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Abstract

Education reformers are calling for increased accountability for the nation’s public schools. Teacher evaluation has experienced a shift in focus from what teachers do to accomplish the task of teaching to student growth as a result of what teachers do in the classroom (Achieve, Inc., 2007). Additionally, a connection between teacher job satisfaction and quality of education in the classroom has been identified (Hall, Zinko, Perryman, & Ferris, 2009). The purpose of this quantitative study was to determine if increased accountability measures found in the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System (OTES) impacted teacher job satisfaction. The research was conducted through a three-part survey which included a demographic section, questions from the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire, and questions specifically related to the OTES. The survey was sent to Ohio K-12 public education superintendents and principals to be forwarded to teachers. Survey participation was voluntary and all participants were anonymous. A total of 290 completed responses were submitted. Pearson Product-Moment Correlations were performed on the data. The data suggested the OTES did not significantly impact teacher job satisfaction. Additionally, the findings indicated components of the OTES did not significantly impact teacher job satisfaction. A disparity was found between the data and open-ended comments made by the participants. Recommendations for future research include accessing a statewide database to increase the size of the sample and conduct the study again in the future to determine if the results were due to the design of the OTES or to change in general.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

Background of the Problem

In an effort to improve educational outcomes for Ohio’s K-12 students, Ohio’s legislators have mandated through the legislative process, rapid change and increased accountability measures causing Ohio’s educators to experience change within the profession at an unprecedented rate (Achieve, Inc., 2007). Currently, the state of Ohio’s legislators have written and continue to write and vote for a wide variety of educational policy changes, especially policies that increase accountability measures for educators in K-12 educational settings. These policy changes and increased accountability measures have a myriad of compelling ramifications for teachers throughout the state. The impact of increased accountability measures imposed upon Ohio educators provides a developing opportunity to understand how increased accountability affects teacher job satisfaction.

As an illustration of increased accountability and policy changes, several pieces of legislation stand out. One of these pieces of legislation is House Bill 555. Governor Kasich signed House Bill 555 into law on December 21, 2012. The law became effective on March 22, 2013. This legislation removed previous designations for Ohio K-12 schools such as “continuous improvement” and “academic watch” and replaced it with an A-F grading system. This new grading system for Ohio schools was based on student academic progress and teacher performance determined through a new and rigorous evaluation model known as the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System (OTES). House Bill 153 spelled out the new teacher evaluation system, which combined student growth measures with observable performance ratings of the teacher to provide a holistic determination of a teacher’s designation (Ohio Department of
A teacher may be designated as Accomplished, Skilled, Developing, or Ineffective (Ohio Department of Education, 2015c).

Additionally, the Ohio General Assembly passed Senate Bill 316 into law. This legislation included the new third grade reading guarantee. At present, Ohio schools are graded on the number of students reading at grade level. While all students in K-3 receive interventions if they are not found to be reading at grade level, only third grade students face retention based on the Ohio Achievement Assessment for Reading. A student must receive a score of 400 or higher to be considered to be reading at grade level. This policy puts third grade teachers in the spotlight, potentially adding stress and increased pressure to perform. Not only will poor student performance on the Ohio Achievement Assessment for Reading negatively impact a teacher’s evaluation, there are financial implications for a school district if a student is not reading at grade level and is retained. For example, a series of interventions must be put into place for that student. These interventions may include increased time devoted to reading instruction for that student and intervention services from outside providers (OCTELA, 2012).

More notable legislative changes, found in Senate Bill 165 were college and career readiness standards that change how Ohio’s students are assessed prior to graduation. Because schools will be judged on their preparation of high school students to be college and career ready, this policy change impacts how Ohio students will be tested. For more than a decade, students have been required to take the Ohio Graduation Test (OGT). Then, beginning in 2015, students were to begin to be required to pass a series of PARCC (Partnership for Assessment of College and Career) Assessments and “End of Course” exams provided by AIR (American Institute for Research) Assessments. However, legislation was passed with the 2015-2016 budget by the General Assembly and signed by Governor Kasich ordering the Ohio Department
of Education to discontinue the use of the PARCC Assessments. Instead, the AIR tests would be used for all tested subjects (Ohio Department of Education, 2016). An overlap of these assessments was anticipated causing concern among educators, parents, and students that important instruction time would be sacrificed in order to administer these assessments (Guilfoyle, 2006). These aforementioned examples are merely a few of the legislated changes facing educators in Ohio. Teachers, both experienced and inexperienced, have expressed complaints of being overwhelmed by the pace of the policy changes and by the uncertainty of how they will be evaluated under increased accountability measures (Franco, Zigler, & Lindsey, 2013). Teachers lack faith in the validity of student growth measures as a component of their evaluation. The reason for this is the data reflects on the previous year’s student growth rather than the current year for which they are receiving the evaluation rating.

Connected to teacher evaluation is job satisfaction. Job Satisfaction, in general, may be negatively impacted by factors such as low pay, dwindling resources affecting employee performance, disparagement by the media, frequent changes in educational policy, and circumscribed accountability measures that lack teacher input (Scott, Stone, & Dinham, 2001; Van den Berg, 2002). Zembylas and Papanastasiou (2005) found that educator job satisfaction is related to teacher empowerment. In fact, they claim a less than satisfying evaluation system was found to diminish teacher empowerment and therefore job satisfaction. Job satisfaction was associated with teacher motivation, and these occupational attitudes have been linked to quality education in schools (Evans, 2000).

Another crucial issue for educational leaders to consider is that in order to provide effective leadership and supervision to K-12 teachers, it is imperative for administrators to understand how frequent and fast-paced policy changes and increased accountability measures
affect teacher job satisfaction. According to Linda Evans (2000), co-director of the University of Warwick’s Teacher Development Research and Dissemination Unit, job satisfaction, motivation, and morale are all work-related attitudes. Morale is different from job satisfaction in that it is future-oriented and anticipatory, while job satisfaction is present-oriented or a response to a situation (Evans, 2000). Evans (2000) defines motivation as “a condition, or the creation of a condition, that encompasses all of those factors that determine the degree of inclination towards engagement in an activity” (p. 179). This study will focus on the work attitude of job satisfaction as defined by Fuming and Jiliang (2007). Their definition of job satisfaction “the degree of satisfaction a worker evinces for the work in which he or she is engaged” (Fuming & Jiliang, 2007, p. 87), was determined by the researcher to be most succinct for the current study.

Another important concept to be defined for this study is accountability. Wood and Winston (2005) said “Accountability refers to employees’ beliefs about the degree to which they will be required to justify their actions at work to one or more individuals who hold reward or punishment power” (p. 85). In the case of teachers in Ohio, justified actions at work will be measured by student growth referred to as value-added, or adequate yearly progress (AYP), and student achievement in the form of the Ohio Graduation Test, which, as stated earlier, was slated to be eliminated. New AIR Assessments or End-Of-Course Exams were being developed and approved by the Ohio Department of Education and were expected to provide a measure of academic achievement. Earlier research suggested increased accountability may stimulate both positive and negative results connected with job satisfaction (Hochwarter, Ferris, Gavin, Perrewe, Hall & Frink, 2007). This implication is important because a strong correlation between teacher job satisfaction and quality of education has been identified (Persevica, 2011).
Accountability has become a buzzword according to Lerner and Tetlock (1999). Accountability continued to be defined as the “implicit or explicit expectation that one may be called on to justify one’s beliefs, feelings, and actions to others” (Tetlock, 1992, p. 332). The term accountability created stress due to the inference that accountability implied that people who did not justify actions satisfactorily would endure adverse consequences (Stenning, 1995). The term accountability used in education-oriented discussions connoted an ethical responsibility of the school or teacher for effective education (Levit, 1972).

The call for accountability was one that has grown in momentum and increased in volume. This call for accountability was a nationwide movement that was technocratic and efficiency-oriented (Levit, 1972). States across the nation have developed nearly identical programs to ensure educational accountability, with nearly all of the programs utilizing large-scale assessment results (Popham, 2000). Ohio was one of the many states just described. The use of large scale assessments was no minor detail in the world of educators because the movement of employing accountability systems based on student testing “had the potential to become one of the major reform efforts in American education in this century, perhaps equal in impact to such movements as the development of the comprehensive high school or the racial integration of public education” (Ramirez, 1999, p. 205). While many reforms exist in Ohio to address the call for increased accountability, the current study focused on one aspect of increased accountability reform which was the introduction of the OTES.

The Ohio Teacher Evaluation System (OTES) was developed to reform the educational system and advance student growth and achievement as called for in “No Child Left Behind” and “Race to the Top,” both federal attempts to improve the nation’s competitive standing in the world arena. OTES was designed by Ohio teachers, administrators, and college and university
faculty along with various educational associations under the guidance of the Educator Standards Board. These Ohio educational professionals worked collaboratively with national experts on teacher evaluation (Ohio Department of Education, 2013). The Ohio Teacher Evaluation System was designed to more closely align teacher evaluation with the new Ohio Standards for Educators. OTES became effective for the 2013-2014 school year. Ohio Department of Education (Ohio Department of Education, 2015c) materials further claimed the OTES was dedicated to teacher growth and student achievement. It sought to strengthen and re-vamp teacher evaluation. Previously, teacher evaluations were often superficial, offering very little valuable feedback to teachers. According to the ODE, these efforts were for the purpose of seeking improvement in student educational growth. Under the OTES, 50% of a teacher’s evaluation was based on student growth measures. The other 50% was based on a series of formal and informal observations conducted by administrators. These two components were the primary source of legislative debate in Senate Bill 229 (Harris, 2015).

While OTES is relatively new, its future remains unclear. Senate Bill 229 made its way to the House of Representatives where it became House Bill 362. The Ohio General Assembly passed it on June 3, 2014. The highly contested changes reduced the frequency of evaluations for skilled or accomplished teachers and allowed districts to choose between the original evaluation system structure and an alternative structure. The alternative framework for the OTES included a 42.5%, 42.5%, and 15% division of percentages of category weights (Ohio Department of Education, 2014a). The alternative framework was once again amended in Ohio House Bill 64 for the 2015-2016 school year. Changes included making the teacher performance rating worth 50% of the evaluation and student growth worth 35%. The alternative component chosen by the district was given a value of 15% (Ohio Department of Education, 2015a). Due to
the short interval of time since OTES was first implemented, its effect on student growth and achievement remains unclear.

**Rationale & Significance of the Study**

Shifting the teacher evaluation process in Ohio from looking at what teachers do in the classroom to what students learn was a major alteration in the teacher evaluation paradigm. This deviation from traditional teacher evaluations to evaluations which, included student test scores as a measure of teacher effectiveness created consequences in the teaching profession. Using student test scores to determine teacher effectiveness as part of the teacher evaluation escalated the accountability element. Because the OTES was relatively new, little to no research existed creating the opportunity to conduct an investigation. In light of the fact that legislators continued to create and tweak educational policies regarding teacher evaluation, this study was significant and may have provided important information for consideration in policy development at the state level. Moreover, educational administrators may find the results of the current study helpful as they employ the state level teacher evaluation policies in their local districts.

**Purpose of Study**

Because student test scores became part of the calculation in teacher evaluation, teachers may have perceived the OTES as holding them more accountable for what happened in the classroom. Accountability may impact teacher job satisfaction. Furthermore, positive correlations between teacher job satisfaction and the quality of education in the classroom have been identified (Persevica, 2011). Persevica (2011) concluded teacher job satisfaction was a fundamental element of quality of education. The researcher sought to gain insight into the relationship between accountability and teacher job satisfaction, specifically in Ohio K-12 public education. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to determine the impact of increased
accountability conveyed through the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System on teacher job satisfaction.

**Theoretical Framework**

Having formulated the research questions “Is the OTES associated with an impact on teacher job satisfaction?” and “Which components of the OTES, if any, are most associated with job satisfaction?” the researcher developed a hypothesis. The researcher hypothesized that increased accountability, perceived in the various elements of the OTES, would have a positive rather than a negative impact on teacher job satisfaction. The researcher based this hypothesis on Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, focusing on the top portions of the Maslow pyramid. These were the esteem needs and the self-actualization needs. The esteem needs were based on respect of others and respect by others, as well as self-esteem and achievement (Maslow, 1943). Through increased accountability, the successful teacher would potentially feel greater respect and heightened accomplishment. Maslow described self-actualization needs as incorporating morality and creativity among other elements (Maslow, 1943). Successful teachers would likely feel a moral obligation to help students achieve in their classrooms. Therefore, in an effort to reach all students and meet the specific learning needs of each child, teachers were apt to express creativity in their instructional design.

**Research Questions**

In order to ascertain the outcomes related to teacher job satisfaction created by the various elements of the OTES and the perceived increased accountability, the researcher sought to determine answers to the following questions:

1. Is OTES associated with an impact on teacher job satisfaction?
   
   a. If so, is the relationship positive or negative?
2. Which components of OTES, if any, are most associated with teacher job satisfaction?

Definition of Terms

The following definitions were provided to ensure a thorough understanding and to establish consistency throughout the study. Each term has been defined as related to the research.

**Job Satisfaction.** Used in the positive sense, it is the extent of an employee’s perception and value of the characteristics of the work situation including: compensation, autonomy, coworkers, and productivity (Lester, 1982). Found in the text is another succinct definition for job satisfaction, “The degree of satisfaction a worker evinces for the work in which he or she is engaged” (Fuming & Jiliang, 2007, p. 87).

**Job Dissatisfaction.** Job dissatisfaction is not the opposite of job satisfaction. “Job dissatisfaction is the unpleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job as frustrating or blocking the attainment of one's job values or as entailing disvalues” (Locke, 1969, p. 316).

**Self-Efficacy.** This is a self-perceived competence (in one’s own intellect and ability to perform) (Gagne & Deci, 2005).

**Autonomy.** Acting based on one’s own willingness and having a choice in one’s actions (Gagne & Deci, 2005).

**Accountability.** Evaluations will be connected to student performance on standardized tests (Ellison, 2012).

**High-Stakes Testing.** Tests given in schools to students where the test results are used to make decisions that have far-reaching consequences (Wilson, 2007).
**Adequate Yearly Progress.** A standard of measurement for one expected year of growth for a student (Ohio Department of Education, 2015c).

**Value-Added Modeling.** Value-Added calculations utilize data from the state-tested subjects and grades, as applicable (Ohio Department of Education, 2015c).

**21st Century Skills.** A term frequently used in education defined as “The building blocks for learning in a complex world” (Trilling & Fadel, 2009, p. 3).

**Teacher Evaluation.** A professional appraisal or judgment of teacher job performance.

**Standards-Based Evaluation.** A professional appraisal or judgment of teacher effectiveness based on standards for the teaching profession, clearly defining what a teacher should know and be able to do (Ohio Department of Education, 2013).

**Performance-Based Evaluation.** A professional appraisal or judgment of teacher effectiveness in which teachers are asked to make evident how their instruction affects their students’ academic growth (Ohio Department of Education, 2013).

**Formal Observation.** A visitation of a class period or the viewing of a class lesson conducted for an entire class period, lesson, or a minimum of 30 minutes. During the classroom observation, the evaluator documents specific information related to teaching and learning (Ohio Department of Education, 2013).

**Student Growth Measure.** A mechanism for ascertaining the degree of academic gains students have made (Ohio Department of Education, 2013).

**Walk-Through Observation.** Informal teacher observations lasting less than 30 minutes. These may occur frequently and may be unannounced (Ohio Department of Education, 2013).
**Pre-Conference.** A meeting between the teacher and evaluator during which each discusses what the evaluator will observe during the classroom visitation. Important information is shared about the characteristics of the learners and learning environment. Specific information is also shared about the objectives of the lesson and the assessment of student learning. The conference will also give the teacher an opportunity to identify areas in which he/she would like focused feedback from the evaluator during the classroom observation (Ohio Department of Education, 2013).

**Post-Conference.** A meeting between the teacher and evaluator to provide reflection and feedback regarding the observed lesson and to identify strategies and resources for the teacher to incorporate into lessons to increase effectiveness (Ohio Department of Education, 2013).

**Valid.** Teaching measures proven to lead to student learning (Cantrell & Kane, 2013).

**Reliable.** Reflective of a typical performance without the influence of the observer or the particular group of students (Cantrell & Kane, 2013).

**Extrinsic.** Outside influences

**Intrinsic.** Internal influencers

**Student Learning Objective.** A student learning objective is a measurable, long-term academic growth target that a teacher sets at the beginning of the year for all students or subgroups of students. Student learning objectives demonstrate a teacher’s impact on student learning. (Ohio Department of Education, 2013).

**Student Growth.** A succinct definition for student growth is “A demonstrable change in a student’s learning between two or more points in time” (Illinois State Board of Education, 2011, p. 1).
**Student Growth Measure.** A method for determining how much academic progress students are making by measuring growth between two points in time (Ohio Department of Education, 2013).

**Shared Attribution.** Shared attribution measures are student growth measures that can be attributed to a group, including a district, building, department, or grade-level team. These measures encourage collaborative goals and may be used as data in the student growth component (Ohio Department of Education, 2013).

**Professional Improvement Plan.** Improvement plans are developed for a teacher by the evaluator in response to ineffective ratings in performance and/or below average student growth measures. The Improvement Plan is intended to identify specific areas for improvement of performance and for identifying guidance and support needed to help the teacher improve. When an improvement plan is initiated by an administrator, it is the responsibility of the administrator to identify, in writing, the specific area(s) for improvement to be addressed in relationship to the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession; specify, in writing, the desired level of performance that is expected to improve and a reasonable period of time to correct the deficiencies; develop and implement a written plan for improvement that will be initiated immediately and includes resources and assistance available; determine additional education or professional development needed to improve in the identified area(s); and gather evidence of progress or lack of progress (Ohio Department of Education, 2013).

**Professional Growth Plan.** Professional growth plans are intended to help teachers focus on areas of professional development that will enable them to improve their practice. Teachers are accountable for the implementation and completion of the plan and should use the plan as a starting point for the school year. Teachers are to include identification of area(s) for
future professional growth; specific resources and opportunities to assist the teacher in enhancing skills, knowledge, and practice; outcomes that will enable the teacher to increase student learning and achievement (Ohio Department of Education, 2013).

