learning objective(s).
3.2 Facilitates Instructional Cycle	**A. Executes lesson cycle**			
	The teacher executes a lesson cycle that is inappropriately paced. AND The teacher does not execute a lesson cycle that gradually releases responsibility.	The teacher executes a lesson cycle that is inappropriately paced. OR The teacher does not execute a lesson cycle that gradually releases responsibility.	The teacher executes an appropriately paced lesson cycle that gradually releases responsibility so that students can independently master the learning objective(s).	*All of level 3 and...* To address the needs of subgroups or an individual student, the teacher adapts pacing or the release of responsibility.
	B. Cognitive Level of Student Learning Experiences			
	Learning experiences are not cognitively engaging (at students' various ZPD levels). OR Learning experiences do not match the level of rigor required to attain mastery of the standard/learning objective(s).	Some learning experiences are cognitively engaging (at students' various ZPD levels). OR Some learning experiences match the level of rigor required to attain mastery of the standard/learning objective(s).	Learning experiences throughout the lesson cycle are cognitively engaging (at students' various ZPD levels). AND Learning experiences consistently match the level of rigor required to attain mastery of the standard/learning objective(s).	*All of level 3 and...* Learning experiences require student thinking that exceeds the level of cognition or increases the level of challenge required by the standard/learning objective(s).
3.3 Implementation of instructional strategies	**A. Questioning**			
	The teacher poses few questions to students. OR The teacher does not scaffold questions toward cognitive challenge and mastery of the learning objective(s). OR Wait time is not used.	The teacher poses questions to a small number of students in the class. OR The teacher inconsistently scaffolds questions toward cognitive challenge and mastery of the learning objective(s). OR Wait time is used inconsistently	The teacher poses questions to a wide range of students that are scaffolded toward cognitive challenge and mastery of the learning objective(s). AND The teacher uses strategies to enable students to correctly answer questions and extend or justify their thinking. AND Wait time is used consistently	*All of Level 3 and…* Students pose questions that require cognitive challenge. OR Students initiate questions to further their own or other students' understanding of the content.
	B. Academic Discourse			
	The teacher does not require students to use academic vocabulary, discuss academic ideas, or justify their reasoning. OR	The teacher inconsistently requires students in whole class or small group conversations to use academic vocabulary, discuss academic ideas, ***or*** justify their reasoning.	The teacher facilitates conversations in whole class and small group settings that require all students to consistently use academic vocabulary, discuss	Students facilitate whole class or small group conversations and consistently use academic vocabulary, discuss academic ideas, ***and*** justify their reasoning.

	The teacher provides minimal opportunities for student discussion.	OR Academic discourse is limited to a small number of students.	academic ideas, ***and*** justify their reasoning.	

	C. Group structures			
	The structure and size of grouping arrangements do not move students toward mastery of the learning objective(s).	The structure and size of grouping arrangements inconsistently move students toward mastery of the learning objective(s). OR Students inconsistently participate within all group structures.	The structure and size of grouping arrangements move students toward mastery of the learning objective(s). AND Students actively participate within all group structures.	*All of level 3 and...* Students support each other to work through challenging activities and hold themselves and each other accountable for individual or group work that leads to mastery of the learning objective.
	D. Resources and instructional materials			
	Resources and instructional materials are unsuitable to the lesson objective(s), distract from or interfere with student learning, or do not promote cognitive engagement.	Resources and instructional materials are partially suitable to the lesson objective(s). Resources and materials only partially promote cognitive engagement.	Resources and instructional materials are suitable to the lesson objective(s), support attainment of the learning objective(s), and promote cognitive engagement.	*All of level 3 and...* Students choose, adapt, or create materials to extend learning.
3.4 Monitoring student learning during instruction	**A. Checking for understanding and adjusting instruction**			
	The teacher does not check for students' understanding of the learning objectives during the lesson. OR The teacher does not adjust instruction based on the data.	The teacher inconsistently checks for understanding throughout the lesson cycle. OR The checks do not yield actionable data on students' progress toward the learning objective(s). OR The teacher inconsistently or ineffectively adjusts instruction based on the data.	The teacher checks for understanding using different techniques throughout the lesson cycle to yield actionable data on students' progress toward mastery of the learning objective(s). AND The teacher adjusts whole-class instruction based on the data to meet students' learning needs as necessary.	*All of level 3 and...* The teacher implements differentiated instruction and continued checks for understanding based on the progress of individual students or subgroups toward mastery of the learning objective(s).
	B. Feedback to students			
	The teacher does not provide feedback to students. OR Feedback does not advance students toward mastery of the learning objective(s).	The teacher provides feedback but not throughout the lesson cycle. OR Feedback inconsistently advances students toward attainment of the learning objective(s).	The teacher provides feedback throughout the lesson cycle that is specific and timely. AND Feedback consistently advances students toward attainment of the learning objective(s).	*All of level 3 and...* Students provide specific feedback to one another.

Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities				
Standard	**Level I**	**Level II**	**Level III**	**Level IV**
4.1 Engage in critical reflection, constantly revising practice to increase effectiveness	**A. Accuracy**			
	The teacher does not know the degree to which a lesson was effective or achieved its instructional goals, or profoundly misjudges the success of a lesson.	The teacher has a somewhat accurate impression of a lesson's effectiveness and success in meeting the instructional goals.	The teacher makes an accurate assessment of a lesson's effectiveness and success in meeting the instructional goals, citing general data to support the judgment.	*All of level 3 and…* The teacher cites specific data, and weighs the relative strengths of each data source.
	B. Use in future planning			
	The teacher does not make suggestions for how the lesson could be improved.	The teacher makes specific suggestions about how the lesson could be improved OR how the teacher's practice can be improved in future lessons.	The teacher makes specific suggestions about how the lesson could be improved AND How the teacher's practice can be improved in future lessons.	*All of level 3 and…* The teacher predicts how the improvements will advance student learning in future lessons.
	C. Acceptance of feedback			
	The teacher is resistant to feedback from supervisors or colleagues and/or does not use the feedback to improve practice.	The teacher accepts feedback from supervisors and colleagues but may/may not use the feedback to improve practice.	The teacher welcomes feedback from supervisors and colleagues and uses the feedback to improve practice.	*All of level 3 and…* The teacher proactively seeks feedback on what has been implemented.
4.2 Engage in collaborative relationships with peers to learn and share best practices and ensure continuity in student learning	**A. Participation in a professional community**			
	The teacher avoids participating in the professional community activities or has strained relationships with colleagues that negatively impact the learning community.	The teacher participates in professional community activities as required, maintaining cordial relationships with colleagues.	The teacher actively participates in the professional community by developing positive and productive professional relationships with colleagues.	*All of level 3 and…* The teacher assumes appropriate leadership roles and promoting positive and professional relationships
	B. Professional development			
	The teacher resists applying learning gained from professional development activities, and does not share knowledge with colleagues.	The teacher applies learning gained from professional development activities, and makes limited contributions to others or the profession.	The teacher welcomes professional development opportunities and applies the learning gained to practice based on an individual assessment of need. The teacher willingly shares expertise with others.	*All of level 3 and…* The teacher seeks out professional development opportunities and initiates activities that contribute to the profession.
	C. Shared commitment			
	The teacher demonstrates little commitment to supporting shared agreements that support student learning.	The teacher adheres to shared agreements that support student learning.	The teacher contributes to and actively endorses shared agreements that support student learning.	*All of level 3 and…* The teacher assumes a leadership role in contributing to, endorsing and encouraging others to embrace the shared agreements that support student learning.
4.3 Uphold and exhibit the CMO norms and expectations	**A. Ethics and professionalism**			
	The teacher has little sense of ethics and professionalism, and contributes to practices that put adult interests ahead of students.	The teacher displays a moderate level of ethics and professionalism in dealing with colleagues.	The teacher displays a high level of ethics and professionalism in dealings with both colleagues and students.	*All of level 3 and…* The teacher consistently works to support traditionally underserved students.
	B. Norms described by school/CMO handbooks			
	The teacher inconsistently complies with school and CMO policies and timelines.	The teacher complies with school and CMO policies and timelines, doing just enough to "get by."	The teacher fully supports and complies with school and CMO policies and timelines.	*All of level 3 and…* The teacher assumes a leadership role in modeling school and CMO policies and timelines and encourages others to support them.
4.4 Develop two-way communication with families about student learning and achievement	**A. Initiation of meaningful communication**			
	The teacher provides minimal information to parents about individual students, and/or the communication is inappropriate to the cultures of the families.	The teacher adheres to the school's required procedures for communicating with families with an awareness of cultural norms	The teacher initiates communication with parents about students' progress on a regular basis, respecting cultural norms.	*All of level 3 and…* Students contribute to the design implementation of the parent communication system.
	B. Responsiveness to parent inquiries and communication			
	The teacher does not respond, or regularly responds insensitively to parent concerns about students.	The teacher responds to parent concerns in a superficial or cursory manner, or responses may reflect occasional insensitivity	The teacher responds to parent concerns in a timely and culturally respectful manner.	*All of level 3 and…* The teacher handles parent communication with professional and cultural sensitivity.
	C. Inclusion of the family as a partner in learning decisions			
	The teacher makes no attempt to engage families in the instructional program, or such efforts are inappropriate.	The teacher makes modest and partially successful attempts to engage families in the instructional program.	The teacher's efforts to engage families in the instructional program are frequent and successful.	*All of level 3 and…* Students contribute ideas for projects that will be enhanced by family participation.

APPENDIX B

EVALUATION RUBRIC FOR CMO C

Standard 1: Maintain high expectations ***Guiding Question: Does the classroom foster an environment conducive to enthusiastic learning?***			
Level 1	**Level 2**	**Level 3**	**Level 4**
A. High Expectations			
The teacher conveys low expectations for scholar effort and achievement. Few or no scholars follow behavioral expectations and directions.	The teacher inconsistently conveys high expectations for scholar effort and achievement. Some scholars follow behavioral expectations and directions.	The teacher consistently conveys high expectations for scholar effort and achievement. Most scholars follow behavioral expectations and directions.	The teacher consistently conveys high expectations for scholar effort and achievement and scholars convey high expectations for each other. All or almost all scholars follow behavioral expectations and directions.
B. Positive and proactive response to behavior			
The teacher's verbal and non-verbal response to behavior is disrespectful of scholar dignity. The teacher does not respond to scholar misbehavior.	The teacher's verbal and non-verbal response to behavior is inconsistent, reactive, or if applicable, does not adhere to the scholar's individual support plan. The teacher's response emphasizes consequences over positive reinforcement.	The teacher's verbal and non-verbal response to behavior is consistent, respectful, proactive and, if applicable, adheres to the scholar's individual support plan. The teacher's response emphasizes redirection, feedback or positive reinforcement to either the whole-class and/or specific scholars, as appropriate.	The teacher's verbal and non-verbal response to behavior is consistent, respectful, proactive and, if applicable, adheres to the scholar's individual support plan. Scholars are empowered to take ownership of classroom expectations and the classroom exhibits little to no need for the teacher to redirect behavior.
Standard 2: Maximize instructional time ***Guiding Question: Are all scholars engaged in the work of the lesson from start to finish?***			
Level 1	**Level 2**	**Level 3**	**Level 4**
Scholars do not execute routines, procedures and transitions in an orderly or time-efficient manner, or are not supported as needed per their individual support plan, even when redirected by the teacher. Scholars are left without work to do for a significant portion of the class period. The class has a slow pace and instructional time is not used efficiently.	Scholars inconsistently execute routines, procedures and transitions in an orderly or time-efficient manner, or are not supported as needed per their individual support plan, requiring significant direction and/or redirection from the teacher. Scholars are idle while waiting for the teacher or left with nothing to do for one or two minutes at a time.	Scholars consistently execute routines, procedures and transitions in an orderly and time-efficient manner, or execute routines per their individual support plan, although some initial direction may be required from the teacher. Scholars are engaged in the work of the lesson from start to finish and are idle for only short periods of time (less than one minute).	Scholars hold each other accountable for executing routines, procedures, and transitions in an orderly and time-efficient manner, or execute routines per their individual support plan. The teacher maximizes the amount of time devoted to each component of the lesson, and scholars are engaged in the work of the lesson from start to finish. If applicable, scholars finishing assigned work early are engaged in meaningful learning that is aligned to lesson objectives.