**Delimitations**

The study was designed to investigate the impact of increased accountability, via components of the OTES, on teacher job satisfaction. Because the researcher was investigating components of the OTES, and not evaluation systems in general, the current study was focused on K-12 public education teachers in the state of Ohio. Participation in the study was for teachers who have been evaluated through the OTES. Parochial and charter school instructors were not included in the study as they were not required to adhere to the structure of the OTES.

**Limitations**

Limitations for this study have been identified. First, the study was based on a convenience sample rather than a random sample. Because teacher e-mail addresses were unattainable, the survey link was sent to superintendents and principals to forward to their instructional staff. The majority of districts receiving the survey link were in northwestern Ohio as that was where the researcher had the most professional contacts. Second, the researcher had no way to know how many teachers received the survey link to determine a response rate. Some superintendents or principals may have failed to see the e-mail with the survey link or may have determined they did not want their teachers to participate. Conversely, some teachers may have forwarded the survey link to peers in other districts. Third, in section two of the survey, the researcher inadvertently left off a question from the supervision section of questions. While the question was not critical to the current research, the researcher carefully analyzed the statistical results for all supervision questions. The TJSQ item omitted from the survey was “My
Immediate supervisor treats everyone equitably” (Lester, 1982, p. 13). The fourth and final limitation affected reliability. The survey included only one question each pertaining to student growth, pre-conference and post-conference, to link to job satisfaction. Therefore, reliability of survey was lower.

**Researcher Bias**

With the introduction of the new Ohio Teacher Evaluation System (OTES), teachers were faced with a presumably more rigorous evaluation system that included two components. One component was based on teacher performance and determined through both formal and informal observations conducted by a supervisor. The other component was a student growth measure. Teachers were now to be evaluated based on student performance, in terms of measuring student growth, in addition to their own performance in the classroom (Ohio Department of Education, 2013).

The researcher chose this topic due to an inner curiosity regarding whether teachers would experience an increase or decrease in job satisfaction due to the increased accountability elements of the OTES. Due to news stories in the media, the researcher perceived that the general public had developed a negative view of teachers. Additionally, the researcher formulated the perception that politicians used teachers as a scapegoat for society’s woes in order to build campaign platforms.

The researcher entered the study with bias based on the assumption that the OTES increased accountability. She was further biased in her expectation to learn that most teachers had an improved level of job satisfaction due to increased communication with their evaluator and improved methods for tracking student growth. These two elements were byproducts of the increased accountability measures found in the OTES. Her bias was in favor of teachers’ desire
to be effective and against critics who claimed educators were not concerned with having a positive effect on student learning.

How does accountability affect teacher job satisfaction? The researcher anticipated the study would prove that increased accountability improves teacher job satisfaction. She intended to look for evidence of the contrary and did not feel compelled to deny any evidence that disproved her opinion. The researcher was careful to prevent bias from impacting the results of the study. Preventative measures were taken, such as asking proofreaders to look for instances of potential bias.

In order to accomplish research goals, research included a survey of K-12 teachers in the state of Ohio. The study was quantitative by design, utilizing a teacher survey that included as large a sample as possible. Teachers who submitted responses had an opportunity to respond to a prompt to provide open-ended information regarding any of their other responses to the survey or their impressions of the OTES.

The researcher created a document consisting of five chapters discussing the study of the impact of increased accountability measures found in the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System on teacher job satisfaction. Chapter One introduced the topic, provided a rationale for the study, the purpose of the study, and the theoretical framework of the study. The researcher defined key terms in Chapter One along with discussing delimitations or parameters of the study and three limitations. Finally, the researcher discussed her own bias regarding the research. In Chapter Two, the researcher provided an overview of the literature related to the study. Chapter Three was a discussion of the methodology used in the study. For example, the researcher discussed the design of the research, the participants, the instrumentation and data sources, how data was collected, her research questions, and how data was analyzed. Additionally, the researcher
discussed her assumptions for the research. Chapter Four provided an analysis of the data in addition to demographic information provided by the participants. Finally, Chapter Five discussed compelling discoveries made through the research process and collected data. The researcher included implications of the study in Chapter Five and made recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER II

Literature Review

The state of Ohio’s General Assembly has imposed a stream of increased accountability measures for educators in K-12 educational settings. These accountability measures had a direct impact on teachers throughout the state. This study examined the impact of increased accountability measures on teacher job satisfaction. Research of the literature conducted in preparation for the current study implied that increased accountability may stimulate both positive and negative results connected with job satisfaction and correlated teacher job satisfaction and quality of education (Hall, Zinko, Perryman, & Ferris, 2009). Understanding the impact of increased accountability on teacher job satisfaction will be beneficial to policy makers and educational leaders as they make decisions regarding teacher accountability measures in the future.

The literature review included a review of the history of the accountability movement in order to allow the reader an understanding of the evolution of accountability related to teacher evaluation. The second section included a discussion of the politics of accountability in education and teacher evaluation. Understanding the political fuel for accountability in teacher evaluation was helpful to gain an overall understanding of the evolution of teacher evaluation and accountability. The third section examined the connection between accountability and teacher job satisfaction. These concepts were the nexus of the research. The fourth section examined teacher evaluation, which has changed and evolved since the initiation of the accountability movement. The discussion of teacher evaluation was beneficial, in general, to both the reader and the researcher, as it provided a strong understanding of teacher evaluation
and the various components of an evaluation system. Such a discussion led directly into section five which explained the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System, which was central to the research.

**History of the Accountability Movement**

The call for accountability in the United States and the evolution to the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System (OTES), may be traced back to the latter part of the twentieth century when attempts to add rigor to the curriculum and use test results to measure learning began to gain appeal (Ramirez, 1999). In 1958, the National Defense Education Act was authorized. The purpose of the act was “To strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs; and for other purposes” (U. S. Congress, 1958, p. 1580). This act was “the culmination of criticism that had been mounting since early in the Cold War and had gained traction when the Russians launched Sputnik in 1957” (Bracey, 2008, p. 83). Schools took the criticism for the United States’ failure to be first in space (Bracey, 2008). The accountability movement continued to gain momentum when, in 1965, under the Johnson Administration, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was authorized. This legislation was a part of Johnson’s “War on Poverty” (Elementary and Secondary Education Act, 2014). It was the most significant federal legislation affecting education ever passed by Congress because prior to the passage of ESEA, the federal government provided school funding only for the purchase of land on which to build schools and for special programming. This was the first time the federal government provided funding to schools for socioeconomically challenged students to reduce a gap in achievement (Standerfer, 2006). Among this piece of legislation’s many directives was the mandate for schools to establish high standards and accountability. Indeed, as federal funding of education increased, so did the public cry for accountability (Standerfer, 2006).
The accountability movement continued as the 1970s experienced a call for “back to the basics” in education (Ramirez, 1999). The “Back to Basics” movement was brought on by a prevailing impression that American schools were in decline. Proponents of the “Back to Basics” movement pointed at a slump in performance on standardized tests, unraveling academic standards, a degeneration of respect for authority in schools, as well as an aura of permissiveness (Cohen & Barnes, 1993). Further censure of the nation’s schools occurred when U.S. industry began experiencing international challenges for their markets. The finger was again pointed toward the U.S. education system with the concern that American students were falling behind, globally, in skills acquisition necessary to keep the U.S. economically competitive (Curriculum, 2005).

As a response to the continued criticism, in 1981, Secretary of Education T. H. Bell created the National Commission on Excellence in Education. In 1983, this commission published a well-known report titled “A Nation at Risk.” This began phase one of the modern reform movement in education (Danielson, 2001). “A Nation at Risk” recommended all levels of education, including primary, secondary, and post-secondary, develop more rigorous and measurable standards (The National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). The recommendations made in this report were swiftly promoted by the media (Bracey, 2003). “A Nation at Risk” has had a far-reaching influence on educational policy and the way the nation thinks about education (Seashore Louis, Febey, & Schroeder, 2005). “A Nation at Risk” fueled the continuation of the accountability movement.

In 1987, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) was established. The NBPTS encouraged conversation regarding the development of useful and substantial standards for teachers in order to conduct performance-based assessment and
recognize exceptional skill in teaching (Weis & Weis, 1998). Through these new teaching standards, teachers were asked to make evident how their teaching affected their students’ academic growth. The goal of the new teaching standards, while increasing accountability for teachers, was to create a more meaningful educational experience for America’s youth (Weiss & Weiss, 1998). The standards movement has evolved from creating minimum graduation requirements, to the creation of a comprehensive curriculum structure, to standardized testing, increasing the qualifications to become a teacher, and the creation of benchmarks for student learning (Seashore Louis, Febey, & Schroeder, 2005).

Phase two of the modern reform movement in education began in the 1990s and included a focus on academic standards that were challenging for students along with high-stakes assessment (Danielson, 2001). Indeed, the 1990s brought a vigorous high-stakes approach to educational policy that included carrot and stick elements, as rewards and sanctions were put into place (Seashore Louis, Febey, & Schroeder, 2005). This phase of the reform movement continued throughout the decade and into the millenium (Danielson, 2001). The National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future 1996 publication of “What Matters Most: Teaching for America’s Future,” commenced phase three of the modern reform movement (Danielson, 2001). This report found the following inefficiencies in America’s educational system: “low expectations for student performance; unenforced standards for teachers; major flaws in teacher preparation; slipshod teacher recruiting; inadequate induction for beginning teachers; inadequate professional development opportunities and few rewards for knowledge and skill; and schools that are structured for failure rather than success” (Boothe, 1997, p. 90). The report offered five primary suggestions to correct the issues: “Get serious about standards for both students and teachers; reinvent teacher preparation and professional development; fix
teacher recruitment and put qualified teachers in every classroom; encourage and reward teacher knowledge and skill; create schools that are organized for student and teacher success” ( Boothe, 1997, p. 89). Many recommendations made during the 1990’s found their way into current educational policy.

Further impacting the United States’ educational system was the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act by President George W. Bush in 2001. The reauthorization known as “No Child Left Behind” expanded the reach of the federal government’s role in education. “No Child Left Behind” (NCLB) originally was referred to as “An Act to Close the Achievement Gap With Accountability, Flexibility, and Choice, So That No Child is Left Behind” (U. S. Congress, 2002, p.1425). The title explained the intended objective for No Child Left Behind which called for high standards and measurable goals in a standards-based education system. This legislation required all schools receiving federal education dollars to test students through standardized tests at specific grade levels. No Child Left Behind increased accountability for schools and teachers as the standardized test scores provided a tool for measuring if a school or teacher was successful at teaching the standards. It called for transparency of accountability in order to hold states, districts, schools, and teachers responsible through the publication of results (Koyama & Kania, 2014). Despite drastic increased accountability measures, NCLB received scant resistance when it was first proposed (Seashore Louis, Febey, & Schroeder, 2005). However, opposition developed as time passed and unfunded mandates created by the increased accountability measures were identified (Lips & Feinberg, 2007).

Adequate yearly progress became a measure of one expected year of growth for a student. School districts and individual teachers who failed to have their students meet this
standard of measurement were in the public spotlight. Building on the educational reforms of NCLB, in 2009, President Barack Obama put into motion a federal grant program known as Race to the Top (RTTT). The aim of RTTT was to financially reward schools exhibiting high achievement in order to accelerate school reforms thereby helping students become primed for success in a competitive global society (U.S. Department of Education, 2010). Race to the Top elevated the accountability quotient in education by mandating student test scores account for 50% of teachers’ evaluations as criteria for receiving federal funds (Lynn, 2013).

As the federal government increased its reach into education with RTTT, decisions for how to accomplish the goals set forth were left to individual states. Various controversial legislation was implemented around the country. Teachers’ unions such as in Wisconsin and Chicago fought various efforts of state government to reform education in their states. Ohio had its own share of controversy. In 2004, the report of the Governor’s Commission on Teaching Success was followed by Senate Bill 2. This bill called for the creation of the Educator Standards Board of Education. One task for the Educator Standards Board was to create a set of Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession. Then, in 2009, House Bill 1 instructed the Educator Standards Board to propose exemplary evaluation systems for teachers and principals to the State Board of Education for their examination and endorsement (Ohio Department of Education, 2013). The Educator Standards Board then recommended the OTES, in response to that mandate. The OTES was adopted and became the topic of research in the current study.

**Politics and Accountability in Education**

As previously stated, politicians, including Governor Kasich, regularly made education reform part of their campaign platform. Because public education was paid for with public funds, taxpayers wanted to know how their money was being spent and that there was value in
the final product. From the vantage point of policy makers and legislators, the purpose of teacher evaluation was quality assurance (Danielson, 2001). Accountability was associated with transparency in that school data was available to the public. Transparency in this instance referred to conveying openness in operations (Koyama & Kania, 2014). Transparency through school data was helpful to politicians using education as a campaign platform (Ozga, 2009). The tax-paying public positively affirmed legislators’ efforts to make teachers accountable for their performance (Popham, 2000). Taxpayer and, more importantly, voter interest in the subject supported the politicians’ choice to make education reform a platform initiative. According to Kellaghan et al. (2003), education reform has become one of the most politically important federal and state issues.

As a result, the concept of accountability in education has been used as a political tool with formidable skill (Ellison, 2012). Politicians sought re-election and reappointment on a regular basis, so promoting policies that supported the accountability movement served politicians well. Their need to show results to the voting public has been pressing and immediate. Unfortunately, a demand for immediate results did not allow for the development and enrichment of a stronger educational system over the long run (Corbett, 1991). In fact, there existed considerable data showing U.S. public school performance has been stable or slightly improved over the past 30 years. Despite such data, conservative and liberal political groups alike benefited from portraying a decline in quality of education and teacher quality (Peterson, 2000; Spring, 1997).

As mentioned earlier, high stakes testing and large-scale assessment became common features of state level accountability programs (Popham, 2000). In order for politicians to show policy results, they created an environment for measuring results. High-stakes testing became a
visible tool for politicians to show they had an influence on education. Additionally, the public wanted to know that the education system spent money wisely and effectively. Tax payers were looking for accountability measures. High-stakes, large scale tests allowed for such accountability measures through a comparison of scores made available in the data.

Furthermore, the public found the practice acceptable and even preferable because student learning remained the intended function of schools (Danielson, 2001). Popular consensus was that public education must be held accountable as it played an integral function in society. Schools have been obligated to teach to rigorous standards set by society and to measure their success in teaching (Ellison, 2012). However, “the devil is in the details” (Ellison, 2012, p. 31), as determining the appropriate standards, how to teach those standards, and how to measure success in teaching and learning has been an ongoing journey in the field of education.

Important to consider are the drawbacks of high-stakes testing for accountability purposes. Supovitz (2009) claimed that when a new test was introduced, scores were typically low and then rose over time. Such a trend of scores starting low and improving over time opened the question of whether high-stakes tests actually had an impact on the improvement of the educational system, or was high-stakes testing merely for the purpose of demonstrating that the educational system was accountable. Two sides of the high-stakes testing argument existed. On one side of the argument was the thought that testing stimulated improvement. The other side of the argument maintained that testing undermined good teaching (Seashore Louis, Febey, & Schroeder, 2005). Connecting challenging accountability systems to standardized, high-stakes assessment motivated a practice of abbreviating curriculum and instruction as well as promoting a teacher-centered format of direct instruction (Ellison, 2012). In his study, Supovitz (2009) concluded high-stakes tests were merely symbolic and did not foster true educational
improvement. Lynn (2013) maintained evidence was inconclusive that having teacher evaluations based on student test scores contributed to an increase in quality of instruction. Furthermore, Ellison (2012) found no evidence that high-stakes testing was necessary to raise student achievement and recommended policy makers search for alternative avenues to education reform.

Moreover, issue has been taken with the practice of using high-stakes test scores to compare classrooms, schools, and districts. Everson, Feinauer, & Sudweeks (2013) claimed that making comparisons based on test scores should be done with great care, if done at all. Everson et al. (2013) continued to explain that statistics included errors and that teaching and learning was about much more than test scores. Student achievement used for purposes of teacher evaluation purposes was challenged by statistical reliability and equity due to many different influences on student learning, making it difficult to determine if teacher effect was or was not the cause of student learning (Danielson, 2001). Ellison (2012) articulated the concept of accountability in education appeared to be contradictory and seriously flawed. Regardless, current politics called for a business model for public schools with quantifiable results and accountability resulting in discipline for failure to meet goals. As schools and teachers were being held increasingly more accountable for the failures of the educational system, policy-makers and researchers were not held equally accountable for equipping teachers with the necessary resources, breaking a type of social contract. This contradiction opened the door for private interests to access public education dollars (Ellison, 2012).

**Teacher Evaluation**

Undeniably, teacher evaluation has been the primary tool for increasing the accountability of job performance for teachers. Procedures for the evaluation of teachers are
typically spelled out in contracts as determined by the school district and the local bargaining agent. A number of states had legislatively mandated teacher evaluation (Stodolsky, 1984). Ohio was one of those states. External stakeholders were bolstered by teacher evaluations that reflected the success of the school (Peterson, 2004). However, it was not until the turn of the 21st Century that the focus of teacher supervision turned to the evaluation process (Marzano, Frontier & Livingston, 2011).

Initially, teacher evaluation was most commonly made up of an anecdotal report, summarized judgment, numerical rating, or checklist completed by the school principal after visiting the classroom one or two times during the school year (Boyd, 1989; Loup, Garland, Ellett, & Rugutt, 1996; Stodolsky, 1984). Teachers were evaluated on appearance and personality, in addition to rapport with students, preparation for teaching, content knowledge, classroom management, and professional contributions (Stodolsky, 1984). Teacher evaluation typically lacked common ideals and antecedents regarding what constituted good teaching, not to mention providing insufficient feedback for teachers (Danielson & McGreal, 2000).

According to Stodolsky (1984), the format of direct observation for teacher evaluation was limited in the information it could produce. Moreover, the process of teacher evaluation had an issue with low validity (Medley & Coker, 1987). By the late 2000’s the practice of teacher evaluation came under scrutiny (Marzano, Frontier & Livingston, 2011). Indeed, Peterson (2000) maintained that evaluations are not useful in terms of improving instruction. As mentioned earlier, in 1987 the NBPTS created standards for teachers which included the following components: identified and defined elements of good teaching, a rubric outlining levels of performance, more frequent observations and collection of artifacts for a more holistic evaluation, and training for the evaluator (Danielson & McGreal, 2000).
One response to the scrutiny of teacher evaluation practices was the Measures of Effective Teaching Project (MET Project). The MET Project focused its mission and efforts on determining and disclosing techniques for measuring effective teaching. The MET Project, funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, involved in excess of 3,000 teachers whose participation was voluntary. The MET Project aimed to provide tools for teachers to be successful at improving student achievement. The primary goal of the MET Project was to determine how evaluation could be used to develop outstanding teaching. The research conducted was based on research showing that “a teacher’s contribution matters more than anything else within the school” (Cantrell & Kane, 2013, p. 1).

Ultimately, the research of the MET Project found various elements made up effective teaching and, therefore, must be evaluated using a variety of measures. Furthermore, researchers have established that evaluations must be both valid and reliable in order to be worthwhile (Coker, Medley, & Soar, 1980; Medley & Coker, 1987; Kane & Staiger, 2012; Scriven, 1981; Stodolsky; 1984). The MET Project defines “valid” as teaching measures proven to lead to student learning and defines “reliable” as reflective of a typical performance, without the influence of the observer or the particular group of students (Kane and Staiger, 2012).

In response to the call for accountability, researchers began to consider various data sources for the purpose of teacher evaluation. As intended, elements added to the traditional teacher evaluation brought increasingly more accountability to teachers and their supervisors. For example, Value-Added Measures, (VAMs) became a component used for teacher evaluations. Value-Added Measures were used to ascertain the impact a teacher had on student growth. Typically this was determined through a statistical analysis of effectiveness based on standardized test scores. Value-Added Measures evolved due to a growing interest in measuring

According to Darling-Hammond, et al. (2012), issues with VAMs as appropriate measurement of teacher effectiveness were discovered. For instance, VAMs were unpredictable. Furthermore, the value-added score of a teacher could change based on the students assigned to their classroom as there were many elements that contributed to or hindered student growth (Darling-Hammond, Amrein-Beardsley, Haertel, & Rothstein, 2012; Everson, Feinauer, & Sudweeks, 2013). Value-Added Measures were unable to discern those elements from teacher effect (Darling-Hammond, Amrein-Beardsley, Haertel, & Rothstein, 2012). Per Everson, et al., (2013) VAMs should not be used singularly for teacher evaluation because measurement problems exist that need to be solved.

Despite such arguments about using test scores to make comparisons, state lawmakers were incorporating student growth measures into teacher evaluation systems. Veritably, “it is genuinely difficult to find a large-scale educational assessment that isn’t playing some sort of role in a local or regional accountability drama” (Popham, 2000, p. 283). As a result of including student growth measures into teacher evaluation, the focus of teacher evaluation changed from one of inputs to one of outputs (Levit, 1972). The focus of evaluation used to be to examine what teachers do and the tasks they perform. These are inputs. What a student knew and could do with that knowledge were defined as outputs. The new focus on student achievement focused on outputs (Kellaghan, Stufflebeam, Pearlman, & Tannenbaum, 2003). Student growth measures were calculated in terms of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and also VAMs.
Value-Added Modeling was used to show the effects of the school and teacher-on-student achievement or growth. Such information was useful in reflecting the importance of the teacher in the outcomes of student learning. Value-Added Modeling was an important component of the high-stakes test and accountability movement (McCaffrey Lockwood, Koretz & Hamilton, 2003). Adequate Yearly Progress was a measurement of teacher and school contributions to a student’s learning. It has been an essential tool for holding teachers and schools accountable (Kupermintz, 2003). However, Kellaghan et al. (2003) argue that test misalignment (when tests do not align with what teachers are asked to teach) would provide unfair results. Moreover, standardized tests typically cover basic recall of information (Kellaghan, Stufflebeam, Pearlman, & Tannenbaum, 2003) rather than higher-level thinking such as evaluation or analysis. This could penalize teachers who focus on critical thinking, a 21st Century Skill. Adding to the controversy were teachers’ perspectives of standardized achievement tests. According to Urdan and Paris (1994), teachers, by and large, have not respected the validity of the tests. They have had no say in what tests were given or in how the results were used. The results were not useful in determining how to help their students (Urdan & Paris, 1994). Because of this, Urdan & Paris (1994) point out that teachers may have employed methods that undermined students’ test score validity.

Without a doubt, excellence in instruction goes much farther than test scores, such as provoking a love for learning, developing critical thinking skills, and encouraging creative thinking (Everson, Feinauer, & Sudweeks, 2013). A drawback of VAMs was that they were comparative, especially when they were used to make employment decisions regarding retention and promotion. This practice has pitted teachers against each other instead of encouraging an
environment of cooperation and development of professional learning communities (Everson, Feinauer, & Sudweeks, 2013).

Using student achievement data for the evaluation of teachers was a problematic undertaking (Stronge & Tucker, 2000). Effective teachers possessed a variety of strengths which they brought to the classroom. What made one teacher effective was potentially different from what made another teacher effective. Because teachers were individuals, their evaluations ought to have been tailored or differentiated (Peterson, 2004). Additionally, the practice of instruction was both methodical and impromptu (Stodolsky, 1984). Weiss and Weiss (1998) recommended “teaching needs to be understood dynamically in its multiple contexts, and performance data need to be gathered from diverse sources” (p. 4). Such factors were important to consider during the evaluation process for an improved understanding of results.

Teachers were both apprehensive and dubious of the evaluation process (Peterson, 2000). The OTES was a new and unknown entity and according to Peterson (2004) “Teachers [would] not support systems with inadequate procedures and components” (p. 63). Teacher evaluation systems were relevant when they focused on aspects of teaching that were seen as valuable to both the evaluator and the teacher (Iwanicki, 2001). In other words, evaluation systems must make sense to the practitioner (Peterson, 2004). Teachers were concerned about factors that relate to the nature of teaching itself (Danielson, 2001). Evaluation has been viewed as an activity in which the teacher participates and also one that encourages reflection on the part of the teacher. Such components made the process more meaningful to teachers (Weiss & Weiss, 1998). Unfortunately, teacher evaluation often encouraged teachers to follow procedure rather than actually advancing teacher performance (Johnson, 1990). Placing an emphasis on procedure was an ineffective means to achieve the desired goal of academia, which is student
learning. Lynn (2013) stated teacher views should be taken into account when creating an evaluation system. According to Lynn (2013) “Teachers viewed evaluations as a tool for improvement, while school reform advocates and some parents viewed evaluations as a way to dismiss teachers who were not performing well enough” (p. 208). While the accountability movement called for appraisals based on standards and student growth, the goal of evaluation should have been to develop systems to increase productivity of the school, not systems to fire people (Iwanicki, 2001). Inarguably, when a teacher is consistently ineffective, they should receive more comprehensive evaluation with the possibility of termination (Iwanicki, 2001).

Standards-based accountability has been one of the most important accomplishments of the reform movement as widely accepted standards for the teaching profession (clearly defining what a teacher should know and be able to do) were endorsed (Kellaghan, Stufflebeam, Pearlman & Tannenbaum, 2003). Evaluating teachers based on the standards was the logical next step toward accountability. The purpose of standards-based teacher evaluation systems was to provide standards and rubrics in order to determine the effectiveness of instructional choices and to provide accountability (Borman & Kimball, 2005). In fact, the focal point of legislative policy-making at both the state and federal levels has been the standards movement (Seashore Louis, Febey, & Schroeder, 2005).

**Accountability and Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction was a much-studied topic as evidenced by the many articles published on the subject. Job satisfaction was defined as “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experience” (Locke, 1976, p. 1304). Job satisfaction was impacted by various factors. To understand teacher job satisfaction, it was necessary to analyze the educational environment and inclination of teachers (Kim & Loadman, 1994). Kallerberg
(1977) established that work values had independent and significant effects on job satisfaction. Sergiovani (1967) found that recognition, achievement, and responsibility led to higher levels of job satisfaction. Ma and MacMillan (1999) established that gender and experience play a role in teacher job satisfaction. Female teachers, when compared to male teachers holding the same position, were typically more satisfied, and teachers with more experience were found to possess greater job satisfaction. Other research determined differences relating gender to job satisfaction were non-existent (Klassen & Anderson, 2009). Herzberg (1966) suggested contributors to job satisfaction were independent of factors contributing to job dissatisfaction. This meant that just because a factor created job satisfaction, the opposite or lack of the factor did not necessarily lead to job dissatisfaction. However, he made the claim that sources of dissatisfaction may eventually erode job satisfaction. Kim and Loadman (1994) claimed research has not found well-rounded and coherent prognosticators for teacher job satisfaction. Regardless, sources of teacher job satisfaction and dissatisfaction continued to be on the radar of researchers because research has shown teachers’ sense of well-being has had an effect on their commitment to the job, morale, motivation, and decision to remain in the profession (Rhodes, Neville, & Alan, 2004; Jesus & Lens, 2005).

Other important factors of teacher job satisfaction included autonomy and self-efficacy (Kim & Loadman, 1994; Gagne & Deci, 2005; Skaalvik & Skaavlik, 2014). Self-efficacy was defined as self-perceived competence (Gagne & Deci, 2005) and as “individual teachers’ beliefs about their own abilities to plan, organize, and carry out activities required to attain given educational goals” (Skaavlik & Skaavlik, 2007 p. 612). Gagne and Deci (2005) identified autonomy and self-efficacy as important components of self-determination theory and considered them as critical elements for psychological well-being. Self-determination theory described by
Gagne and Deci (2005) was about intrinsic motivation and choice. Caprara, Barbaranelli, Steca and Malone (2006) looked at the connection between teacher self-efficacy beliefs and their job satisfaction and found that self-efficacy beliefs did contribute to job satisfaction. Additionally, they found that teacher self-efficacy beliefs, related to the profession, impacted student achievement. Duyar, Gumus, and Bellibas (2012) found professional collaboration to be a strong predictor of teacher self-efficacy and job satisfaction. Teachers in higher achieving schools and who were found to have high levels of job satisfaction reported a sense of autonomy in their job (Lee, 2006). Kreis and Brockopp (2001) found a significant correlation between perceived autonomy within the classroom and job satisfaction.

Some elements of teacher job satisfaction were intrinsic in nature, and others were extrinsic in nature. Extrinsic rewards were outside influences including such factors as opportunity for promotion and salary. Intrinsic rewards were those internal influencers such as challenging work and working conditions (Kim & Loadman, 1994). Among intrinsic variables were self-efficacy and autonomy (Gagne and Deci, 2005: Perrachionne, Peterson & Rosser 2008). Autonomy and professional challenge have been cited as components of teacher job satisfaction because the combination allowed for the teacher to use his/her personal judgment to guide instructional work with students (Kim & Loadman, 1994). Positive interaction with colleagues was considered an intrinsic source of teacher job satisfaction. The sense of collaboration, community, and peer recognition derived from positive working relationships was another often-cited contributor to teacher job satisfaction (Kim & Loadman, 1994). The concept of public service was another satisfaction-building element in teaching. As stated by Kim and Loadman (1994) “Teaching is an opportunity to serve society, and the teacher is a moral agent dedicated to serving the public” (p. 9). Status and esteem were identified as additional intrinsic
variables of job satisfaction (Whiteford, 1990). Persevica (2011) concluded that by improving the intrinsic factors of teacher job satisfaction, the quality of education would be improved. Knowledge of the elements leading to job satisfaction provide important background information for the current study into the effects of teacher evaluation on teacher job satisfaction in Ohio.

Unfortunately, teacher status and esteem have recently succumbed to public criticism. Lately, the media tended to focus on the failures of schools, as typically measured by federally or state-mandated tests, rather than the successes (Krechevsky, Rivard, & Burton, 2010). This declining public perception may have led to increased stress for teachers. Surely, a factor related to low levels of job satisfaction was stress. High levels of stress were found to be both directly and negatively linked to low levels of job satisfaction (Reilly, Dhingra, & Boduszek, 2014). Muchhal and Chand (2010) supported that finding by adding that constant stress can dramatically lower professional commitment.

Extrinsic variables that were found to have a positive impact on teacher job satisfaction were students, teacher support, and a positive school environment (Perrachionne, Peterson, & Rosser, 2008). Satisfied teachers expressed being passionate about students and learning successes and cited coworkers as positive elements of their job (Hunt, Afolyayan, Bryd-Blake, Fabunmi, Pryor, & Aboro, 2009). Overall, researchers found teachers to be mostly satisfied with their profession (Persevica, 2011), a satisfaction that increased with age and length of service (Fuming & Jiliang, 2007). Fortunately, the desirability of the teaching profession has not been significantly impacted, and no evidence existed that teacher job satisfaction has been significantly reduced by elements of NCLB since it was enacted in 2001 (Grisson, Nicholson-Crotty, & Harrington, 2014).
Teachers who experienced dissatisfaction with their job exhibited lower commitment to their work, and this negatively impacted student motivation due to emotional contagion (Hatfield, Cacioppo, & Rapson, 1993). Moreover, teachers were found to be dissatisfied with salary (Persevica, 2011). Additional unfavorable feedback from teachers included state-mandated testing. Teachers reported constant stress and pressure because of the tests. They worried that they would transfer that stress onto their students. Furthermore, they worried about the stigma their district would endure if district scores were low (Barksdale-Ladd & Thomas, 2000). Additional complaints regarding testing included the amount of time taken away from instruction. Critics further charged that state testing drove instruction. Teachers complained that testing reduced creativity opportunities. Furthermore, teachers from all school levels expressed dissatisfaction with the practice of holding special-needs students to the same standard as typically-performing students (Hunt, Afolayan, Bryd-Blake, Fabunmi, Pryor, & Aboro, 2009).

In the 1986 publication of “A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century,” it was found that half of all teachers left the profession within seven years. Furthermore, data showed the most highly qualified teachers were those that choose to leave the profession (Heller, Clay & Perkins, 1992; Darling-Hammond, 1984). Because of such unfortunate data, the argument may have been made that paying heed to teacher job satisfaction for teacher retention purposes was critical to the retention of talented instructors. Also emanating from “A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century,” was proof that teachers found motivation via success in the classroom; therefore, they had a significant passion for meeting the academic requirements of their students. This was also how teachers achieved substantial satisfaction (Heller, Clay & Perkins, 1992).
Teacher job satisfaction was an important consideration when implementing policy. Due to the connection made earlier between teacher job satisfaction and quality of education in the classroom, it may be concluded that “by closing the teacher job satisfaction gap, educators may then have a tool for closing the student achievement gap” (Perrachionne, Peterson, & Rosser, 2008, p. 12). A strong link between classroom effectiveness and teachers’ overall job satisfaction have been found (Heller, Clay & Perkins, 1992). These research-based claims pointed to the necessity of understanding the impact of teacher evaluation on teacher job satisfaction. Teachers who have greater levels of job satisfaction have a higher level of commitment to the job (Conely, Muncey, & You, 2005; Muchhal and Chand, 2010). According to Burke, Greenhouse and Schwarzer (1996), attending to teacher job satisfaction was imperative. Teachers who experienced work-related stress or low job satisfaction were inclined to have weaker relationships with their students. Anemic relationships with students led to classroom management issues and decreased quality of education.

Moreover, waxing teacher job satisfaction aided in teacher retention and even inspired the best candidates to enter the profession of teaching (Knox & Anfara, 2013). Student learning was dependent on the quality of the curriculum and by the pedagogical skill of the teacher (Rutter, 1983). Teachers with high job satisfaction were more likely to devote themselves to continuing education, engage in professional development opportunities, and enhance their teaching efforts (Knox & Anfara, 2013). In other words, they were more likely to put forth the effort to develop their own pedagogical skills. Furthermore, teachers who were highly satisfied with the particulars of the job displayed an intrinsic motivation in working with students. As previously stated, such particulars included challenging work, autonomy, and working conditions
(Kim & Loadman, 1994). This motivation led to higher efficiency and quality of work
(Persevica, 2011).

Studies on whether or not teacher job satisfaction directly correlated to student
achievement have exhibited mixed results. Judge, Bono, Thoresen, & Patton (2001) conducted a
two-pronged study with a quantitative component and a qualitative component. The qualitative
portion of the study found no significant relationship between job satisfaction and job
performance. However, the quantitative portion of the study found a relationship correlation.
Caprara et al. (2000) and Persevica (2011) found no significant relationship between teacher job
satisfaction and student achievement. Bowling (2007) found the job satisfaction-job
performance relationship to be “spurious.” However, other studies reported educator job
satisfaction as having had an impact on student achievement (Knox and Anfara, 2013; Mertler,
be geared toward providing teachers with the resources necessary to meet the needs of students.

Research has identified “the single most dominant factor affecting student academic gain
is teacher effect” (Sanders & Rivers, 1996, p. 6). Teachers repeatedly suggested they were the
most significant influence on student academic achievement (Stronge, 2002). Mertler (2002)
found in his study that 23% of teachers reported being dissatisfied with teaching. He concluded,
“It is probably safe to assume that the students of these classroom teachers are not receiving the
highest quality education” (Mertler, 2002, p. 51). By understanding and surveying job
satisfaction and factors contributing to it, school and district administrators have been able to
control it, which would lead to a more productive and satisfied instructional staff (Knox &
Anfara, 2013; Mertler, 2002).
The nature of accountability was found to be stressful (Breaux, Perrewe, Hall, Frink, & Hochwarter, 2008; Jones, Jones, Hardin, Chapman, Yarbrough, & Davis, 1999; Smith, 1991). The term accountability implied for teachers that their evaluations were to be connected to student performance on standardized tests. Such a connotation insinuated for administrators that the entire school would be judged by student performance on those same standardized tests. Feared consequences included the possibility of staff losing jobs, a restructuring of the school, or even reconstitution of the school (Ellison, 2012). Because programs published test scores in the newspaper, many teachers experienced feelings of guilt or embarrassment. Such was true even for those teachers whose students scored well on the tests (Smith, 1991). A multitude of factors caused concern for instructors. Their apprehension did not end there.