Standard 3: Align lesson objectives, grade-level content standards, and engage scholars in challenging learning experiences *Guiding Question: Are all scholars working with content aligned to the appropriate standards for their subject and grade?*			
Level 1	**Level 2**	**Level 3**	**Level 4**
A. Content aligned to standards			
The lesson, including the lesson objective, does not focus on content and learning experiences (e.g., texts, questions, problems, exercises, assessments) that advance scholars toward grade-level content standards. Few scholars can access grade-level content.	The lesson, including the lesson objective, partially focuses on content and learning experiences (e.g., texts, questions, problems, exercises, assessments) that advance scholars toward grade-level content standards. Some scholars, including only some English Learners and special needs scholars, can access grade level content through integration of language supports and IEP accommodations.	The lesson, including the lesson objective, focuses on content and learning experiences (e.g., texts, questions, problems, exercises, assessments) that advance scholars toward grade-level content standards. Most scholars, including most English Learners and special needs scholars, can access grade level content through integration of language supports and IEP accommodations.	The lesson, including the lesson objective, focuses on content and learning experiences (e.g., texts, questions, problems, exercises, assessments) that are differentiated so individual scholars and/or subgroups of scholars advance toward grade-level content standards. All or almost all scholars can access grade level content through integration of language supports and IEP accommodations.
B. Criteria for successfully demonstrating attainment of the learning objectives			
Few scholars are clear about the specific criteria that will be used to evaluate their individual performance for successfully demonstrating attainment of the learning objectives. Few scholars use the criteria for success to evaluate their own or other's performance through peer or self-evaluation.	Some scholars are clear about the specific criteria that will be used to evaluate their individual performance for successfully demonstrating attainment of the learning objectives. Some scholars use the criteria for success to evaluate their own or other's performance through peer or self-evaluation.	Most scholars are clear about the specific criteria that will be used to evaluate their individual performance for successfully demonstrating attainment of the learning objectives. Most scholars use the criteria for success to evaluate their own or other's performance through peer or self-evaluation.	All or almost all scholars are clear about the specific criteria that will be used to evaluate their individual performance for successfully demonstrating attainment of the learning objectives. All or almost all scholars use the criteria for success to evaluate their own or other's performance through peer or self-evaluation, and self-advocate for what they need to succeed.

Standard 4: Foster scholar to scholar interactions *Guiding Question: Does the academic discussion deepen all scholars' understanding of the content?*			
Level 1	**Level 2**	**Level 3**	**Level 4**
A. Engage scholars' curiosity through challenging questioning			
The teacher poses few challenging questions or poses challenging questions to only a few scholars. Questions do not support scholars in achieving learning objectives.	The teacher poses challenging questions, but to only some scholars. Questions are inconsistently sequenced to support scholars in achieving learning objectives.	The teacher poses challenging questions, ensuring most scholars participate in asking and responding to questions, including challenging questions to and from their peers. Questions are strategically sequenced to support scholars in achieving learning objectives and require scholars to justify their reasoning.	The teacher poses challenging questions, ensuring that almost all scholars enthusiastically ask and respond to questions, including challenging questions to and from their peers. Questions are strategically sequenced to support scholars in achieving learning objectives and require scholars to justify their reasoning.
B. Promote scholar-to-scholar interactions through academic discourse			
Scholars are not required to use academic vocabulary and discuss academic ideas. Few scholars respond to and build on their peers' thinking, ideas or answers, or they respond negatively to their peers' thinking, ideas, or answers.	Scholars inconsistently use academic vocabulary and discuss academic ideas. Some scholars respond to and build on their peers' thinking, ideas or answers, or their responses lack meaningful evidence to justify their reasoning.	Scholars consistently use academic vocabulary and discuss academic ideas. Most scholars respond to and build on their peers' thinking, ideas or answers, and they provide meaningful evidence to justify their reasoning.	Scholars facilitate conversations that consistently use academic vocabulary and discuss academic ideas. All or almost all scholars respond to and build on their peers' thinking, ideas, or answers, and they provide meaningful evidence to justify their reasoning. Scholars synthesize diverse viewpoints from peers and other sources.
Standard 5: Empower scholars to do the "heavy lifting" of the cognitive learning experience ***Guiding Question: Are all scholars responsible for doing the thinking in this classroom?***			
Level 1	**Level 2**	**Level 3**	**Level 4**
Scholars do very little of the cognitive work during the lesson (reading, writing, discussing, analyzing, computing, or problem solving). Very few or no scholars produce meaningful evidence (academic writing, discussion using academic language) to support their thinking. Few scholars grapple with complex ideas or persist when the academic work is challenging.	Only the teacher or some scholars complete the cognitive work of the lesson, (reading, writing, discussion, analysis, computation, or problem solving). Some scholars produce meaningful evidence (academic writing, discussion using academic language) to support their thinking, or do so at only one or two points during the lesson. Some scholars grapple with complex ideas or persist when the academic work is challenging.	Most scholars complete most of the cognitive work during the lesson (reading, writing, discussing, analyzing, computing, or problem solving). Most scholars produce meaningful evidence (academic writing, discussion using academic language) to support their thinking throughout the lesson. Most scholars grapple with complex ideas and persist even when the academic work is challenging.	All or almost all scholars complete most of the cognitive work during the lesson (reading, writing, discussing, analyzing, computing, or problem solving). All or almost all scholars produce meaningful evidence (academic writing, discussion using academic language) to support their thinking throughout the lesson. All or almost all scholars enthusiastically grapple with complex ideas and persist even when the academic work is challenging. Scholars celebrate peer success and persistence in the face of challenging content.

Standard 6: Challenge scholars to demonstrate learning *Guiding Question: Do all scholars demonstrate that they are learning throughout the lesson?*			
Level 1	**Level 2**	**Level 3**	**Level 4**
A. Feedback for scholar growth			
The teacher's feedback is limited or general and is not differentiated to support individual scholars in achieving learning objectives. Few scholars provide feedback to one another or monitor their progress.	The teacher's feedback is inconsistent and minimally supports individual scholars in achieving learning objectives. Some scholars provide feedback to one another or monitor their progress effectively.	The teacher's feedback is specific, timely, and consistently advances individual scholars towards mastery of the learning objective. Most scholars provide feedback to one another and monitor their progress effectively.	The teacher's feedback is specific, timely, and consistently advances individual scholars towards mastery of the learning objective. All or almost all scholars provide useful feedback to one another and monitor their progress effectively.
B. Assess and respond to the progress of scholars' learning			
Questions, tasks or assessments do not yield data that allow the teacher to assess scholars' progress toward learning objectives and the data is not used to adjust instruction or address scholars' needs. Scholar responses, work, and interactions demonstrate that most scholars are not on track to achieve the learning objectives.	Questions, tasks or assessments yield data that only partially allow the teacher to assess scholars' progress toward learning objectives, or the data is only used at one or two points during a lesson to adjust instruction and address individual scholars' needs. Scholar responses, work, and interactions demonstrate that some scholars are on track to achieve the learning objectives.	Questions, tasks or assessments yield data that allow the teacher to assess scholars' progress toward learning objectives and the data is used throughout the lesson to adjust instruction and address scholars' needs. Scholar responses, work, and interactions throughout the lesson demonstrate that most scholars are on track to achieve the learning objectives.	Questions, tasks or assessments yield data that allow the teacher to assess scholars' progress toward learning objectives and the data is used throughout the lesson to adjust instruction and address individual scholars' needs. Scholar responses, work, and interactions throughout the lesson demonstrate that almost all scholars are on track to achieve learning objectives.

APPENDIX C

PROTOCOLS FOR CURRENT TEACHERS

1. Tell me about yourself.

1. What is your name?

2. What race(s)/ethnicity(ies) do you most identify with?

3. What is your age?

4. What languages do you speak?

5. What specific credentials do you hold?

6. What is your experience in education?

a) How long have you been teaching?

b) How long have you been at this school site?

c) What grades and subjects do you teach (And have taught in the past?)

d) What previous positions have you held? What other sites have you previously worked at?

2. Tell me about the system of teacher evaluation in your school organization

1. Knowledge of the system:

a) What are the components of evaluations and/or steps involved?

b) Do you know how the system and individual instruments were developed? (Follow up: Who was involved in creating the system? Were teachers' part of the development of the instruments?)

c) Are you familiar with the contents and intended uses of each instrument? (observation rubric, student and teacher survey)

2. Individual results/impact:

a) What were the most recent results or ratings you obtained in the evaluation? Have these ratings changed from previous cycles?

b) Have you received feedback, coaching, or other resources or support as part, or a result of the evaluation?

c) In your own experience with the evaluation system: what have been some positive effects on your practice or performance? How did these effects come about?

d) Has the evaluation system had any negative effects on your practice or performance? How did these effects come about?

3. What do you perceive as the benefits of teacher evaluation systems, in general and at your school?

4. What do you perceive as the detriments of teacher evaluation systems, in general and at your school?

5. Does the evaluation system affect in any way the culture of the school? (Effects may be positive or negative, direct or indirect)

6. Let's talk about teacher morale in your school. For this interview, morale will be defined as the emotional and spiritual sense that a person feels about his/her job

7. How would you describe your morale as a teacher working in this school?

1. How would you describe the morale of teachers on your campus?

a) What sorts of things decrease your morale or the morale of other teachers on your campus?

b) What factors increase sour morale of the morale of other teachers on your campus?

i.(Follow up. You mentioned problems with morale. Have those issues made you consider leaving this school or the teaching profession?)

2. What changes (if any) would you make to the design, components, or use of the teacher evaluation system, and why?

APPENDIX D

PROTOCOLS FOR FORMER TEACHERS

1. Tell me about yourself.

1. What is your name?

2. What race(s)/ethnicity(ies) do you most identify with?

3. What is your age?

4. What languages do you speak?

5. What specific credentials do you hold?

6. What is your experience in education?

a) How long have you been teaching for? (If you are not currently teaching: how long did you teach for?)

b) How long have you been at this school site? (If you are not currently teaching: how long have you been out of teaching for?)

c) What grades do you teach (And have taught in the past?)

d) What previous positions have you held? What other sites have you previously worked at?

2. Tell me about your former teacher evaluation system when you were at CMO C/CMO A/Alliance

1. Knowledge of the system:

a) What were the components of evaluations and/or steps involved?

b) Were you familiar with the content and intended uses of each instrument?

c) Did you know how the system was developed?

d) Did you know how the individual instruments were developed (observation rubric, student and teacher survey?) (Follow up: Who was involved in creating the system? Were teachers' part of the development of the instruments?

2. Individual results/impact:

a) What were the last results or ratings you obtained in the evaluation? Have did those ratings change from previous cycles?

b) Did you receive feedback, coaching, or other resources or support as part or as a result of the evaluation?

c) In your own experience with the evaluation system: what were some of positive effects on your practice or performance? (and how did these effects come about?)

d) Did the evaluation system had any negative effects on your practice or performance, and how did these effects come about?

3. What do you perceive as the benefits of teacher evaluation systems at your former school?

4. What do you perceive as the detriments of teacher evaluation systems at your former school?

5. Let's talk generally about morale

3. How would you have described the morale of teachers on your campus?

a. What sorts of things decreased teacher morale on your campus?

b. What factors increased teacher morale on your campus?

c. How did the evaluation system affect the culture of the school?

i.(Follow up 4. So, you mentioned problems with morale. Did those issues cause you to leave this school or the teaching profession?)