Teachers indicate that they worry during test time about whether or not they have prepared students for the test, whether or not students have done their best, and whether students will display emotional effects, such as fighting, vomiting, crying, giving up, randomly marking answer sheets, and so on (Jones, Jones, Hardin, Chapman, Yarbrough, & Davis, 1999, p. 202).

Jones and Egley (2009) found teachers experienced extraordinary pressure to boost test scores. Additionally, teachers lost a sense of autonomy, or independence, previously determined to be an important variable in teacher job satisfaction because high-stakes, standardized assessments diminished control. Policy makers, who typically were not education specialists, were making the decisions regarding what was to be taught (Corbett, 1991). Furthermore, many policy makers have been unable to build a consensus regarding what composed the desired results of education (Hilliard, 2000). State legislated policy created a scenario where teachers were teaching to the test, thereby reducing teacher competence (Hilliard, 2000). Instances of
school systems simply setting goals, exhorting teachers to do better, and holding out threats of punishment if increased achievement did not occur have been witnessed (Heller, Clay, & Perkins, 1992).

Another issue was that teachers experienced role conflicts especially related to the lack of time to cover all of the standards and experienced emotional exhaustion due to a perceived lack of support for teachers in new policies (Berryhill, Linney, & Fromewick, 2009). Teachers typically felt they were hired to “inspire a love of learning, develop higher order thinking skills, create functioning citizens, encourage creative abilities, or simply provide love and hope to a child who has never experienced either of those things before” (Everson, Feinauer, & Sudweeks, 2013, p. 367). Test-based accountability sent the message to teachers that they were hired to raise test scores (Everson, Feinauer, & Sudweeks, 2013). Because of the inner turmoil created by this role conflict, Berryhill et al., (2009) found teachers perceived accountability policies as having unintended consequences for their own well-being. However, when an evaluation system was understandable and relevant, teachers perceived they were able to modify how they were evaluated. For example, teachers were able to determine which standards needed the most attention. This freedom provided a sense of autonomy and positively impacted job satisfaction (Conley, Muncey, & You, 2005). Moreover, when accountability measures led to improved teacher job performance, job satisfaction was likely to increase as the teacher’s reputation among peers elevated (Hall, Zinko, Perryman, & Ferris, 2009).

Standards-based evaluation and high-stakes testing were meant to improve the educational system in the U.S. by increasing student achievement. However, standards-based accountability systems actually created game-playing strategies with regards to retention and graduation rates in order to raise rates of student achievement. This has had an adverse effect on
low-performing students who tend to drop out of school or fade away. Ellison (2012) stated the social cost of standards-based reform must be considered. When standards were understandable and relevant, role ambiguity was reduced, which led to greater job satisfaction for teachers. Unintended consequences of using high-stakes tests, to ensure teacher accountability, were numerous. One frequent complaint was that assessment drives instruction. Unfortunately, standardized tests typically avoided questions that required students to use higher-level thinking skills such as analyzing and synthesizing information (Jones, Jones, Hardin, Chapman, Yarborough, & Davis, 1999; Kellaghan, Stufflebeam, Pearlman, & Tannenbaum, 2003; Lynn, 2013).

The goal of standards-based reform became conflicted with practice as it required challenging academic content to encourage high academic achievement. However, standardized tests required criteria to be clear and easily measured (Ellison, 2012). Creative and critical thinking may have been sacrificed for the purpose of teacher accountability (Jones, Jones, Hardin, Chapman, Yarborough, & Davis, 1999; Lynn, 2013). Furthermore, education that involved the arts and creativity, character education, critical thinking, and student motivation was complicated for the general public to understand and difficult to measure (Corbett & Wilson, 1991).

Also difficult to measure was the negative impact of testing on the educational process. As reported by Krechevsky, Rivard and Burton (2012) “Teachers in successful, as well as failing, schools are increasingly dispirited when they see joy, intellectual richness, and passion of teaching and learning take a backseat to testing mania” (p. 66). Indeed, many educators working in the climate of accountability worried that creative and content-rich learning would disappear (Paduella, Abrams, Madaus, Russell, Ramos, & Miao, 2003). Therefore, this type of education
was often sacrificed in order to focus on test preparation. Some educational scholars were apprehensive that with a loss of autonomy in the classroom, teachers have relinquished their own critical thinking and creativity skills (Jones, Jones, Hardin, Chapman, Yarbrough, & Davis, 1999). Such sacrifices would be one more unintended consequence of high-stakes testing and accountability. The cost of accountability systems in public education exceeded their value in the classroom as the change they created was anemic (Darling-Hammond, 2003; Bracey, 2003).

Another cause for concern was test misalignment. Teachers were asked to teach content-area standards to their students. If the test was not closely aligned with the standards taught, the results provided an inaccurate picture. As mentioned earlier, standardized tests were not efficient measures of the 21st Century skills of critical thinking, creativity, problem solving, communication, and collaboration. The typical multiple-choice format used on standardized tests was designed for purposes of reliability in the effort to rank and find norms. Moreover, the tests did not provide information helpful to the improvement of teaching and learning (Ellison, 2012). Such skills were important to the educational curriculum for preparing students to be college and career ready as legislatively mandated by the Ohio General Assembly. Cassner-Lotto and Barrington (2006) found a skills gap in high school graduates existed. Nonetheless, teachers who focused on these important elements of education would be penalized (Kellaghan, Stufflebeam, Pearlman, & Tannenbaum, 2003).

An additional issue with evaluating teachers’ performance based on student achievement was the question of how to control all of the variables that may have an impact. Such variables included but were not limited to income levels of families, involvement of parents, and class size (Egalite, 2016). Until this was determined, such an evaluation system would have been considered disingenuous (Kellaghan, Stufflebeam, Pearlman, & Tannenbaum, 2003). A final
unintended consequence of test-based accountability was the flight of quality teachers from lower-achieving/high-poverty districts. High-stakes accountability included rewards and sanctions focused on teachers as professionals. Teachers were recognized for high student achievement and indicted for poor student achievement. Unfortunately, this was a disincentive to work in underperforming schools (Rice & Malen, 2003). The flight of quality teachers from low-performing districts was understandable as “teachers, like any professionals, want to be effective in their work and when they perceive that this is not possible, they find an environment where they can be more effective” (Roellke & Rice, 2008 p. 290).

Because of this flight of quality teachers, it became more difficult, yet still imperative to make sure there was a competent teacher in each classroom (Danielson, 2001). In that vein, reform efforts were made with good intentions. However, research showed reform efforts may have actually decreased teacher satisfaction by setting forth increased expectations for student achievement without making the changes necessary to allow teachers to be more effective (Heller, Clay, & Perkins, 1992). Teacher job satisfaction retained good teachers so efforts to increase job satisfaction should have been made. Policy makers would have been prudent to consider all aspects of what constitutes teacher job satisfaction in order to improve education (Kim & Loadman, 1994). Klassen and Anderson (2009) suggested today’s teachers are less concerned with sources of dissatisfaction and more concerned with negative satisfiers (the factors they thought would be contributors to their job satisfaction but were absent). On a positive note, despite the unintended, negative consequence of high-stakes testing, Jones and Egley (2009) found many teachers were largely job satisfied.
The Ohio Teacher Evaluation System (OTES)

Teachers knew that instruction was a multi-faceted endeavor and a short observation did not provide enough information to substantiate an evaluation for the year (Danielson, 2001). As discussed earlier in the review of the literature, changes in teacher evaluation methods have and will continue to occur. The journey toward accountability began in Ohio in 2004 with the report of the Governor’s Commission on Teaching Success. The report was followed by Senate Bill 2 which called for the establishment of the Educator Standards Board of Education. The Educator Standards Board of Education was charged with formulating a set of Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession. Following that, in 2009, House Bill 1 “directed the Educator Standards Board to recommend model evaluation systems for teachers and principals to the State Board of Education for their review and adoption” (Ohio Department of Education, 2013, para. 8). In response to that decree, The Educator Standards Board recommended the state adopt the OTES.

At the time research was conducted, peer-reviewed literature regarding the OTES was limited. Therefore, information regarding the evaluation system was gleaned directly from the website for The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) which claimed, “Ohio's system for evaluating teachers (Ohio's Teacher Evaluation System) provides educators with a rich and detailed view of their performance, with a focus on specific strengths and opportunities for improvement” (Ohio Department of Education, 2013, para. 1). The Ohio Department of Education claimed that the OTES was research-based and transparent (Ohio Department of Education, 2013).

The original evaluation framework recommended by The Educator Standards Board for the OTES included two components each weighing 50% in the overall structure. The first component, Teacher Performance Rating, was determined from three elements including a
professional growth plan, two thirty-minute observations conducted by a trained and credentialed evaluator, and walkthrough observations. The evaluator participated in training and completed an on-line evaluation to receive the appropriate credentials for conducting the evaluations. The evaluator was required to re-calibrate and test every two years as the credentials expired in that time frame. According to ODE, whether or not to announce the formal observations ahead of time was a local district decision (Ohio Department of Education, 2015b).

The teacher evaluation process called on the evaluator to use evidence collected from a multitude of sources. These included a professional growth or improvement plan, observations, walkthroughs, conferences and any evidence or artifacts the teacher chose to share. Such data was used to determine a teacher performance rating of Accomplished, Skilled, Developing, or Ineffective. Pre and post conferences were not required but were considered a best practice and a rich sources of evidence. Additionally, the post conference was a reflective opportunity for the teacher and the evaluator to determine areas for refinement or reinforcement. Areas of refinement were intended to drive professional development decisions for that instructor (Ohio Department of Education, 2013).

The second component was the student academic growth rating, also initially intended to weigh 50% of the overall teacher evaluation. Half of each teacher's evaluation would have been derived from the degree to which his or her students learned during the school year. Student growth measures were a mechanism for ascertaining the degree of academic gains students made (Ohio Department of Education, 2013). This was done by calculating student growth between two points in time, also referred to as the interval of instruction. Because there was no common assessment shared by all teachers, the student growth element was challenging. Three methods for measuring student growth were determined. The first method was Value-Added. Value
Added Measures were discussed earlier in the literature review. The OTES required teachers to use Value-Added data, if it existed, for their students. Additionally, if legally acceptable, the district could have incorporated local student growth measures. If Value-Added data were unavailable, districts were instructed to use assessments referred to as Approved Vendor Assessments. Such assessments were offered by national testing vendors if they were on the approved list for the state of Ohio. The third method for determining student growth was referred to as Locally-Determined Measures. These measures were to be used in areas such as art or music, where Value-Added data and Approved Vendor Assessments were not available (Ohio Department of Education, 2015c).

In situations where the third method was required to be employed, the districts were charged with creating the opportunities to measure student progress. Districts were able to produce measures through a locally authorized procedure. Locally Determined Measures included Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) or Shared Attribution. An SLO was one way to establish a teacher’s influence on student learning. Student Learning Objectives were intended to cover a long-term interval of instruction and included a target for academic growth for each student. As previously stated, shared attribution was another Locally Determined Measure. Shared attribution was a growth measure that was attributed to or shared by a group. Shared attribution was helpful for supporting collaboration for meeting school goals (Ohio Department of Education, 2015c).

On June 3, 2014, House Bill 362 modified the OTES. One change was in the number of observations a teacher would receive. House Bill 362 allowed less frequent evaluation of teachers who received skilled and accomplished ratings beginning in the 2014-2015 academic year. The other change allowed school districts to choose between a new alternative teacher
evaluation structure and the original structure. The alternative structure allowed for an additional measure or data source for teacher evaluation. This data source was to count for 15% of the evaluation. Options for data included student surveys, teacher self-evaluations, peer review evaluations, and student portfolios. Student Growth and Teacher Performance both constituted 42.5% of the evaluation under the alternative structure (Ohio Department of Education, 2014a).

Yet another change was made to the OTES through the 2016-2017 state budget bill: House Bill 64. Changes that affected a number of elements of the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System became effective in September 2015. The alternative framework for the OTES was modified. The initial alternative framework included a 42.5%, 42.5%, and 15% division of percentages of category weights, but the new alternative framework changed the percentages so that teacher performance would count for 50%, student growth would count for 35%, and the third component would count for 15% of the overall evaluation. The original framework for teacher evaluation remained unchanged. Furthermore, safe harbor provisions were offered to districts, which meant value-added ratings derived from state tests for both the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 academic years were not to be used as part of teacher evaluation ratings. Furthermore, they could not be used for decisions in dismissal or retention, tenure, nor compensation (Ohio Department of Education, 2015d). The preceding information provided an up-to-date description of the OTES necessary for understanding of the current research.

The Ohio Teacher Evaluation system incorporated a detailed rubric for components of instruction. The observation process recommended, but did not require, the evaluator to scribe for the duration of the observation. Three categories, Instructional Planning, Instruction and Assessment, and Professionalism were broken down further into more focused categories. Instructional Planning included categories such as Focus for Learning, Assessment Data, Prior
Content Knowledge/Sequence/Connection, and Knowledge of Students. Instruction and Assessment incorporated Lesson Delivery, Differentiation, Resources, Classroom Environment, and Assessment of Student Learning categories. Under Professionalism was the subcategory Professional Responsibilities. The rubric provided a detailed description of what these categories looked like in practice. The evaluator was responsible for analyzing evidence for each category and determining if the instructor being evaluated was Accomplished, Skilled, Developing, or Ineffective for each category. The evaluator then assigned a final overall designation which was used as the performance rating. Finally, the results of the performance rating were uploaded to the state, as were the student growth results. These two components were uploaded into the electronic Teacher and Principal Evaluation System (eTPES) (Ohio Department of Education, 2015d).

Summary

Educators and policy makers alike acknowledged what astute parents figured out a long time ago: the competency of the individual teacher counted (Danielson, 2001). The accountability movement, which began with the 1959 National Defense Education Act, led to the evolution of the standards-based reform movement and culminated with The Ohio Teacher Evaluation System as a response to the accountability movement in the state of Ohio. Political aspects of the accountability movement and how legislators benefited from the perpetuation of the belief that schools are failing are pertinent to the study of accountability. Additionally, the pros and cons of high-stakes assessment, VAMS, and the validity of the data were important elements for a holistic study of teacher accountability, evaluation, and teacher job satisfaction. Issues of high-stakes testing and how such assessments positively and negatively impacted
education were key components of the research. The progression of teacher evaluation was traced as many of the transformative elements were found in the OTES.

Many of the elements of the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System were directly connected with both accountability and teacher job satisfaction. While a direct link between teacher job satisfaction and student achievement was a subject of disagreement between researchers, its overall importance in the realm of educating students was conclusive. When the research for this study began, the state of Ohio was in the process of full implementation of its new Ohio Teacher Evaluation System. A look at the components of the OTES and their impact on teacher job satisfaction was needed. Ohio’s teachers faced multiple challenges and stressors in their work. How did teacher job satisfaction fare in the face of the OTES?
CHAPTER III

Methodology

Education reformers have called for increased accountability for the nation’s public schools (Seashore, Louis, Febey, & Schroeder, 2005). The accountability movement has pushed high-stakes, standardized testing as a way to measure teacher productivity (Koretz, 2002). Teacher evaluation has experienced a shift in focus from what teachers do to accomplish the task of teaching to student growth as the result of what teachers do in the classroom (Levitz, 1972; Kellaghan, Stufflebeam, Pearlman, & Tannenbaum, 2003). The state of Ohio’s General Assembly has increased accountability measures for educators in K-12 educational settings, which had a direct impact on teachers throughout the state. In an effort to improve educational outcomes for Ohio’s K-12 students, Ohio’s legislators mandated rapid change and increased accountability measures through enacted laws which caused Ohio’s educators to experience change within the profession at an unprecedented rate (Achieve Inc., 2007). The purpose of this study was to determine if increased accountability under the new Ohio Teacher Evaluation System (OTES) impacted teacher job satisfaction.

The policy changes and increased accountability measures in the OTES created wide-ranging and compelling ramifications for teachers throughout the state of Ohio. Research has implied that increased accountability may stimulate both positive and negative results connected with job satisfaction (Hall, Zinko, Perryman, & Ferris, 2009). Understanding the impact of increased accountability on teacher job satisfaction will be beneficial to policy makers and educational leaders as they make decisions regarding teacher accountability measures in the future. The impact of increased accountability measures found in the new teacher evaluation


system imposed upon Ohio educators was studied in order to understand how it affected teacher job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction has been associated with teacher motivation, and these occupational attitudes have been linked to quality education in schools (Evans, 2000). Research has identified a strong correlation between teacher job satisfaction and quality of education (Persevica, 2011). The desired outcome for this study was to contribute to the existing literature connecting accountability and teacher job satisfaction while taking a close look at the new Ohio Teacher Evaluation System.

This chapter discussed the research methodology and provided the rationale for chosen approaches. Additionally, participants, instrumentation, data sources, and collection procedures were examined. Research questions were restated to provide a coherent review of the research process. Data analysis was described and methods, as well as tools, were justified in Chapter Three. Finally, assumptions regarding this research were deliberated as part of the methodology discussion.

**Research Design**

This study used primary data collected through a quantitative, non-experimental research design. The researcher chose a quantitative approach to allow for generalizations from the participant sample and to receive measurable data. Non-experimental research was identified as appropriate for the study as the researcher sought to understand the dependence of variables through correlations. The researcher collected primary data using an electronic survey that included three sections. The three sections included demographic, job satisfaction, and OTES-specific questions. Subjects of the research were Ohio K-12 teachers who were evaluated through the OTES format. A digital survey was chosen for conducting research as it required
minimal effort with the potential for expedient results. The online survey was sent via a recruitment e-mail (Appendix B) to superintendents and principals, selected by the researcher, with a request to forward the survey to teachers. An invitation to teachers to participate in the study (Appendix C) was included at the beginning of the survey and contained a statement of implied consent. The online survey was open for data collection from May 20, 2015 until August 31, 2015. Mid-May was the target day for sending the survey as teachers received their written evaluations in May. Timing would allow respondents to complete the survey while the evaluation experience was fresh in their minds. Data was analyzed to determine if increased accountability elements of OTES positively or negatively impacted teacher job satisfaction.