6. Is the teacher evaluation system at your current position different than at your CMO C/CMO A/Alliance school site? In what ways is it better/worse?

7. What changes (if any) would you like to see made to the design, components, or use of the teacher evaluation system at your previous CMO C/CMO A/Alliance school site?

APPENDIX E

PROTOCOLS FOR ADMINISTRATORS

1. Tell me about yourself.

1. What is your name?

2. What race(s)/ethnicity(ies) do you most identify with?

3. What is your age?

4. What languages do you speak?

5. What specific credentials do you hold?

6. What is your experience in education?

a) How long did you teach for?

b) How long have you been an administrator?

c) How long have you been at this school site?

d) What grades did you teach in the past?

e) What previous positions have you held? What other sites have you previously worked at?

f) If you are no longer at your former CMO, what were your reasons for leaving?

2. Tell me about the system of teacher evaluation in your school organization

1. Knowledge of the system:

a) What are the components of evaluations and/or steps involved?

b) Are you familiar with the content and intended uses of each instrument?

c) Do you know how the system was developed?

d) Do you know how the individual instruments were developed (observation rubric, student and teacher survey?) (Follow up: Who was involved in creating the system? Were teachers' part of the development of the instruments?)

e) Describe the implementation of the evaluation system at your school site.

2. Individual results/impact:

a) In generally, what were the most recent results or ratings you gave teachers on the evaluation? Has this generality of ratings changed from previous cycles?

b) What is your role in feedback, coaching, or support as part or as a result of the evaluation system?

c) From your own experience with the evaluation system: what have been some positive effects on your teachers practice or performance, and how did these effects come about?

d) Has the evaluation system had any negative effects on your teachers practice or performance, and how did these effects come about?

e) Has the evaluation system had any positive effects on your ability to be an administrator?

f) Has the evaluation system had any negative effects on your ability to be an administrator?

3. What do you perceive as the benefits of teacher evaluation systems at your school?

4. What do you perceive as the detriments of teacher evaluation systems at your school?

8. Let's talk generally about morale

4. How would you describe the morale of teachers on your campus?

a) What sorts of things decrease teacher morale on your campus?

b) What factors increase teacher morale on your campus?

c) How does the evaluation system affect the culture of the school?

(Follow up 4. So, you mentioned problems with morale. Do you believe those issues have made teachers think about leaving this school or the teaching profession?)

5. Were you a teacher under your CMO's teacher evaluation system? Do you think your experience as a teacher under the evaluation system affects your ability to evaluate other teachers? If so, how? If not, why not?

6. What changes (if any) would you like to see made to the design, components, or use of the teacher evaluation system?

REFERENCES

Aaronson, D., Barrow, L., & Sander, W. (2007). Teachers and student achievement in the Chicago public schools. *Journal of Labor Economics, 25*, 95–135. https://doi.org/10.1086/508733

Achinstein, B., Ogawa, R. T., Sexton, D., & Freitas, C. (2010). Retaining teachers of color: A pressing problem and a potential strategy for "hard-to-staff" schools. *Review of Educational Research, 80*(1), 71–107. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654309355994

Allensworth, E., Ponisciak, S., & Mazzeo, C. (2009). *The schools teachers leave: Teacher mobility in Chicago Public Schools*. Chicago, IL: Consortium on Chicago School Research - University of Chicago.

Alliance for Excellent Education. (2008). *What keeps good teachers in the classroom? Understanding and reducing teacher turnover*. Retrieved from http://www.all4ed.org/files/TeachTurn.pdf

Arizona Department of Education. (2015). *Educator retention and recruitment report*. Phoenix, AZ: Author.

Baker, E. L., Barton, P. E., Darling-Hammond, L., Haertel, E., Ladd, H. F., Linn, R. L., Shepard, L. A. (2010, August). *Problems with the use of student test scores to evaluate teachers* (Briefing Paper No. 278). Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute.

Balu, R., Beteille, T., & Loeb, S. (2009-2010). Examining teacher turnover: The role of school leadership. *Politique Americaine, 15*, 55–79. https://doi.org/10.3917/polam.015.0055

Barnes, G., Crowe, E., & Schaefer, B. (2008). *The cost of teacher turnover in five school districts: A pilot study*. Arlington, VA: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.

Berry, B., & Fuller, E. (2007). *Teaching and learning conditions in Ohio: Implications for supply and demand. Final report.* Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED514989

Bickmore, D. L., & Dowell, M. M. S. (2018). Understanding teacher turnover in two charter schools: principal dispositions and practices. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 22*(4), 387-405. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2018.1481528

Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. (2011). *Learning about teaching: Initial findings from the Measures of Effective Teaching project*. Bellevue, WA: Author. Retrieved from http://www.gatesfoundation.org/college-ready-education/Documents/preliminary-findings-research-paper.pdf

Blasé, J. J. (1982). A social–psychological grounded theory of teacher stress and burnout. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 18*(4), 93-113. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161x82018004008

Borman, G. D., & Dowling, N. M. (2008). Teacher attrition and retention: A meta-analytic and narrative review of the research. *Review of Educational Research, 78*(3), 367–409. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654308321455

Boyd, D., Grossman, P., Ing, M., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2011). The influence of school administrators on teacher retention decisions. *American Educational Research Journal, 48*(2), 303–333. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831210380788

Boyd, D., Grossman, P., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2006). How changes in entry requirements alter the teacher workforce and affect student achievement. *Education Finance and Policy, 1*(2), 176–216. https://doi.org/10.3386/w11844

Boyd, D., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2005). Explaining the short careers of high-achieving teachers in schools with low-performing students. *The American Economic Review, 95*(2), 166–171. https://doi.org/10.1257/000282805774669628

Brown, K. M., & Wynn, S. R. (2007). Teacher retention issues: How some principals are supporting and keeping new teachers. *Journal of School Leadership, 17,* 664-698. https://doi.org/10.1177/105268460701700601

Brown, K. M., & Wynn, S. R. (2009). Finding, supporting, and keeping: The role of the principal in teacher retention. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 8*(1), 37–63. https://doi.org/10.1080/ 15700760701817371

Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. L. (2002). *Trust in schools: A core resource for school reform*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Bryk, A. S., Sebring, P. B., Allensworth, E., Easton, J. Q., & Luppescu, S. (2010). *Organizing schools for improvement: Lessons from Chicago*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Bulkley, K., & Fisler, J. (2003). A decade of charter schools: From theory to practice. *Educational Policy, 17*(3), 317-342. https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904803017003002

Carlo, A., Michel, A., Chabanne, J. C., Bucheton, D., Demougin, P., Gordon, J., ... Valette, S. (2013). *Study on policy measures to improve the attractiveness of the teaching profession in Europe*. Retrieved from https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00922139/document

Carroll, S., Reichardt, R., Guarino, C., & Mejia, A. (2000). *The distribution of teachers among California's school districts and schools.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND. Retrieved from http://www.rand.org/pubs/monograph_reports/MR1298z0

Chang, M. L. (2009). An appraisal perspective of teacher burnout: Examining the emotional work of teachers. *Educational Psychology Review, 21*(3), 193-218. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-009-9106-y

Clotfelter, C. T., Ladd, H. F., & Vigdor, J. L. (2011). Teacher mobility, school segregation, and pay-based policies to level the playing field. *Education Finance and Policy, 6*(3), 399–438. https://doi.org/10.1162/edfp_a_00040

Clotfelter, C. T., Ladd, H. F., Vigdor, J. L., & Wheeler, J. (2007). High-poverty schools and the distribution of teachers and principals. *North Carolina Law Review, 85,* 1345-1380. https://doi.org/10.1037/e722752011-001

Danielson, C., & McGreal, T. L. (2000). *Teacher evaluation to enhance professional practice.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Dee, T. S., & Wyckoff, J. (2015). Incentives, selection, and teacher performance: Evidence from IMPACT. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 34*(2), 267-297. https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.21818

Demorouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands–resources model of burnout. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 86,* 499–512. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499

Doherty, K., & Jacobs, S. (2013). *Connect the dots: Using evaluations of teacher effectiveness to inform policy and practice*. Washington, DC: National Council on Teacher Quality.

EdSource. (2009). *California's charter schools: 2009 update on issues and performance*. Retrieved from http://www.edsource.org/pub_CharterPerf6-09.html

Elfers, A. M., Plecki, M. L., & Knapp, M. S. (2006). Teacher mobility: Looking more closely at "the movers" within a state system. *Peabody Journal of Education, 81*(3), 94–127. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327930pje8103_4

Evans, L. (2000). The effects of educational change on morale, job satisfaction and motivation. *Journal of Educational Change, 1*(2), 173-192.

Fuller, E. J., Pendola, A., & Young, M. D. (2018). *The role of principals in reducing teacher turnover and the shortage of teachers* (Policy Brief 2018-2). Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED580347

Geiger, T., & Pivovarova, M. (2018). The effects of working conditions on teacher retention. *Teachers and Teaching*, *24*(6), 604-625. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2018.1457524

Gerald, D. E., & Hussar, W. J. (1998). *Projections of education statistics to 2008.* Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Glynn, M. A., & Raffaelli, R. (2010). Uncovering mechanisms of theory development in an academic field: Lessons from leadership research. *Academy of Management Annals*, *4*(1), 359–401. https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520.2010.495530

Goe, L., & Croft, A. (2009). *Methods of evaluating teacher effectiveness*. Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.

Goldhaber, D., & Cowan, J. (2014). Excavating the teacher pipeline: Teacher preparation programs and teacher attrition. *Journal of Teacher Education, 65*(5), 449–462. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487114542516

Goldring, R., Taie, S., Riddles, M., & Owens, C. (2014). *Teacher attrition and mobility: Results from the 2012–13 teacher follow-up survey* (NCES 2014–077). Washington, DC: National Center of Education Statistics.

Govindarajan, K. (2012). Teachers morale. *International Journal of Behavioral Social and Movement Sciences, 1*(2) 57-61.

Grissom, J. A. (2011). Can good principals keep teachers in disadvantaged schools? Linking principal effectiveness to teacher satisfaction and turnover in hard-to-staff environments. *Teachers College Record, 113*(11), 2552–2585.

Guin, K. (2004). Chronic teacher turnover in urban elementary schools. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 12*(42), 1–30. https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v12n42.2004

Hakanen, J. J., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). Burnout and work engagement among teachers. *Journal of School Psychology, 43*(6), 495–513. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2005.11.001

Hanushek, E. A. (2011). Valuing teachers: How much is a good teacher worth. *Education Next, 11*(3), 40-45.

Hanushek, E. A., Kain, J. F., & Rivkin, S. G. (2004). Why public schools lose teachers. *Journal of Human Resources, 39*(2), 326–354. https://doi.org/10.3368/jhr.xxxix.2.326

Hemphill, C., & Nauer, K. (2009). *The new marketplace: How small-school reforms and school choice have reshaped New York City's high schools*. New York, NY: Center for New York City Affairs, The New School for Management and Urban Policy.

Henig, J. R., Holyoke, T. T., Brown, H., & Lacireno-Paquet, N. (2005). The influence of founder type on charter school structures and operations. *American Journal of Education, 111*(4), 487-522. https://doi.org/10.1086/431181

Henke, R. R., Chen, X., & Geis, S. (2000). *Progress through the teacher pipeline: 1992–93 college graduates and elementary/secondary school teaching as of 1997*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Holstein, J. A., & Gubrium, J. F. (1995). *The active interview*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Ingersoll, R. (2003). *Is there really a teacher shortage?* Washington, DC: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.