Participants

The researcher surveyed teachers in K-12 public education in the state of Ohio. At the time of the research, Ohio had 3,794 public schools which housed 107,972 public school teachers (Meador, 2016). While the researcher focused on sending the survey to districts in northwest Ohio, whether or not the survey went only to districts in the northwest region was unknown. Superintendents and principals were encouraged to forward the survey to their own contacts. Additionally, the survey was not sent to all districts in the region, rather only to those regions in that the researcher had a personal contact thereby making the sample a convenience sample.

The population of the participants included those Ohio teachers who were evaluated through the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System (OTES). Participation in the survey was voluntary with 321 teachers responding to the request. Ultimately, the number of participants who completed the survey was 290; therefore, the N=290 for the purposes of the research. The participants were able to choose to complete the online survey in any setting that was convenient.
The mental and physical health of the participants was unknown. K-12 teachers whose districts adopted an alternative evaluation process to OTES were not qualified to respond to OTES-based questions and, therefore, were excluded from the study. Because participation in the survey was voluntary, the participants were likely interested in the subject. Furthermore, because the research was conducted through a convenience sampling, most of the participants were from the northwest region of Ohio as that was where the researcher has the strongest K-12 public education contacts.

**Instrumentation & Data Sources**

The first section of the online survey was for the collection of demographic information. These questions were created by the researcher for the purpose of determining if demographic differences had an impact on data obtained regarding teacher job satisfaction and/or teacher perceptions of the OTES. Demographic information such as gender (male, female, or other), years of experience in teaching, union affiliation, and tenure was sought in this section. Teachers were asked to provide their highest academic degree attained; their content area of teaching; and whether they taught in an elementary, middle, high school, or career technical facility. They were asked to further describe their school by student body size; percentage of students who qualified for free and reduced lunch; and if they worked in a rural, suburban, or urban school district.

Additionally, OTES-specific demographic questions were asked to determine if such factors influenced teacher job satisfaction or teacher impressions of the OTES. Teachers were asked to respond to a question regarding the structure of OTES used by the respondent’s school. Schools were able to choose to use the 50/50 structure, which means that 50% of the teacher evaluation was based on observation and 50% was based on student growth. The other option
was the alternative structure. This structure was 42.5%/42.5%/15%, with observation and student growth each comprising 42.5%. The additional 15% was fulfilled through one of the following tools: teacher self-evaluation, teacher peer review evaluation, student portfolio, or student perception surveys. These tools were provided by the Ohio Department of Education.

Teachers were also asked to provide information regarding how they were categorized for the purposes of the OTES. Under the OTES, an instructor was categorized as a type A, B or C teacher for student growth purposes. Type A teachers used teacher-level value-added data to determine student growth. Type B teachers had a combination of vendor assessment data and district measures/Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) to determine student growth. Type C teachers had only district measures/SLOs to determine student growth (Ohio Department of Education, 2013). Asking what category a teacher was grouped with was considered important by the researcher. An impression existed that teachers who created SLOs also created their own tests and therefore had more control over what was on the test. Looking at the connection between teacher categories, teacher job satisfaction and teacher impression of the OTES was thought to be an important component for this study.

Another important piece of demographic information regarding the OTES was the respondent’s most recent evaluation designation. Teachers were designated as Ineffective, Developing, Skilled, or Accomplished. If a teacher received a designation of “Ineffective” in consecutive years, they might have been subject to being removed from the classroom (based on local district bargaining agreements). Teachers with a designation of “Ineffective” or “Developing” were placed on a Teacher Improvement Plan designed by their supervisor. Teachers who received a designation of “Skilled” or “Accomplished” were placed on a Teacher Growth Plan. The Teacher Growth Plan was designed by the individual teacher. Teachers with
a designation of “Skilled” or “Accomplished” were subject to less frequent formal observations (Ohio Department of Education, 2014b). The researcher sought to determine if a connection between teacher evaluation designation and job satisfaction existed. Furthermore, the researcher explored for a connection between teacher evaluation designation and teacher perception of the OTES.

The second section of the survey was for the purpose of collecting data on teacher job satisfaction. The questions utilized in section two were from the P. E. Lester Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ) found in Appendix D. Permission to use these questions was granted by P.E. Lester, and a copy of the letter granting permission to use the TJSQ for the purposes of this study may be found in Appendix E. Lester (1982) created the TJSQ for use specifically in educational research. Lester created nine factors of teacher job satisfaction including Supervision, Colleagues, Working Conditions, Pay, Responsibility, Advancement, Security, and Recognition. Questions used in this study included questions from Lester’s Factor One, Supervision; Factor Five, Responsibility; Factor Eight, Security; and Factor Nine, Recognition. These four factors from the P. E. Lester TJSQ were chosen for use as they were deemed most germane to the current study by the researcher. Likert-scale response choices for all TJSQ questions included Strongly Agree, Agree, Neither Agree nor Disagree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree.

Supervision was the first TJSQ factor included in section two of the survey. Lester defined Supervision as “the task-oriented behavior and person-oriented behavior of the immediate supervisor” (Lester, 1982, p. 11). These questions were determined to be applicable to the current research as the supervisor was the most likely candidate to complete the observation process for teachers. Supervision questions asked the participant to provide
responses to eleven statements. Statements included “My supervisor gives me assistance when I need help,” “My immediate supervisor praises good teaching,” and “My immediate supervisor offers suggestions to improve my teaching.” Negative statements were also included, such as “My supervisor makes me feel uncomfortable,” “My immediate supervisor is not willing to listen to suggestions,” and “My immediate supervisor does not back me up.” One of the supervision statements provided by Lester inadvertently left off of the survey was “My immediate supervisor treats everyone equitably.”

The second factor from the TJSQ included in the current research was Responsibility. Responsibility was defined as “the opportunity to be accountable for one’s own work and the opportunity to take part in policy or decision-making activities” (Lester, 1982, p. 11). The Responsibility factor included eight statements for teacher response, including “I get along well with my students,” “My students respect me as a teacher,” and “I try to be aware of the policies of my school.” Negative statements for this factor included “I am not responsible for my actions” and “I am not interested in the policies of my school.” The Responsibility factor was included in the current research as it examined the teacher’s sense of being held accountable and the opportunity to participate in decision-making in the work environment. The researcher was interested in understanding if the OTES had an impact on these elements. Therefore, the Responsibility factor was determined to be pertinent to the current research.

Security was defined as “the school’s policies regarding tenure, seniority, layoffs, pension, retirement, and dismissal” (Lester, 1982, p. 11). The Security factor was deemed relevant to the current study as the OTES impacted tenure in the state of Ohio for teachers. For example, if a teacher received an ineffective rating for three years consecutively, the school district may be required to remove the ineffective teacher from the classroom based on local
bargaining agreements as specified by Ohio Rev. Code 3319.112 (2011). Ohio Rev. Code 3319.111 (2011) stated, “The board shall include in its evaluation policy procedures for using the evaluation results for retention and promotion decisions and for removal of poorly performing teachers. Seniority shall not be the basis for the decision to retain a teacher except when making a decision between teachers who have comparable evaluations.” Such language implied that Reduction in Force (RIF) practices can no longer be related to seniority but instead must be based on teacher evaluation designation. If a teacher was new to the district but had a rating of Accomplished and a teacher with ten years of service had a rating of Skilled, the district must RIF the senior teacher. Therefore, job security may now be a threat to teacher job satisfaction as never before. Three statements comprised the Security factor in the TJSQ. They include “I am afraid of losing my teaching job,” “Teaching provides for a secure future,” and “I never feel secure in my teaching job.”

The final TJSQ factor included in the current study was Factor Nine, Recognition. Recognition was defined as “some act of notice, blame, praise, or criticism” (Lester, 1982, p. 11). The Recognition factor was determined to be significant to this study by the researcher as potentially, OTES may impact teachers’ perceived sense of being noticed, praised, or criticized. Factor Nine included three statements for teacher response. The statements included “I receive full recognition for my successful teaching,” “No one tells me I am a good teacher,” and “I receive too little recognition.”

The third section of the survey was comprised of eleven questions designed by the researcher. Questions were intended to explore the respondent’s impression of the OTES and the impact of the evaluation system on his/her teaching practice. Respondents were asked questions regarding whether or not the OTES made him/her more accountable and if it has had a positive
impact on the quality of his/her instructional design. The teachers’ sense of self-efficacy was sought in this section of the survey. Additionally, the respondent was asked about his/her impression of various components of the OTES, such as the design of the pre and post conferences. The final question in section three was open-ended and provided an opportunity for the respondent to expand on or offer insight into his/her previous responses, thereby offering additional insight.

The survey was sent electronically at the time teachers’ evaluation results for the 2014-2015 academic year were being uploaded to the state of Ohio through the eTPES. The eTPES was the electronic teacher and principal evaluation systems portal. According to the Ohio Department of Education, a written report of an instructor’s evaluation results with designated ratings be completed by mid-May each year (2014b). The latter part of May was targeted for sending the survey so the current year’s evaluation results would be fresh in the minds of the teachers.

**Data Collection Procedures**

The participants were asked to voluntarily complete an anonymous online survey. There were three parts to the online survey. Part one was for demographic information, part two provided data regarding job satisfaction, and part three provided teacher impressions of the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System. The link to this online survey was e-mailed to the superintendents and principals who were asked to forward the survey to their teaching staff. Quantitative data was collected through specific survey questions. Feedback was collected through the final question that was open-ended and requested respondents to expand on their responses and offer any insight they deemed important to the research.
As discussed in the Research Design section of this chapter, an online survey was sent electronically to superintendents and principals selected by the researcher, who forwarded the survey to teachers. Such an approach was necessary because teacher e-mail addresses are not easily accessible, by the public, in Ohio. The three sections of the online survey were purposefully designed or chosen by the researcher in order to elicit pertinent data for the current study. The TJSQ was chosen for use in this survey because it was designed specifically for use in education, customized for teachers, with language easily understood by the population. Furthermore, the P. E. Lester TJSQ was frequently mentioned in sources relevant to the current study. Additionally, the TJSQ had established rates of validity and reliability.

This study employed a convenience sampling as surveys were sent to superintendents or principals to forward to teachers. Superintendents and principals were chosen based on familiarity through professional organizations and regional meetings by the researcher. E-mail addresses were available through business cards or the researcher’s address book. The total number of expected participants was 100 K-12 teachers. Surveys were sent to district and building leaders in K-12 education selected by the researcher, who then forwarded the survey to their instructional staff members. The researcher aimed to have 500 teachers receive the survey through this process. However, there was no way to track how many teachers actually received the survey. Nevertheless, the researcher anticipated one out of four instructors receiving the survey would submit completed responses. The participants were asked to voluntarily complete the anonymous online survey. A letter to superintendents and principals requesting them to forward the survey link may be found in Appendix B. Additionally, the letter to teachers inviting them to participate in the survey, which acted as the Implied Consent form may be found in Appendix C.
The survey was piloted with 27 teachers. Seventeen teachers responded to the survey request out of the 27. The shortest time taken to complete the survey was 3 minutes and 31 seconds while the longest time taken was 12 minutes and 38 seconds. The median time was six and a half minutes. Following the pilot, no participants said the survey was too long. When asked, all pilot participants felt the questions were clearly written, and all understood the survey was asking about evaluation/OTES/job satisfaction. However, it was found that many teachers were unclear if they were a Type A, B, or C teacher. When asked if they would understand if Type C included the term SLO in the description, the instructors’ response was they would have more clearly understood. The researcher changed the explanations for the teacher types for improved clarity.

The total investment of the participant was between five and ten minutes. The risk to participants was made minimal through the use of an anonymous survey. Their participation in the survey in no way jeopardized either their teaching license or their current employment status. Because the participants were anonymous, responses were not traceable. In this way, risk was alleviated ensuring the participants would not be negatively impacted professionally or personally due to their participation in the survey. The value of the information gained from this research was far greater than the less-than-minimal risk to any participants. Participants benefited by having their voices heard by administrators and legislators regarding the impact of their evaluation system on their job satisfaction. Equity and equality of participants who completed the survey were insured as all responses were included in the results.

With more than 100,000 teachers in the state of Ohio, this study aimed to receive responses from 100 participants. Surveys were sent to district and building leaders in K-12 education, selected by the researcher, who forwarded the survey to their instructional staff
members. The researcher aimed to have 500 teachers receive the survey through this process. An anticipated response rate was one out of four instructors would complete the survey. However, there was no way to track how many teachers received the survey as some superintendents and principals may have chosen not to forward the survey. No compensation was awarded to the participants for their time. Participants benefited by having their voices heard by administrators and legislators regarding the impact of their evaluation system on their job satisfaction. Benefits resulting from this study included an increased understanding of how the accountability movement impacts teacher job satisfaction. Information gained through the research will be helpful to state legislators, educational administrators, and other stakeholders of Ohio’s educational system.

In order to inform the participants of the details of their participation, a waiver of implied consent was embedded into the electronic survey. Teachers were instructed to print the implied consent waiver for their own reference. Submission of a completed survey implied consent of participation on behalf of the participant. Full disclosure was provided to the participants at the start of the survey via the waiver.

**Research Questions**

As a result of including student test scores in teacher evaluation in Ohio as a measure of teacher success, teachers may consider the OTES as holding them more accountable for what happens in the classroom. Such culpability may impact teacher job satisfaction. Moreover, teacher job satisfaction had been confirmed to affect the quality of education in the classroom (Persevica, 2011). The researcher sought to gain insight into the relationship between accountability within teacher evaluation and teacher job satisfaction, specifically in Ohio public education. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to determine the impact of increased
accountability conveyed through the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System on teacher job satisfaction. In an effort to determine the influence of various elements of the OTES and perceived accountability within those elements on teacher job satisfaction, the researcher sought answers to the following questions:

1. Is the OTES associated with an impact on teacher job satisfaction? If so, is the relationship positive or negative?

2. Which components of the OTES, if any, are most associated with teacher job satisfaction?

**Data Analysis**

Research data collected through the voluntary survey was first analyzed to determine data providing feedback for two variables referred to as OTES Impression and OTES Performance. All data was assigned a numerical value. First, overall job satisfaction of respondents was calculated. A score was found for each subset. The primary method of analysis was correlational analysis in order to determine a dependence of variables. A correlation matrix was completed for each research question.

**Research Question One**

To analyze the research data, each item from the Likert questionnaire was analyzed separately. The value assigned to each Likert item was based on an equidistant 5-point scale as predetermined by choice of responses: Strongly Agree (5 points), Agree (4 points), Neither Agree nor Disagree (3 points), Disagree (2 points), and Strongly Disagree (1 point).

Regarding the TJSQ, according to P. E. Lester, “Upon completion of the final factor solution, tests of reliability were run for the total and for each of the nine factors (subscales). The internal consistency of the TJSQ was determined through computation of an Alpha
coefficient. The total scale Alpha for the sample (N =526) was .93” (Lester, 1982, p. 2). However, for the purposes of the current study, the researcher chose to utilize four of the nine factors including supervision, responsibility, security, and recognition. The specific factors scale coefficients are .71 (security), .73 (responsibility), .74 (recognition), and .92 (supervision).

With respect to the validity of the TJSQ, Lester affirmed the content of the questionnaire was inspected by experts in the field with the TJSQ being scrutinized for the instructions, order of items, and the selection of the items. Furthermore, content validation was completed through a modified Q sort which is a statistical method for determining a person’s subjectivity or point of view. Items were examined for “length, intelligibility, and redundancy as well as their content specificity to an educational setting. Thus a representative sample of items was developed, generating an initial pool of 120 items” (Lester, 1982, p. 3). For the TJSQ, Lester disclosed that criterion validity was not obtained. Factor analysis was used for construct validation of the TJSQ, as it discovered the variables that articulate and their relation to each other.

Items borrowed from the TJSQ for the purposes of the current study used in section two of the survey asked the participants to determine their level of agreement or disagreement with particular statements on a scale of one to five. The scales for favorable and unfavorable items were reversed. Therefore, according to Lester, “a low score represents low job satisfaction, and a high score represents high job satisfaction” (Lester, 1982, p. 5). Lester, based on the scale described above, created a survey tool that was easy to score. However, the researcher needed to take care to score the Supervision questions carefully as Lester included 14 items in that section. The researcher unintentionally left one of the items off of the newly created survey, and therefore only used thirteen of the Supervision items created by Lester.
Assumptions

At the outset of the current study, the researcher made certain assumptions regarding the research process. First of all, the researcher assumed participants would be honest in their responses to the questions in the survey. There was the potential for a respondent to answer negatively for all items because they resent the OTES. However, it was assumed that participants would answer each question carefully and independently of the other questions. Furthermore, time and care were given to the consideration of components of OTES and the factors of the TJSQ. The researcher assumed the items included in the research instrument would uncover connections and themes between the OTES and teacher job satisfaction. It was assumed the themes would result in findings significant to the teaching profession that would impact policy at the state level. The researcher further assumed that OTES does increase accountability. The researcher expected to learn that most teachers have an improved level of job satisfaction due to increased communication with their evaluator and improved methods for tracking student growth. These two elements were byproducts of the increased accountability measures found in the OTES.
CHAPTER IV

Results

Through this study, the researcher investigated the correlation between teacher evaluation, specifically the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System, and teacher job satisfaction. The researcher determined the investigation into the effects of teacher evaluation on teacher job satisfaction was pertinent due to the correlation between teacher job satisfaction and quality of education identified by Persevica (2011). Due to the relative newness of the OTES as the teacher evaluation system in Ohio, an understanding how the OTES impacted teacher job satisfaction was considered by the researcher as valuable information for educators and legislators. Because the survey was sent to district leaders, it was not known how many teachers actually received the request to complete the survey. The immediate chapter was written as a presentation of the results of the survey as they pertained to the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System and teacher job satisfaction.

The research for this study collected data through the online survey regarding demographics, OTES impressions, and job satisfaction. Collected data was analyzed using correlational analysis by first creating variables of OTES performance and for OTES impression. Additionally, a variable was created for overall job satisfaction as well as for each of the four sub scores. A correlation matrix was created for each research question derived for the current study.