Ingersoll, R. (2012). Beginning teacher induction what the data tell us. *Phi Delta Kappan, 93*(8), 47–51. https://doi.org/10.1177/003172171209300811

Ingersoll, R. M. (2001a). *A different approach to solving the teacher shortage problem* (Teaching Quality Policy Brief No. 3). Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, University of Washington.

Ingersoll, R. M. (2001b). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis. *American Educational Research Journal, 38*(3), 499–534. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312038003499

Ingersoll, R. M. (2004). Four myths about America's teacher quality problem. In M. Smylie & D.Miretzky (Eds.), *Developing the teacher workforce: The 103rd yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 1–33). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Ingersoll, R. M., & May, H. (2011). *Recruitment, retention and the minority teacher shortage* [Research report]. Retrieved from https://repository.upenn.edu/gse_pubs/226/

Ingersoll, R. M., & Merrill, L. (2012). *Seven trends: The transformation of the teaching force*. Retrieved from http://www.cpre.org/sites/default/files/workingpapers/1464_seventrendsupdatedoctober2013.pdf

Jacob, A., Vidyarthi, E., & Carroll, K. (2012a). *The irreplaceables: Understanding the real retention crisis in America's urban schools*. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED533959

Jacob, A., Vidyarthi, E., & Carroll, K. (2012b). *Keeping irreplaceables in D.C. Public Schools*. Brooklyn, NY: The New Teacher Project.

Johnson, S. M. (2006). *The workplace matters: Teacher quality, retention and effectiveness.* Washington, DC: National Education Association

Johnson, S. M., Berg, J. H., & Donaldson, M. L. (2005). *Who stays in teaching and why? A review of the literature on teacher retention*. Cambridge, MA: The Project on the Next Generation of Teachers, Harvard Graduate School of Education.

Johnson, S. M., & Birkeland, S. E. (2003). Pursuing a "sense of success:" New teachers explain their career decisions. *American Educational Research Journal, 40*(3), 581-617. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312040003581

Johnson, S. M., Kraft, M. A., & Papay, J. P. (2012). How context matters in high-need schools: The effects of teachers' low morale and burnout on their professional satisfaction and their students' achievement. *Teachers College Record, 114*(10), 1-39

Kimball, S. M., & Milanowski, A. (2009). Examining teacher evaluation validity and leadership decision making within a standards-based evaluation system. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 45*(1), 34–70. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X08327549

Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (2010). *The truth about leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Ladd, H. F. (2011). Teachers' perceptions of their working conditions: How predictive of planned and actual teacher movement? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 33*(2), 235-261. https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373711398128

Lake, R., Dusseault, B., Bowen, M., Demeritt, A., & Hill, P. (2010). *The national study of charter management organization (CMO) effectiveness: Report on interim findings*. Seattle, WA: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. & Center on Reinventing Public Education.

Laney, N. R., Jr. (2018). *Why do they stay? A study of high school math and science teachers' perceptions of working condition factors in a large urban school district* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/1903/20858

Leithwood, K. A., Menzies, T., Jantzi, D., & Leithwood, J. (1999). Teacher burnout: A critical challenge for leaders of restructuring schools. In R. Vandenberghe & A. M. Huberman (Ed.), *Understanding and preventing teacher burnout: A sourcebook of international research and practice* (pp. 1–13). https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511527784.006

Loeb, S., Darling-Hammond, L., & Luczak, J. (2005). How teaching conditions predict teacher turnover in California schools. *Peabody Journal of Education, 80*(3), 44–70. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327930pje8003_4

Lubienski, C. (2003). Innovation in education markets: Theory and evidence on the impact of competition and choice in charter schools. *American Educational Research Journal, 40*(2), 395-443. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312040002395

Lüleci, C., & Çoruk, A. (2018). The Relationship between Morale and Job Satisfaction of Teachers in Elementary and Secondary Schools. *Educational Policy Analysis and Strategic Research*, *13*(1), 54-70. https://doi.org/10.29329/epasr.2018.137.3.

Marinell, W. H., & Coca, V. M. (2013). *Who stays and who leaves? Findings from a three part study of teacher turnover in NYC middle schools*. New York, NY: The Research Alliance for NYC Schools.

Martin, L. E., & Mulvihill, T. M. (2016). Voices in education: Teacher shortage: Myth or reality? *The Teacher Educator*, *51*(3), 175-184. https://doi.org/10.1080/08878730.2016.1177427

Maxwell, J. C. (2007). *The 21 irrefutable laws of leadership* (Rev. ed.). Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.

McNeil, M. (2013a). Feds, states dicker over evaluations. *Education Week*, *32*(23), 1-24.

McNeil, M. (2013b). Rifts deepen over direction of education policy in US. *Education Week, 32*(30), 1-14.

Measures of Effective Teaching Project. (2013). *Ensuring fair and reliable measures of effective teaching: Culminating findings from the MET Project's three-year study*. Seattle, WA: The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation.

Mertler, C. A. (2016). Should I stay or should I go? Understanding teacher motivation, job satisfaction, and perceptions of retention among Arizona teachers. *International Research in Higher Education, 1*(2), 34–45. https://doi.org/10.5430/irhe.v1n2p34

Miron, G., & Urschel, J. L. (2009). *Profiles of nonprofit education management organizations: 2008-2009*. Boulder, CO: National Education Policy Center. Retrieved from http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/profiles-nonprofit-emos-2008-09

Miron, G., & Urschel, J. L. (2010). *Profiles of nonprofit education management organizations: 2009-2010*. Boulder, CO: National Education Policy Center. Retrieved from http://nepc.colorodo.edu/publication/EMO-NP-09-10

National Alliance for Public Charter Schools. (n.d.). *CMO and EMO public charter schools: A Growing phenomenon in the charter school sector. Public charter schools dashboard data from 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10.* Retrieved from http://www.publiccharters.org/sites/default/files/migrated/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/NAPCS-CMO-EMO-DASHBOARD-DETAILS_20111103T102812.pdf

National Alliance for Public Charter Schools. (2010). *Federal charter schools program*. Retrieved from http://www.publiccharters.org/node/40

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (2003). *No dream denied: A pledge to America's children*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctaf.org/wp-content/uploads/no-dream-denied_summary_report.pdf

Neild, R. C., Useem, E., Travers, E. ., & Lesnick, J. (2003). *Once and for all: Placing a highly qualified teacher in every Philadelphia classroom*. Philadelphia, PA: Research for Action.