Demographic or descriptive data collected for the study included number of years the teacher was evaluated under the OTES; the teachers’ OTES rating for the 2014-2015 school year; number of years the teacher worked in Ohio K-12 Public Education; the model of OTES used by the teacher’s school district; and whether the teacher was categorized by the Ohio
Department of Education as type A, type B, or type C. Additionally, teachers were asked to respond to questions regarding any union affiliation, gender of the teacher, if the teacher had tenure or not, the highest academic degree attained by the teacher, school level in which the teacher worked, content area for which the teacher provided instruction, free/reduced lunch designation of the teacher’s school, and type of developed environment, such as urban or rural, of the district in which the teacher was employed. Tables or matrices, were used to frame and describe correlations for student growth and the teachers’ impression of the preconference and the post conference with the overall teacher job satisfaction scores. The same process was conducted for each of the job satisfaction sub scores which included Supervision, Responsibility, Security, and Recognition. Then, a matrix was used to reflect correlations between OTES performance and OTES impression with overall job satisfaction and each of the four sub scores previously mentioned for teacher job satisfaction.

Characteristics of the Sample

The target population for this study was composed of licensed K-12 teachers in public education in Ohio, evaluated under the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System. All participants received the survey along with an invitation to participate, which included a statement of implied consent, in addition to contact information for the researcher and the survey. The researcher received 321 survey responses. Thirty-one of the surveys were incomplete. However, some respondents chose to skip questions within the survey but otherwise submitted a completed survey. The researcher, therefore, received 290 fully completed survey responses, which far exceeded the anticipated 100 responses. This was a 96% completion rate. For those surveys, which were incomplete, the respondents most frequently stopped answering questions at the end
of the demographic response section. Despite the fact that the survey took less than ten minutes on average, the appearance of length seems to have been a limitation.

Question one asked respondents how many years of experience they had in being evaluated under the OTES. The purpose of this question was to determine the level of experience respondents had with the OTES and therefore the level of understanding or comfort with the evaluation system. Respondents were given the option to choose one, two, three, or four years. At the time of the survey, four years was the maximum number of years a district may have employed the OTES as their evaluation tool. Two respondents chose not to answer the question. Therefore, the number of respondents for this question was N=288. The percentage of teachers who answered one year was 24.31% (N=70). Teachers responding two years were 56.25% (N=162). Those who responded three years were 13.19% (N=38), and those responding four years was 6.25% (N=18).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Year</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>24.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Years</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>56.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Years</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.007%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Number of Years Participant Had Been Evaluated Under the OTES (n=290)

Question two of the survey asked the respondent to provide his/her individual OTES rating or designation for the 2014-2015 school year. The researcher was interested in determining if individual OTES ratings impacted teachers’ perceptions of the OTES, its components of the OTES, or teacher job satisfaction. Teacher ratings or designations under the OTES include Ineffective, Developing, Skilled, and Accomplished. Out of 286 teachers who
answered this question, 0.70% (N=2) answered they had received an Ineffective rating.

Instructors receiving a Developing rating were 6.64% (N=19). A Skilled rating was the strongest response with 50% (N=143.) and Accomplished was also a strong response with 42.66% (N=122). Out of 290 respondents, 2% (N=4) chose not to respond to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplished</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>42.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NR = No Response

The majority of the teachers who responded to the survey had been working in Ohio K-12 public education and had ten or more years of experience. The researcher chose to ask this question to identify if teaching experience had an effect on teacher impressions of the OTES or on job satisfaction. Answer options and their correlating responses for question three included one to four years with 8.62% (N=25), five to nine years with 20.34% (N=59), 10 to 14 years with 18.62% (N=54), 15 to 19 years with 24.14% (N=70), 20 to 24 years with 12.41% (N=36), 25 to 29 years with 8.97% (N=26), 30 to 34 years with 5.86% (N=17), and 35 years and more with 1.03% (N=3).
In question number four, respondents were asked about the structure of the OTES their district chose to use. The original structural design for the OTES was a 50/50 structure in which fifty percent of the teachers’ evaluations were based on observation or what they do in the classroom. The other fifty percent of the evaluation was based on student growth or what the student does in the classroom. An alternative structure was offered as an option for school districts. This alternative structure, at the time of the survey, was divided into three sources of data, in a 42.5/42.5/15 calculation. The first data source of 42.5% was based on observation, or what the teacher does in the classroom. The second component of 42.5% was based on student growth or what the student does in the classroom, and the third component supplying the 15% of the calculation was based one of a number of options provided by the Ohio Department of Education. These options included teacher self-evaluation, peer review evaluation, student portfolio evaluation, student surveys, or a district-determined component. The researcher asked this question to determine if the structure of the OTES the participants’ districts use made an impact on teacher job satisfaction or teacher impression of the OTES. Out of 290 completed surveys, 281 participants responded to this question with nine respondents skipping the question.
The great majority of the participants responded that their district utilizes the original 50/50 structure of the OTES. In fact, 97.15% (N=273) claim to follow the original structure. Only 2.85% (N=8) of teachers participating in the survey claim their district uses the alternative structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure of the OTES Used by the Teacher’s District (n=290)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OTES Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original 50/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 42.5/42.5/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR= No Response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question five of the survey was to be answered by participants only if their district used the alternative structure of the OTES. The purpose of this question was to simply follow up on the previous question regarding the structure of the OTES. Of the eight participants who responded that their district used the alternative structure, seven responded to question five. Question five asked the respondent to identify the alternative component used by his/her district. Two hundred eighty-two of the 283 respondents who skipped the question were instructed to do so as their district did not use the alternative structure. As mentioned in the earlier discussion of the alternative structure of the OTES, districts were given the option of using a third component for calculating OTES ratings for teachers. These options included student survey, teacher self-evaluation, peer review evaluation, and student portfolio evaluation. Of the seven teachers responding to this question, peer review evaluation was the most utilized option. Peer review evaluation accounted for 42.86% (N=3) of responses while teacher self-evaluation was the next most popular choice at 28.57% (N=2). Student surveys and student portfolio evaluations each constituted 14.29% (N=1) of respondents.
The sixth question on the survey asked teachers to say if they were a Type A, Type B, or Type C teacher. Definitions of types were provided in the answer choices. Type A teachers were described as those who had teacher-level value-added data available to calculate student growth. Type B teachers were defined as those teachers with approved vendor assessment data available for calculating student growth. Furthermore, Type B teachers were described as using a combination of approved vendor assessment and district measures known as SLOs (Student Learning Objectives). Despite the descriptions, 29% (N=83) skipped the question. In asking this question, the researcher hoped to determine if the teacher type, or the way a teacher’s student growth was derived, had an impact on OTES impression or teacher job satisfaction for individuals. Because student growth was a controversial element of teacher evaluation, the researcher sought to examine if the method of collecting such data had an impact of OTES impression or teacher job satisfaction.

Table 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Survey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Self-Evaluation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Review Evaluation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Portfolio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR = No Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>25.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type C</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>55.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR = No Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question seven asks for the gender of the respondents. All 290 of the respondents answered the gender question. The respondent had three options to choose for this question. The majority of the respondents were female with 67.24% (N=195) choosing that option. Males comprised 31.72% (N=92) of the participants. The third response option was other and was provided for individuals without a strong gender identity. In this case, 1.03% or 3 participants chose the option of other. The researcher asked this question to determine if gender influenced teacher impression of the OTES or teacher job satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (n=290)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR = No Response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The eighth question in the survey asked if the participant had tenure. The respondent asked this question as it may impact teachers’ impressions of the OTES and teacher job satisfaction. Potentially, having tenure may offer respondents a greater sense of job security. Two of the 290 participants skipped question eight with 288 responding. Respondents with tenure and respondents without tenure were nearly even with 44.44% (N=128) responding they had tenure and 55.56% (N=160) responding they did not have tenure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure (n=290)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR = No Response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents were asked to provide the highest academic degree they had earned in question nine. All 290 participants answered this question. Beginning with the lowest level of education acceptable for obtaining a teaching license, the response choices began with Bachelor of Arts/Science with 22.76% (N=66) selecting this answer. Participants with a Master’s Degree accounted for 45.86% (N=1330) of the participants. Those claiming to have a Masters plus 30 credits were 21.38% (N=62) of respondents. Master’s plus 60 credits accounted for only 5.52% (N=16) of respondents. Zero percent (N=0) of participants claimed to have had a doctorate degree, and 4.48% (N=13) responded other to highest level of education received. The researcher chose to include this question in the survey to determine if level of education impacted teachers’ impression of the OTES or job satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA/S</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>22.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>45.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA+30 credits</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>21.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA+60 credits</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NR = No Response</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Union affiliation was the subject of question ten in the survey. Again, all 290 participants answered this question. The vast majority of respondents answered affirmatively they are affiliated with a union or teachers’ association. In fact, 87.24% (N=253) responded yes. Only 12.76 (N=37) responded no. This question was deemed important by the researcher to determine if union affiliation or lack of union affiliation made an impact on OTES impression or job satisfaction.
Next, the researcher asked participants about the school level in which they taught. Options were elementary, middle school, high school, career center, or other. All participants answered this question. Elementary teachers made up 18.97% (N=55) of the participants. Middle school teachers were 21.72% (N=63) of the participants. High school teachers were the largest group making up 31.38% (N=91) of the participants. Teachers in career centers were well represented at 24.83% (N=72) of respondents. Respondents who answered other constituted 3.10% (N=9) of total participants.

Content area was the topic of question twelve. Options included English, foreign language, mathematics, science, social studies, special education, career technical program, with art, music and physical education combined into one cluster. Respondents had the option of choosing other in the case they were not represented by the other content areas. Out of 290 participants in the survey, 288 submitted complete responses. Two participants chose to skip question twelve.
Teachers were asked to describe their school by size. School size was based on number of students enrolled in the school. Again, 288 of the 290 participants answered the question, and two respondents skipped the question. Options for school size were less than 500; 500-1,000; 1,001-1,500; and greater than 1,500. The overwhelming majority of the participants were from schools with a student population of between 500 and 1,000.

In order to learn if respondents taught in a high poverty school district, the researcher asked respondents to report the total percentage of students who qualified for free and/or reduced lunch in the building. A student population of more than 50% free/reduced lunch qualifiers defines a high-poverty district. Fifteen participants skipped this socioeconomic-based question,
so 275 respondents answered the questions. Percentages for free and reduced lunch were grouped as less than 25%, 25-50%, 51-75%, and greater than 75%. Most participants reported their school free and reduced lunch percentage was between 25 and 50%, and therefore did not qualify as high poverty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Free/Reduced Lunch percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-50</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>50.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>26.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;75</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NR = No Response

The final demographic-based question on the survey asked participants to describe their school district by whether it was urban, suburban, or rural. Two hundred eighty-eight out of the 290 participants responded to the question while two participants skipped the question. Suburban district received the most responses while urban district received the least number of responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>47.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NR = No Response

Instrument Validity and Reliability

Reliability for survey items regarding teacher job satisfaction was previously established by P. E. Lester, the creator of the TJSQ. Internal consistency of the TJSQ was established through calculation of an Alpha coefficient. “The total scale for the sample (N=526) was .93”
The P. E. Lester TJSQ was chosen for use in the current study as it was designed to be used with teachers and educational research with language specific to the field. Additionally, the TJSQ already had established rates of reliability and validity. When Lester (1982) tested for reliability, she did so for the total and for each of the nine factors including Supervision, Colleagues, Working Conditions, Pay, Responsibility, Advancement, Security, and Recognition. Lester’s work allowed the researcher to break up the questionnaire by subscales or factors, using only four of the factors in the current study and still retain the established reliability. The four factors from the Lester instrument used in the current study included Factor One, Supervision; Factor Five, Responsibility; Factor Eight, Security; and Factor Nine, Recognition (Lester, 1982).

Lester established content validity through having the job satisfaction questionnaire examined by experts in the field. Moreover, the instrument was examined for the plan and procedures used to construct the instrument. The instrument was also examined for how instructions were written, how the items on the instrument were ordered, and which items were chosen to be included in the questionnaire. A modified Q sort was used to achieve content validation. Any item with less than 80% agreement was either rewritten or rejected by Lester. In order for Lester to generate an amalgamation of 120 items, each potential item was analyzed for its length, its clarity and repetitiveness, and particularity to the field of education (Lester, 1982).

Validity for the OTES impressions section of the survey was established through use of expert analysis of the items. Each item in the third section of the survey, referred to as the OTES Impression section, was deemed necessary and important to elicit and establish a thorough snapshot of participants’ perceptions of the OTES. All items were piloted with 27 teachers for
clarity, and the entire survey was piloted for the length of time a potential participant might expect to spend to complete the survey. Seventeen teachers out of twenty-seven submitted completed surveys. The median time spent taking the survey was six and a half minutes. Ambiguous items were refined for precision.

**Research Question 1**

Due to the relative newness of the OTES and to the critical nature previously described regarding teacher job satisfaction, this study aimed to address two research questions. The first research question was, “Is the OTES associated with an impact on teacher job satisfaction? If so, is the relationship positive or negative?” In the interest of discovering an answer to research question number one, the researcher defined the OTES by OTES Impression and OTES Performance. By assigning a numerical value to each of the four OTES performance ratings (Accomplished, Skilled, Developing, and Ineffective), a new variable titled OTES Performance was created. Section three of the survey included all questions associated with OTES Impression. These questions were answered in a Likert scale format, and each response was already given a numerical value. Therefore, those values were averaged to provide the OTES Impression Variable.

After the researcher created a variable for OTES Performance and for OTES Impression, job satisfaction was defined in order to extract a job satisfaction score. Each sub score including Supervision, Responsibility, Security, and Recognition were averaged separately and collectively. A numerical index was calculated to reflect the relationship between the variables. Pearson product-moment correlation was used in order to determine the strength of the association between the two variables. Subsequently, a correlation matrix was constructed using the set of correlation coefficients.
In response to research question one, “Is the OTES associated with an impact on teacher job satisfaction?” the researcher identified a weak to no relationship between OTES performance and overall teacher job satisfaction. In considering the relationship between OTES performance and the sub scores of teacher job satisfaction, the researcher found a weak to no relationship between Sub Score one, Supervision, and teacher job satisfaction. The relationship between OTES Performance and Responsibility (Sub Score 2), was also a weak to nonexistent relationship. The strongest relationship between OTES performance and a sub score of teacher job satisfaction was found with Sub Score three, Security. The relationship was also considered to be weak. Additionally, Sub Score four was found to have a weak or nonexistent relationship, as well.

An analysis of the correlation coefficients for OTES Impression and Teacher Job Satisfaction proved overall weak to nonexistent relationships between not only overall satisfaction but for each sub score. Overall Job Satisfaction and Supervision were found to have a direct relationship with OTES Impression. Supervision (Sub Score one) turned out to have the strongest relationship with OTES Impression. Sub Scores two, three, and four (Responsibility, Security, and Recognition) were identified as having a weak to no relationship with OTES Impression. Therefore, the researcher concluded that the OTES was not associated with an impact, neither positive nor negative, on teacher job satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 16</th>
<th>OTES Performance Impression and Job Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OTES Performance</td>
<td>Overall Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTES Impression</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final question of the survey offered participants the opportunity to expand on earlier responses or discuss their feelings of the OTES. More than 80 of the respondents chose to take
advantage of the opportunity to make open-ended comments in the survey. The majority of the open-ended comments were negative regarding the OTES. Many cited increased stress caused by the OTES process as an issue. One participant wrote:

I feel like OTES has made teachers in my building more competitive than ever. It used to be that teachers would collaborate and do what was best to support all kids. It is my feeling that OTES has created an environment where teachers are most worried about the improvement of their students alone due to the fact that a teacher's scores directly affect their evaluation so much now.

Another said, “Too much stress was created at a school that was already performing at a high level. A large waste of money.” And another similarly commented, “OTES has just become another system which creates stress for good teachers and bad teachers have found ways to get around.” Some participants discussed a lack of objectivity or fairness in the OTES process.

For example:

Ratings should be given by outside evaluators who are not familiar with that teacher to avoid unfair ratings given by building principals who dislike those teachers and want to purposely give them bad ratings to try to get them to lose their jobs. This system is incredibly unfair and does not truly rate a teacher on what they're capable of.

Another participant discussed her negative feelings toward the OTES process based on her experience. She wrote:

I retired this year and did not need to be reviewed. Last year was a nightmare. My supervisor told me she couldn't understand how my students achieved high results. She
told me this year I would have to change my style completely, even though my students were achieving. I told her I felt uncomfortable when she was in my room, like she was waiting for me to fail. She did not reassure me. Instead she told me she could have ranked a previous lesson lower. I felt like I was walking on eggshells. Thanks to retiring, I didn't have to do OTES this year. She was never in my room. All of my students met their SLO goals. In conclusion, this year without OTES was heaven. Last year was hell.

Yet another participant wrote, “This is the most unfair evaluation system I have encountered in my 28 years in education. Not a fair evaluation. I am being evaluated by an administrator that has never taught in a classroom and offers no PD.” Additional comments expressing the integrity of the OTES were made. One example of such a comment was:

Even though a teacher meets or exceeds all category expectations, it is still very unlikely that they will reach more than skilled. It seems accomplished is out of reach. Others that barely get the marks in the evaluation receive the same rating, as I do. This is very defeating and gives many the "it doesn't matter anyway" thought, so they are happy at remaining mediocre and being labeled skilled. Unfortunately, there are still a few of us that are continuing to do our best, seeking ways to improve, giving it all to our students that try to put little credence in the evaluation, say the Hell with it and keep pushing on to excellence. It doesn't do much for morale or confidence boosting or our feeling of value within our profession.

One common complaint connected to the equity of the OTES was the argument that some teachers created their own tests and wrote SLOs while other teachers were required to use value-
added data from state test scores to measure their students’ performance. One teacher articulated her frustration:

Comparing SLOs and value-added data from state tests is highly unfair. There is no comparison of data on a test that is self-created to data from a test that is created from the state. My coworkers have a 95-100% passage rate on SLOs. That would be nearly impossible on a state test.