Nichols-Barrer, I., Gleason, P., Gill, B., & Tuttle, C. C. (2016). Student selection, attrition, and replacement in KIPP middle schools. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 38*(1), 5-20. https://doi.org/10.3102%2F0162373714564215

Ost, B. (2014). How do teachers improve? The relative importance of specific and general human capital. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics, 6*(2), 127-151. https://doi.org/10.1257/app.6.2.127

Pianta, R. C., & Hamre, B. K. (2009). Conceptualization, measurement, and improvement of classroom processes: Standardized observation can leverage capacity. *Educational Researcher, 38,* 109–119. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189x09332374

Pratt, T., & Booker, L. (2014). *Teacher retention in Tennessee: Are we keeping our best teachers? Policy brief.* Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED560632

Rivkin, S. G., Hanushek, E. A., & Kain, J. F. (2005). Teachers, schools, and academic achievement. *Econometrica, 73*, 417-458. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0262.2005.00584.x

Robertson-Kraft, C., & Zhang, R. S. (2018). Keeping great teachers: A case study on the impact and implementation of a pilot teacher evaluation system. *Educational Policy, 32*(3), 363–394. https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904816637685

Rockoff, J. E. (2004). The impact of individual teachers on student achievement: Evidence from panel data. *American Economic Review, 94*, 247-252. https://doi.org/10.1257/0002828041302244

Ronfeldt, M. (2012). Where should student teachers learn to teach? Effects of field placement school characteristics on teacher retention and effectiveness. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 34*(1), 3–26. https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373711420865

Ronfeldt, M., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2013). How teacher turnover harms student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, *50*(1), 4–36. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831212463813

Sanders, W. L., & Rivers, J. C. (1996). *Cumulative and residual effects of teachers on future student academic achievement*. Knoxville, TN: Value-Added Research and Assessment Center, University of Tennessee.

Scafidi, B., Sjoquist, D. L., & Stinebrickner, T. R. (2007). Race, poverty, and teacher mobility. *Economics of Education Review, 26*(2), 145–159. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2005.08.006

Seidman, I. (2013). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2011). Teacher job satisfaction and motivation to leave the teaching profession: Relations with school context, feeling of belonging, and emotional exhaustion. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*(6), 1029-1038. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2011.04.001

Smith, J., Farrell, C., Wohlstetter, P., & Nayfack, M. (2009). *Mapping the landscape of charter management organizations: Issues to consider in supporting replication*. Los Angeles, CA: University of Southern California.

Smylie, M. A. (1999). Teacher stress in a time of reform. In R. Vandenderghe & A. M. Huberman (Eds.), *Understanding and preventing teacher burnout: A sourcebook of international research and practice* (pp. 59-84). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Stecher, B. M., Holtzman, D. J., Garet, M. S., Hamilton, L. S., Engberg, J. Steiner, E. D., . . . Chambers, J. (2018). *Improving teaching effectiveness: Final report: The intensive partnerships for effective teaching through 2015–2016*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation. Retrieved from https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR2242.html

Stuit, D., & Smith, T. M. (2010). *Teacher turnover in charter schools* [Research brief]. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED543582

Sutcher, L., Darling-Hammond, L., & Carver-Thomas, D. (2016). *A coming crisis in teaching? Teacher supply, demand, and shortages in the U.S.* Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute. Retrieved from https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/coming-crisis-teaching

Taylor, E. S., & Tyler, J. H. (2012). The effect of evaluation on teacher performance. *American Economic Review, 102*, 3628–3651. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.102.7.3628

Toch, T., & Rothman, R. (2008). *Rush to judgment: Teacher evaluation in public education*. Washington, DC: Education Sector.

U.S. Department of Education. (2010). *Charter schools program (CSP) grants for replication and expansion of high-quality charter schools*. Retrieved from http://edocket.access.gpo.gov/2010/pdf/2010-12436.pdf

Ujifusa, A. (2013). Buffalo battle rages over evaluations. *Education Week, 32*, 21.

United States Department of Education. (2009). *Race to the top program: Executive summary*. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/executive-summary.pdf

Weisberg, D., Sexton, S., Mulhern, J., & Keeling, D. (2009). *The widget effect: Our national failure to acknowledge and act on differences in teacher effectiveness*. New York, NY: The New Teacher Project.

Weiss, E., & Long, D. (2013). *Market-oriented education reforms' rhetoric trumps reality. Broader, bolder approach to education*. Retrieved from http://www.epi.org/files/2013/bba-rhetoric-trumps-reality.pdf

Wohlstetter, P., Smith, J., Farrell, C., Hentschke, G. C., & Hirman, J. (2011). How funding shapes the growth of charter management organizations: Is the tail wagging the dog? *Journal of Education Finance, 37*(2), 150-174. https://doi.org/10.1177/089590489500900400l

Wohlstetter, P., Wenning, R., & Briggs, K. L. (1995). Charter schools in the United States: The question of autonomy. *Educational Policy, 9*(4), 331-358.

Yoon, K. S., Duncan, T., Lee, S. W., Scarloss, B., & Shapley, K. L. (2007). *Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects student achievement: Issues & answers report* (REL 2007 No. 033). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences.

Zimmer, R. W., Gill, B., Booker, K., Lavertu, S., Sass, T. R., & Witte, J. (2009). *Charter schools in eight states: Effects on achievement, attainment, integration and competition*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.

Zubrzycki, J. (2012). Districts abandon grants targeting teacher quality. *Education Week, 32*(1), 20–21.