Similar comments were identified from the survey. Another teacher mimics that complaint:

I disagree with the fact that some teachers are required to use value-added scores. For teachers who write SLOs, they create the tests and can teach exactly what is on the test. I believe this is a little unfair. If I had created an SLO, I would have come out accomplished like many of the other teachers in my building.

Teachers continued to express displeasure and confusion with value-added growth measures.

One participant stated:

I disagree with the way the value-added growth measure is set up. Since students learn many different concepts from year to year, I don’t understand how they can show growth.

A true measure of growth would be from the beginning of the year to the end of the year, like SLO or vendor assessments.

Testing for the purpose of determining student performance for the instructors’ evaluation was the subject of many of the comments. One participant complained:

OTES and the current evaluation model have changed teaching in a very negative way. We are educating a generation of test-takers rather than independent thinkers. I spent WAY too much time testing my students the past two years (up to 9 days in a 40-45 day quarter). It is also disheartening that despite using Marzano strategies, there are simply
students who will never prepare themselves for testing because they are raised without education as a core value in their home. Yet teachers are held accountable for the scores of students who sleep through PARCC testing, or finish testing in under half the time because they simply do not want to participate. I also see my fellow teachers who are in the area of special education under a tremendous stress load, and they are given improvement plans that make them feel as though they somehow aren't doing their jobs. Sad. Teaching is no longer a career I would recommend to any young person, and I would NEVER have said that ten years ago. I feel like since the implementation of OTES, I have received less useful feedback about my instructional practices.

Additionally, another participant commented:

The testing has taken time out of my classroom and caused so much work for students/teachers/supervisors, etc. I was not able to teach as much material as I was able to the year before because my students were taken out of my room for 10-15 days of tests. Also, my classroom was used as a testing site which caused disruption outside of testing. This year has been awful and I feel more ineffective in my 3rd year of teaching than I did in my 1st year...and in my first year of teaching I had no idea what I was doing. This entire process is a joke, especially for teachers who are in a "regular" classroom where our students either do not care about their grades or are satisfied with barely passing. How can we be held accountable for their lack of interest or disregard for their learning? The system is not fair in anyway, and I can't even imagine how teachers in lower performing school districts/inner cities are feeling about OTES.

A similar frustration was communicated:
OTES is pushing teachers to teach to the test and is hindering students by placing too much emphasis on the content covered in the SLO assessments. The OTES does not take into account external factors that are under the control of parents and not students.

Further concerns regarding testing requirements of the OTES were focused on students and the degree to which they were tested. For example, a teacher complained:

Test students, then test the students some more. When is the state going to see that we are spending too much time testing and teaching to the test and then have the kids regurgitate on a test when we should be teaching skills they will learn and use?

Another teacher lamented:

My final evaluation last year was skilled, and I believe that was an accurate label. This year my students worked hard and showed strong improvement and growth in daily activities and assessments knowing the scores would have an effect on them and me. However, when taking the SLO assessments after completing all of the PARCC and AIR, many just blatantly said they were exhausted from testing and truly didn't care how they scored. One student even apologized and asked for forgiveness because she knew the assessment would have an effect on my evaluation score. That was an extremely disheartening statement.

While these open-ended comments made by the participants did not impact the quantitative data, they provided depth and insight into the thoughts of the participants that otherwise would not have been expressed.
Research Question 2

In order to gain a more in-depth understanding of the OTES, the researcher asked, “Which components of the OTES, if any, are most associated with teacher job satisfaction?” Again, the researcher used the Pearson product-moment correlation to identify a relationship between the components of the OTES and teacher job satisfaction. The researcher created a correlation matrix to investigate a response to the question. Overall satisfaction scores and sub scores were previously identified and did not require new calculations.

When analyzing the Student Growth component of the OTES in association with teacher job satisfaction, no relationships were found to exist. Overall teacher job satisfaction was insufficient to be considered to have any strength of relationship. Supervision or Sub Score one had a score of zero. Responsibility, Security, and Recognition all had coefficients too weak to be considered as having any significance.

Another component of the OTES included in the current research was the OTES pre-conference. The pre-conference was found to have no significant relationship with teacher job satisfaction other than Recognition, which showed a weak relationship. Once again, Supervision, (Sub Score one) had a coefficient of zero.

Similarly, when interpreting the data regarding the post Conference component of the OTES and the Overall Satisfaction score, Supervision (Sub Score one) again showed a coefficient of zero. Sub Score two (Responsibility), Sub Score three (Security) showed weak to nonexistent relationships to the post conference however, Sub Score four (Recognition) was in the weak range. Due to weak or nonexistent associations between the components of the OTES and teacher job satisfaction, the researcher concluded none of the components of the OTES had a
direct nor indirect association with teacher job satisfaction. The components of the OTES were found to have no association with teacher job satisfaction.

### Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTES Components</th>
<th>Overall Satisfaction</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Growth</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Conference</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Conference</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants wrote open-ended comments regarding the various components of the OTES as examined in the current study. For example, one participant wrote:

The observation and conference portion of OTES seems to be a useful tool to establish expectations, gather accurate observation, and reflect on teaching practices. However, the Student Growth Measures portion seems poorly constructed and defined. The Student Growth Measures apparently attempts to define a teacher's daily classroom competence by one test and one number on an assessment that does not seem representative of complete learning. Also, the Student Growth Measures have some vague and unfair guidelines and math. In particular, SLOs are arbitrary and the philosophy of "what constitutes growth" does not give the teacher credit for all of the growth students attain, which makes the system feel like a punishment for teachers and students alike. SLOs tend to add stress and take time away from more meaningful classroom practices, but accomplish little else.

Other participants referred to time consumption as a major issue with the OTES. A participant in the study commented:
Since the implementation of OTES, I see my immediate supervisor less and less. He is completely consumed with paperwork and data and does not have the opportunity to just stop in classrooms and see what is going on or spend time with students, which I believe is the point of education. OTES has discouraged teachers in the profession, consumes far too much time, and has been a factor in teachers leaving my school district, including myself (after 25 years with the district). OTES is a JOKE!!"

Another said, “My principal is so busy with OTES that I rarely see her. Also, I only received two walk-throughs this year although I was supposed to receive six. She is just too busy!”

And yet another commented on the time factor claiming:

There are too many hoops to jump through and our supervisors pass the work of evaluating SLOs and other OTES stuff to the teachers because they don't have time. More and more "busy work" passed on to the educator while very little has any value; so a lot of time is wasted filling out forms and going to meetings that have no direct or indirect effect on instruction. A lot more stress in teaching since OTES was implemented!

The comments regarding the time consuming nature of the OTES continued with:

I am retiring so I was not evaluated under this system this year. I was evaluated under it last year, and the year before that it was in trial. I only watch and see people wasting time trying to "fit" what they know is good teaching into a box that someone who does not teach can understand. I see principals who SHOULD be in the halls and the classrooms wasting their time with paperwork and pointless meetings. I see people spending countless hours trying to create tests for things that are basically immeasurable on a test, like growth and thought and understanding, simply to satisfy someone who
knows nothing of what we do, that we are doing our jobs. When I began here we had
many grads who went to Ivy League schools...all before this mountain of paper work.
Principals were in our classrooms. Teachers collaborated when they had something to
collaborate about and no one had to turn in notes. We just did it. The more paperwork we
have, the less time we have to think and create and reflect and wonder and teach, and that
shows in the quality of learning our kids are achieving. Adding the SLOs and this time-
consuming evaluation process is just another layer of pointless bureaucracy, when a good
principal, who is in the halls and the classrooms, can know when a teacher is effective
better than any SLO can. Meetings don't teach kids. Accountability is not achieved
through a check list. Accountability is standing up in front of a classroom of kids every
day. It's talking to parents about their child. It's explaining to a child after school how to
do what he or she needs to do. It's not figuring out a multiple choice test to "prove"
you've done your job. It's not checking off a bunch of phony questions to "prove" you've
earned your pay. People who evaluate us need to be in our classrooms, talk to our kids,
sit in on our parent teacher conferences and KNOW WHAT WE DO....not bend their
knees to others who have no clue and participate in this travesty. Let us do our jobs.
Watch us do our jobs. If you don't think we do our jobs well, tell us. Tell us what we
need to do to improve. We are all in this together. Stop distracting us and wasting our
PRECIOUS time with useless, valueless paperwork.

Similarly, another participant expressed frustration with paperwork necessitated by the OTES,
saying:

My principal doesn't have time to be a leader. He's always doing OTES paperwork;
likewise, he sees less of the whole picture of the instruction and getting to know my
students because he's chained to the paperwork. A school should be a community of conversation and vision, and paperwork does not support that. For example, when he comes to observe 2nd graders, they WANT to talk to him. They WANT to show him what they're doing. He can't look away from his notes because he's booked back-to-back with observations all year long. SO, he has to cut them off to continue his paperwork. I am extremely disappointed in OTES. It's destroying the culture of our schools. I received a good, fair rating. I'm not complaining. The paperwork has GOT to go.

Others had similar complaints regarding the OTES, including:

Because my supervisor is doing OTES evaluations and paperwork often, I feel like they have less time to actually stop in my classroom and see what's going on. With the old system, my supervisor would stop in my classroom at least bi-weekly to see what we were doing.

The following participant was even more specific in her complaints regarding the OTES:

In reality, I see less of my immediate supervisor since the implementation of OTES. He is not available due to the fact that he is writing reports. He doesn't casually see the awesome lessons that are being taught throughout the building because of report writing or formal observations or mandatory supervisor meetings. I don't know that I value the input from supervisors in general as they are reciting one-liners from OTES without actually knowing or being able to apply that said one-liner. Pre/post conferences are a joke at our facility. You can fill out the pre-conference questionnaire and it gets pasted into your evaluation where needed, without editing or questions. In terms of work satisfaction, good teachers are good because they regularly reflect upon what they do and make adjustments, I don't do that more or less because of OTES. The same can be said...
of accountability and effectiveness. At the end of a class or a unit, you KNOW if you were effective as an instructor and the lesson itself. OTES doesn't tell me this, the data just verifies it for one student growth measure. OTES is burdensome paperwork that takes away the opportunity for me and my colleagues to plan creative, inspiring and effective lessons. It's the same dog and pony show as before, only instead of check, plus, and minus symbols, we are using data that can be manipulated and inserting catch phrases into a form for the state to see.

Teachers of special populations from special education to at-risk students who responded to the survey appeared to demonstrate even greater frustration with the OTES. Many of the open ended comments pertained to special education. One participant commented:

OTES is a horrible way to represent students identified with disabilities, and I would argue it is discriminatory for a plethora of reasons. This makes it uniquely unfair as an evaluative system to measure teacher performance. This has been shown and argued both quantitatively and qualitatively. This push has caused a focus that is detrimental to students with disabilities as I'm now required to teach to what the state wants and NOT to the student individual needs, which is the whole reason they are on a federally binding legal document called an Individual Education Plan (IEP). We are doing these students and their teachers a terrible disservice and is counter to giving them a quality education.

And another said:

As a special educator, the most frustrating part of OTES is that my value added comes from scores that are from an inclusion classroom where I have NO SAY in the content, teaching strategies, or classroom management. The sections that I teach do not have
enough students to allow me to write SLOs, so essentially I am being evaluated based upon someone else's work.

Another teacher who expressed concern for teachers of students with special needs lamented:

It is very difficult as a Special Education teacher who has to claim their students for 100% and be held to the same standards according to AYP to get a good rating. My administration does a wonderful job of knowing and understanding what goes on in my classroom and that my students grow tremendously at their own pace and level however they will never be able to pass the current state test because mentally they cannot retain a whole year of information. They need to have immediate assessments. Reviewing works, however there is way too much to review. The alternate assessment is wonderful for my students who qualify however for those who don't it is unfair.

One teacher of “at-risk” students claimed:

Working with at-risk students who bring many outside issues with them to school, of which I have no control. I resent that half of my teaching evaluation is based on their test scores. Statistics have proven little or no connection with teacher effectiveness and standardized test scores. As a professional, I am offended that my worth as a teacher is measured in part by scores. As we head into value-added rankings being affiliated with teacher evaluations, I anticipate changing careers.

Further comments on this topic include:

If you teach in a classroom that is stacked with low academic achieving students that will not make benchmark despite growing leaps and bounds. It still affects your rating and moves you down because it includes children on IEPs that were placed in your classroom that may not be able to attain the benchmark but make over a year’s growth.
Positive comments regarding the OTES expressed by participants of the current study were few, but important nonetheless. One participant articulated the belief that the OTES encourages fairness and provides accountability by saying:

I believe that OTES does provide accountability measures for teachers. However, if you are already knowledgeable about your content and strive for excellence in your classroom, I can’t say that it improves your performance. It feels like it’s just more documentation about what you already feel you do. I do feel that it raises the standards for teachers who are not performing as well in the classroom. In that respect I feel like it levels the playing field and will help eliminate complaints among coworkers about fairness.

Another participant commented on the OTES positively by claiming, “OTES has made me look at teaching in a different way and forced me to get better!” Another participant, who claimed the OTES challenged her, said, “I would like to be an accomplished teacher, however; being skilled gives me something to work towards.”

Some teachers who participated in the survey expressed mixed feelings about the OTES through open-ended comments. For example, one commented, “The only positive thing I have taken from OTES thus far is the walk-throughs. I like those because it allows the administration to be present in the classrooms more.” This comment was the only positive comment made by the participant among a litany of complaints regarding the evaluation process. Another example of mixed feelings regarding the OTES found among the comments was “The SLO pre- and post-assessments are valid in showing my effectiveness as a teacher, but they've added to the already cumbersome testing burden my students are required to carry.” Another comment to note was:
My biggest complaint with SLOs is the time they have robbed from instruction. I feel like they have taken away valuable class time. I also hate the time they robbed from my family because of all the paperwork I had to do at home. The good thing about the OTES process and the SLOs is that I have become much more familiar with my state standards and curriculum,” and “I have already worked my hardest and put forth more than 100% effort. I did not need more evaluation and requirements to make me work harder. I am self-driven and I am always striving to do what is best for my students. I know my students after the second week of school. I know who will struggle and who will need my help. I also know my students that need more challenging content. I do not need pre and post growth tests to show me that. I do really like the goal setting. I have implemented so many cool things because of it. I really like that my supervisor is observing my teaching more often. I wouldn't mind if he came in once a week or even once a day.

Pertaining to accountability and the OTES, several teachers commented the OTES did not increase their perceived feelings of being held accountable. One participant stated:

I do not feel that the OTES process has made me a better teacher. I am still teaching and using the same accountability measures that I would have if I would have been evaluated by my districts previously used format. OTES has only made me a data cruncher.

A different participant stated, “I have always felt accountable as an instructor, so OTES has not increased my feelings toward accountability.” More vociferously, another participant agreed:

The current evaluation system is broken to say the least. It is conflicting to have amazing reviews from my direct supervisor who is actually in my classroom watching me teach regularly and then be ranked ineffective from the state just based on test scores of low
achieving students. I am neither more nor less accountable, I'm just scared for my livelihood and my family now on top of the normal stresses of teaching. This current model is ineffective at truly measuring who is and who is not a good teacher.

As stated earlier, the open-ended comments provided by the participants did not impact the data compile through the quantitative study. Rather they offer a depth and breadth to the research providing a more holistic view of the OTES as perceived by the participants.

**Summary**

This chapter described results stemming from the current research focused on two research questions connecting the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System and teacher job satisfaction. Quantitative data was analyzed using Pearson product-moment correlations to determine if relationships between the OTES, in addition to various components of the OTES, and teacher job satisfaction held any significance. In response to research question one, “Is the OTES associated with an impact on teacher job satisfaction?” the research produced data showing no significant relationship between the two variables. With regard to research question two, “Which components of the OTES, if any, are most associated with teacher job satisfaction?” the data did not expose an association, neither direct nor indirect. Therefore, the researcher concluded the OTES has had no impact on teacher job satisfaction nor were the components of the OTES associated with an impact on teacher job satisfaction.

In order to allow for greater insight into the impressions of the teachers who participated in the survey, participants were provided with the opportunity to make open-ended comments. Many of the comments were included with the discussion of the data. Interestingly, while most open-ended comments regarding the OTES were negative, according to the data, the negative impressions and feelings conveyed in the open-ended comment box did not impact teacher job
satisfaction. Otherwise, significant associations would have been found through the correlations. Based on the results discussed in Chapter Four, Chapter Five included a synopsis of the research, and presented a summary of the findings. Conclusions, as well as recommendations for future studies, were addressed.
CHAPTER V
Conclusions and Recommendations

The Ohio Teacher Evaluation System has been a topic of interest for many Ohioans in the teaching profession. The aforementioned interest has been directed toward a component of the OTES in which teachers were now evaluated not only on what they do in the classroom, but also how their students performed in the classroom. Open-ended statements obtained during the current research reflect teachers’ focus on the student performance component. Furthermore, student performance was determined to be evaluated through student growth measures (Ohio Department of Education, 2013). Such inclusion of student performance as a factor in teacher evaluation was new to the state of Ohio with the introduction of the OTES (Ohio Department of Education, 2013), thereby adding to the spotlight on student performance as a component of the new evaluation system (Harris, 2015). Additionally, within the structure of the OTES, teachers were asked to justify what they were doing in the classroom as part of the demand for accountability in teaching. The element of teacher actions typically referred to as teacher performance was the yet another subject of concern for teachers. Respondents to the current research survey articulated similar sentiment in the open-ended response section of the survey. Teachers expressed concerns regarding such accountability as the connotation was that instructors who did not adequately validate their own actions would be subject to negative ramifications. Understanding teacher concern was important as Levit (1972) found the use of the term accountability in education-related discussions suggested an ethical obligation of sorts. Such an implication was significant for a thorough analysis of a teacher evaluation system.

In this study, the researcher has examined the relationship of teacher job satisfaction to accountability measures in teacher evaluation through a careful look at the OTES. Such an
Investigation was considered important by the researcher as research has shown a dissatisfying teacher evaluation system has been connected to teacher job satisfaction (Zembylas & Pampanastasiou, 2005). Furthermore, a correlation between teacher job satisfaction and quality of education was established (Persevica, 2011). Understanding the impact of the OTES on teacher job satisfaction was deemed crucial to ensure quality of education for Ohio’s youth.

**Review of the Study**

The goal of the current study was to identify an association between teacher job satisfaction and the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System. Therefore, the researcher sought to answer two questions. The first question was, “Is OTES associated with an impact on teacher job satisfaction? If so, is the relationship positive or negative?” The second question was, “Which components of OTES, if any, are most associated with teacher job satisfaction?” A convenience survey was conducted electronically in the month of May as teachers were learning their evaluation results for the 2014-2015 school year. Participants were comprised of licensed K-12 teachers in public education in the state of Ohio who were evaluated under the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System. All participants who received the survey also received an invitation to participate and an implied consent form.

Because the survey was sent to superintendents and principals, along with a request to forward to their instructional staff, it was unknown how many teachers received the survey. It was estimated that 500 teachers would receive the survey with a response submitted by 100 teachers. However, a response rate was undetermined. Nonetheless, of the 321 teachers who began the survey, 290 submitted completed responses. The number of completed responses eclipsed the anticipated 100 responses. The completion rate for the survey was 96% of participants who began the survey. Data was collected using a three-part electronic survey,
which included demographic questions, a section of questions from the P. E. Lester TJSQ, and a section of questions specific to the OTES created by the researcher that provided participants an opportunity to make open-ended comments. Those participants who stopped the survey prior to completion typically did so following the demographic data section.

Discussion

As stated previously, the OTES was fairly new for Ohio’s educators. Its impact on education for Ohio’s youth was not yet proven. However, a critical connection between teacher evaluation and teacher job satisfaction has been made, as has the relationship between teacher job satisfaction and quality of education. Therefore, the researcher determined an investigation into the topic was necessary.

Research Question 1.

Significant to the examination of the relationship between teacher evaluation, specifically the OTES, and teacher job satisfaction was the first research question. The researcher asked, “Is the OTES associated with an impact on teacher job satisfaction? If so, is the relationship positive or negative?” In order to answer this question, the researcher used OTES Impression and OTES Performance to delineate the OTES. A numerical value was designated to each of the OTES performance ratings, which allowed the researcher to create a new variable labeled OTES Performance. OTES Impression data was derived from section three of the survey. Section three of the survey was written in a Likert scale style with a numerical value appointed to each response. Values were averaged to provide an OTES Impression variable. Once the researcher had the OTES Impression and OTES Performance variables, a job satisfaction score was sought. Job satisfaction data was derived from section two of the survey, which was composed of questions from the P. E. Lester TJSQ. A numerical index was calculated for the purpose of
demonstrating the relationship between the variables. A correlation matrix was then created using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients.

In response to the research question, “Is the OTES associated with an impact on teacher job satisfaction?” the researcher found no statistically significant relationship between OTES performance and teacher job satisfaction. Furthermore, no statistical significance was found between any of the teacher job satisfaction sub scores and OTES Performance. Because no statistical significance was found, the researcher does not need to address the latter part of the question, which asked if the relationship between the OTES and teacher job satisfaction was positive or negative.

**Research Question 2.**

In order to further understand the relationship between teacher job satisfaction and the OTES, the researcher asked, “Which components of the OTES, if any, are most associated with teacher job satisfaction?” As with research question one, a correlation matrix was created. Overall teacher job satisfaction and each of the four sub scores were included in the matrix. However, because overall satisfaction scores and sub scores were already determined, additional calculations were not required. Initially, the researcher examined the student growth component of the OTES and its impact on teacher job satisfaction. Next, the researcher looked at the pre-conference and its influence on teacher job satisfaction. Finally, the researcher looked at the post conference and its effect on teacher job satisfaction. As with research question one, the correlations for research question two revealed no statistically significant relationships.
Conclusion

Despite a lack of statistical significance, the current study offered important insight to teacher job satisfaction in relation to the OTES. This was desirable as research has shown that teacher job satisfaction contributes to quality of education in the classroom (Persevica, 2011). Furthermore, implications made and attributed to the research were found to be potentially useful to the educational practitioner, specifically to administrators who engage in teacher evaluations. The researcher came to the following conclusions based on the findings:

1. The researcher concludes the OTES did not significantly impact teacher job satisfaction. While teachers have verbalized their dissatisfaction with the OTES, as found in the open-ended responses, the research shows there was no significant impact, neither positively nor negatively, on overall teacher job satisfaction. Additionally, the OTES did not significantly affect teacher job satisfaction in regards to Supervision, Responsibility, Security, or Recognition.

2. The researcher concludes the student growth component of the OTES did not significantly impact teacher job satisfaction. The student growth component found in the OTES was intended to increase accountability in the teaching profession and has been the subject of dissatisfaction for many educators. Teachers complained about the lack of equity in the system because some teachers wrote their own student growth measures and assessments while other teachers were solely reliant on standardized or state tests to show student growth. This was a frequent theme found in the open-ended responses in the survey. Interestingly, the disparity was found to have no significant influence on overall teacher job satisfaction nor on the sub scores of Supervision, Responsibility, Security, or Recognition. The researcher found this
incongruity to be especially interesting and determined it implied the participants were bothered more by the system lacking equity than by the addition of the student growth component to their evaluation outcomes.

3. The researcher concludes the pre-conference did not have a significant effect on teacher job satisfaction. In an effort to delve further into the various components of the OTES and their effect on teacher job satisfaction, the researcher surveyed teachers on their satisfaction with the pre-conference. In open-ended responses, the comments regarding the pre-conference were mixed, and fewer comments were made about the topic in comparison to the growth measures. Because respondents were neutral in their comments, it was no surprise the data showed no statistically significant relationship between the pre-conference and overall teacher job satisfaction or with any of the sub scores.

4. The researcher concludes the post conference component of the OTES did not significantly impact teacher job satisfaction. The post conference was the final component of the OTES to be examined for its effect on teacher job satisfaction. As with the pre-conference, few open-ended comments were made in comparison to other elements of the OTES. While a few comments focused on the time taken for the post conference, most participants seemed to be indifferent on the subject. As with the pre-conference, the post conference was discovered to have no significant consequence for overall teacher job satisfaction nor on the job satisfaction sub scores of Supervision, Responsibility, Security, and Recognition.

The researcher has identified a disparity between the data, which has shown the OTES did not have an effect on teacher job satisfaction and the open-ended comments made, which were
nearly all negative toward the OTES. Such a discrepancy implied teachers may have been disgruntled by the changes in the evaluation process brought about by the OTES, but their discontent was not strong enough to interfere with their overall job satisfaction. However, another theory was that perhaps the OTES has not had enough time to adversely affect teacher job satisfaction which the researcher suggested should be monitored as time progressed.

**Recommendations**

As the researcher referenced in Chapter Two, as recently as the turn of the 21st Century, teacher evaluation lacked validity, provided limited and insufficient feedback to teachers, and even lacked a universal idea on what composed great teaching. Whether or not teacher evaluation even had an impact on the improvement of instruction was in question (Peterson, 2000). In an effort to respond to the scrutiny of teacher evaluation practices, the MET project examined how teacher evaluation might have been used to improve teaching and learning (Cantrell & Kane, 2013). Then, in an effort to increase the accountability of teachers through evaluation, utilizing data sources as part of the evaluation process gained popularity. The OTES incorporated various elements determined to be important in providing validity to teacher evaluation. Student growth data was one example. The current research did not examine the impact of the OTES on quality of education but rather sought to understand its impact on teacher job satisfaction.

Legislators, superintendents, and principals may have taken satisfaction in knowing that by implementing the OTES, teacher job satisfaction had not been negatively impacted. However, if the desired outcome was to improve teacher job satisfaction, educational leaders might have pursued recommendations formed on research. Based on the conclusions of the current research, the following recommendations were proposed:
1. Make the student growth measure component homogenous for all teachers. Until all teachers have value-added data opportunities, have all teachers write SLOs to show student growth. This would alleviate the claim that the OTES was unfair for some teachers and provided an advantage for others.

2. Seek ways to improve the pre-conference component of the OTES for a more meaningful and beneficial experience for teachers. If the pre-conference was a more successful tool for improving instruction, it might have a significant and positive impact on teacher job satisfaction.

3. Seek methods for improving the post conference as a tool for improving instruction and make it a more meaningful experience for teachers. By doing so, the post conference may significantly and positively impact teacher job satisfaction.

**Future Research Opportunities**

The current study concludes with a discussion of future research opportunities. As the researcher sought answers to her questions regarding the OTES and teacher job satisfaction, many more questions emerged. Indeed, a multitude of future research opportunities connected to the current study exist. These questions were framed as opportunities for future research.

The OTES was initially implemented as a pilot in the 2011-2012 school year (Ohio Department of Education, 2012). Due to collective bargaining agreements that were already in place, many districts did not implement the OTES until 2013-2014 (Ohio Department of Education 2011). Because the OTES was relatively new at the time the study was conducted and humans, in general, often resisted change, the researcher suggested replicating the study at a later date. The purpose for conducting identical research at a later date would determine if the element of change due to OTES being new influenced responses to the survey, and thereby,
results, or did the actual design of the evaluation system influence teacher responses to the survey. With these questions in mind, replicating the current research would be prudent.

The researcher used the TJSQ and researcher scripted questions to survey the participants. Another tool that might have been used to provide insight was the Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP). The TEP is a tool for collecting and recording data (Stiggins and Nickel, 1988). According to Stiggins and Nickel (1988) conditions must be conducive in order for growth to be possible. The TEP produces information regarding the environment for teacher evaluation thus allowing for those who use the questionnaire to examine the potential for growth within the evaluation system (Stiggins and Nickel, 1988). Understanding the teacher evaluation environment would provide a different perspective than that provided by the TJSQ. Therefore, replicating the current research with the added element of the TEP is a future research opportunity.

Another avenue to be explored is the relationship between various demographic data with teacher job satisfaction and/or the OTES. A plethora of demographic data was collected during the research process but was not used for the purpose of the current study. Especially enlightening to teacher perceptions would be analyzing the socioeconomic description of the area. Additionally, evaluating the data to see if the teacher was designated as Type A, Type B or Type C would be informative. Teachers commented on the lack of equity in evaluation due to these designations in the open-ended comments section of the survey used, in the current study. Undoubtedly, the demographic data would provide ample opportunities for future research.

Because the current study was a convenience sample, it might be simulated on a larger scale using a statewide database of teachers in order to determine if the regional nature of the surveyed population impacted the results. Teachers in the northwest region of Ohio were targeted because
a convenience sample was used for the quantitative study. Superintendents and principals were sent an e-mail with the survey attached. The e-mail requested they forward the survey to their teachers. Unfortunately, accessing all teachers’ email addresses in the state of Ohio would be time-prohibitive. Without a doubt, replicating the current study on a statewide basis would add to the value of the current research.

For the purposes of the current study, the researcher chose to survey participants on the student growth measures, pre-conference, and post conference components of the OTES. Future research could ask participants in the survey to respond to questions regarding other components of the OTES, such as walk-through evaluations, formal observations, and growth/improvement plans. Additionally, teachers whose district employs the original 50/50 structure of the OTES might be compared to teachers whose districts use the alternative structure of the OTES. Such a comparative study would provide further information and insight into the OTES and its impact on teacher job satisfaction.

In summary, the recommendations for future research provide ample opportunity to continue to explore the connection between teacher job satisfaction and teacher evaluation, specifically the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System. Such opportunities include replicating the current study on a larger scale, utilizing demographic data already collected, using an alternative instrument such as the TEP, or enlarging the survey sample. Regardless, careful consideration of teacher evaluation and its impact on teacher job satisfaction is suggested. Through careful analysis of teacher feedback and appropriate action taken based on the feedback, teacher evaluation may be useful in increasing teacher job satisfaction.
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Dear Teachers,

You are invited to participate in a study of teacher job satisfaction since the implementation of the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System (OTES). I hope to learn without prejudice how you perceive the components of OTES as impacting your job satisfaction. Specifically, I am interested in whether components built into OTES are perceived as increasing accountability and if those components impact teacher job satisfaction. You were selected as a possible participant in this study because you were identified as an Ohio teacher who might be required to participate in the OTES. This survey will take between five and ten minutes to complete. No benefits accrue to you for answering the survey. Any discomfort or inconvenience to you derives only from the amount of time taken to complete the survey. If you decide to participate, please complete the electronic survey. Your submission of a completed survey is implied consent.

Any information that is obtained with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will not be disclosed. The anonymous, unidentifiable data collected will be stored in a password protected server or computer for the minimally required three years. Your decision whether or not to participate will not prejudice any future relationships with The University of Findlay. If you decide to participate, you are free to discontinue participation at any time without prejudice.
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APPENDIX F

Part 1: Demographic Information Questions

1. March 1, 2015

Dear Teachers,

You are invited to participate in a study of teacher job satisfaction since the implementation of the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System (OTES). I hope to learn without prejudice how you perceive the components of OTES as impacting your job satisfaction. Specifically, I am interested in whether components built into OTES are perceived as increasing accountability and if those components impact teacher job satisfaction. You were selected as a possible participant in this study because you were identified as an Ohio teacher who might be required to participate in the OTES. This survey will take between five and ten minutes to complete. No benefits accrue to you for answering the survey. Any discomfort or inconvenience to you derives only from the amount of time taken to complete the survey. If you decide to participate, please complete the electronic survey. Your submission of a completed survey is implied consent.

Any information that is obtained with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will not be disclosed. The anonymous, unidentifiable data collected will be stored in a password protected server or computer for the minimally required three years. Your decision whether or not to participate will not prejudice any future relationships with The University of Findlay. If you decide to participate, you are free to discontinue participation at any time without prejudice.

If you have any questions, please contact Pamola R. Downing, (419) 236-9492 or email downingp@findlay.edu or Dr. Kathleen Crates, 419-434-6552 or email crates@findlay.edu, or the chairperson of The University of Findlay Institutional Review Board, Susan Stevens, Ed. D. via email at irb@findlay.edu or stevens@findlay.edu.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Pamola R. Downing
Doctoral Student at The University of Findlay
419-236-9492
downingp@findlay.edu

☐ Yes, I give consent to have my responses included in the study.
☐ No, I do not give consent to have my responses included in the study.

2. How many years have you been evaluated under OTES?
   ☐ 1
   ☐ 2
   ☐ 3
   ☐ 4

3. What was your rating for the 2014-2015 school year?
   ☐ Ineffective
   ☐ Developing
   ☐ Skilled
   ☐ Accomplished

4. How many years have you worked in Ohio K-12 Public Education?
   ☐ 1-4
   ☐ 5-9
   ☐ 10-14
   ☐ 15-19
   ☐ 20-24
   ☐ 25-29
   ☐ 30-34
   ☐ 35+

5. My school uses...
   ☐ the original 50/50 structure for evaluation under OTES.
   ☐ the alternative 42.5/52.0/5% structure for evaluation under OTES.

If your school uses the alternative structure, please answer question #5. Otherwise, move on to question number 6.
6. If your school uses the alternative structure, what accounts for the 15%?
- Student Surveys
- Teacher Self-Evaluation
- Peer Review Evaluation
- Student Portfolios

7. Are you...
- Type A: Teacher Level Value Added data available (No district measures or SLOs)
- Type B: Approved Vendor Assessment data available (Uses a combination of approved vendor assessment and district measures/SLOs)
- Type C: No Teacher Level Value Added or Approved Vendor Assessment data available (Uses district measures/SLOs exclusively)

8. Gender
- Male
- Female
- Other

9. Do you have tenure?
- Yes
- No

10. What is the highest academic degree you have attained?
- BA/BS
- MA
- MA + 30 credits
- MA + 60 credits
- Doctorate
- Other

11. Do you have Union affiliation?
- Yes
- No
12. In which school level do you teach?
- Elementary
- Middle
- High School
- Career Center (IVSD)
- Other (please specify)

13. In which content area do you teach?
- ART/Music/Physical Education
- English/Language Arts
- Foreign Language
- Mathematics
- Science
- Social Studies
- Special Education
- Career Technical Program
- Other (please specify)

14. What is your school size?
- < 500
- 500-1000
- 1001-1500
- >1500

15. What total percent of students qualify for free and/or reduced lunch in your building(s)?
- <25
- 25-50
- 51-75
- >75
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. My immediate supervisor gives me assistance when I need help.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. My immediate supervisor praises good teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. My immediate supervisor provides assistance for improving instruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I receive recognition from my immediate supervisor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. My immediate supervisor does not back me up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. My immediate supervisor explains what is expected of me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. My immediate supervisor is not willing to listen to suggestions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. My immediate supervisor makes me feel uncomfortable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25. When I teach a good lesson, my immediate supervisor notices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

26. My immediate supervisor offers suggestions to improve my teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

27. My immediate supervisor makes available the material I need to do my best.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Factor 5: Questions on Responsibility

28. I get along well with my students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

29. I try to be aware of the policies of my school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

30. I am not interested in the policies of my school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

31. I do have responsibility for my teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

32. My students respect me as a teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

33. I am responsible for planning my daily lessons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

34. Teaching provides me the opportunity to help my students learn.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
35. I am not responsible for my actions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Factor 9 Questions: Security

36. I am afraid of losing my teaching job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

37. Teaching provides for a secure future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

38. I never feel secure in my teaching job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Factor 10 Questions: Recognition

39. I receive full recognition for my successful teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

40. No one tells me that I am a good teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

41. I receive too little recognition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Part 3: OTES Questions

42. I am more satisfied with the evaluation process under OTES than under my district's previous evaluation system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
43. I have more contact with my direct supervisor since the implementation of OTES than before the implementation of OTES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

44. I receive more feedback from my district supervisor through OTES than through my district's previous evaluation system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

45. My instructional practices have improved since the implementation of OTES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

46. OTES has made me more accountable as an instructor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

47. I feel more effective as an instructor since the implementation of OTES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

48. I am more satisfied with my work since the implementation of OTES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

49. I am satisfied with the student growth component (SLO, Vendor Assessment Value-Added Data, Teacher Level Value-Added Data) of OTES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

50. I am satisfied with the format of the pre-conference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

51. I am satisfied with the format of the post-conference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
52. I am satisfied with my current evaluation rating under OTES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

53. Please use this text box to offer insight for any of your responses in this section you would like to expand upon.
