



Teacher Goal-Setting Survey Report

Prepared by the Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession
June 2014

The Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession conducted two surveys on goal-setting to Washington teachers in January and May 2014. CSTP worked with OSPI to develop the survey questions. NBCT Heather Fowler contracted with CSTP to administer the surveys via Survey Monkey and analyze the data.

The following information is more detailed information about the survey participants and their responses.

Participant Demographic Characteristics

There were 1,040 teacher participants in the first survey and 921 teacher participants in the second survey. The same 1,040 who took the survey were given the opportunity to take the second survey and if both surveys were completed received a \$100 stipend. Most of the teacher participants in both surveys were female (77%, 81%). Teachers with 1 – 4 years of experience were the largest cohort who took the surveys (27%, 25%). There were teacher participants from every ESD region with about 40% coming from the Puget Sound ESD region.

	<i>Survey #1 N=1,040</i>	<i>Survey #2 N=921</i>
Gender		
Female	77% (797)	81% (743)
Male	23% (243)	17% (157)
No answer		2% (21)
Years Teaching		
1-4	27% (276)	25% (226)
5-7	13% (135)	12% (112)
8-10	15% (162)	16% (150)
11-15	19% (195)	19% (177)
16-20	10% (100)	11% (98)
21+	16% (172)	17% (158)
ESD		
101	5% (48)	4% (34)
105	6% (64)	7% (61)
112	11% (117)	10% (94)
113	14% (149)	15% (134)
114	3% (26)	2% (22)
121	41% (429)	41% (380)
123	8% (78)	8% (71)
171	8% (86)	7% (64)
189	4% (41)	4% (40)
No answer	2	2% (21)



Type of Evaluation and Framework

	Survey #1	Survey #2
Type of Evaluation		
Comprehensive	63% (659)	64% (332)
Focused	37% (381)	36% (589)
Framework		
Danielson	56% (584)	51% (467)
CEL 5Ds	29% (297)	28% (262)
Marzano	15% (157)	14% (124)
Did not answer	2	7% (68)

Most of the teacher participants were on a Comprehensive evaluation. Over 50% also used the Danielson Framework. Following that about 30% used the CEL 5Ds Framework and then 15% used the Marzano Framework.

Value of Student Growth

From December to May there was little change in how teachers perceived student growth, and the majority of teachers agree that using student growth as part of their evaluation has value. At least 80% of respondents see the value of including student growth in their evaluations, and this number had little change over the six months between surveys.

	Survey #1	Survey #2
I see the value in focusing on student growth.		
Completely Agree	48% (496)	52% (476)
Agree	50% (518)	47% (429)
Disagree	1% (13)	1% (12)
Completely Disagree	1% (5)	0% (4)
Skipped Question	8	
I see the value in focusing on student growth as part of my evaluation.		
Completely Agree	22% (226)	52% (476)
Agree	59% (608)	47% (429)
Disagree	15% (158)	1% (12)
Completely Disagree	4% (40)	0% (4)
Skipped Question	8	



The next set of questions about student growth were purposely asked in survey #2 after teachers had time to complete the evaluation process.

More than three-quarters of teachers said their teaching improved due to focusing on student growth, and 80% said teaching across the state will improve because of the student growth goal process. Even with the majority of teachers agreeing student growth goals was a positive influence on teaching and learning, more than 60% did not believe student growth was an accurate measure of teacher effectiveness. 90% of teachers did not believe standardized tests are accurate measures of teacher effectiveness.

Setting, monitoring, and reflecting on student growth goals has improved my teaching.	
Completely Agree	19% (175)
Agree	58% (538)
Disagree	20% (181)
Completely Disagree	3% (227)
Setting, monitoring, and reflection on student growth goals will improve teaching in Washington state.	
Completely Agree	17% (158)
Agree	63% (582)
Disagree	18% (163)
Completely Disagree	2% (18)
I believe measurement of student growth is an accurate measure of teacher effectiveness.	
Completely Agree	5% (42)
Agree	35% (325)
Disagree	46% (428)
Completely Disagree	14% (126)
I believe standardized tests (MSP, HSPE, SBAC) are accurate measures of teacher effectiveness.	
Completely Agree	0% (5)
Agree	10% (89)
Disagree	52% (480)
Completely Disagree	38% (347)

Effect on Collaboration

	Survey #1
When writing my student growth goal(s) I worked with (mark all that apply):	
No one	18% (184)
My PLC	47% (483)
My evaluator	57% (591)
Academic coach	11% (115)
Like-content teachers	45% (465)
District employee (not evaluator)	23% (243)
No one, my district or school gave it to me	1% (15)
No one, we have not written them yet	9% (95)

Writing student growth goals allowed teachers to work with their evaluator, their Professional Learning Communities, and like-content colleagues.



	Survey #1 (Dec)	Survey #2 (May)
I anticipate student growth goals will improve my collaboration with colleagues.		
Completely Agree	18% (186)	15% (138)
Agree	57% (585)	52% (481)
Disagree	22% (230)	30% (275)
Completely Disagree	3% (31)	3% (27)
How many times during the 2013-14 school year did you meet one-on-one with your principal/supervisor regarding your student growth goals?		
0	18% (180)	4% (41)
1	34% (340)	17% (153)
2	29% (283)	31% (282)
3	11% (105)	26% (235)
4	5% (46)	13% (124)
5	2% (16)	4% (38)
6 or more	2% (17)	5% (48)
How many times during the 2013-14 school year did your PLC meet with your principal/supervisor regarding your student growth goals?		
0	33% (329)	24% (220)
1	24% (237)	17% (156)
2	13% (133)	18% (166)
3	8% (75)	11% (102)
4	3% (34)	6% (58)
5	2% (19)	3% (24)
6 or more	4% (43)	10% (88)
I do not have a PLC	12% (117)	12% (107)
My principal and I have adequate time to discuss my instruction and progress towards my professional and student goals.		
Completely Agree		10% (90)
Agree		38% (348)
Disagree		36% (332)
Completely Disagree		16% (151)

Three out of four teachers agreed working on student growth goals improved their collaboration with colleagues.

In the first survey (Dec), 18% of teachers reported they had not met with their principal regarding their student growth goals. In the second survey that number went down to 4% who had not met with their evaluator.

By the end of the school year, there was an 11% increase in teachers reporting their PLC had met with their evaluator.

Despite increased collaboration with colleagues, teachers were nearly split (48% agree, 52% disagree) on whether or not there was enough time given to meet with their evaluators.



Professional Development

Between the first and second surveys, teachers reported a slight overall increase of 5% in the amount time spent learning how to write and measure student growth goals. By May, 72% of teachers received 2 hour or more of professional development in this area.

The methods teachers found *least* useful for learning about student growth goals was through the TPEP website (55%) and whole group professional development at the district (47%).

Teachers reported conversations with their colleagues (68%), whole group professional development at their school (53%), one-on-one with their evaluator (47%) and professional learning communities (43%) as the most effective ways of learning about student growth goals.

	Survey #1	Survey #2
Approximately how much time have you spent on learning to write and measure student growth goals with your school district and/or building?		
30 min < 2 hours	30% (312)	25% (226)
2 hours < 5 hours	38% (392)	42% (388)
6+ hours	25% (257)	30% (275)
We have not spent time on SGGs	8% (79)	3% (32)
What was the <u>LEAST</u> effective ways you learned about student growth goals?		
TPEP website		55% (504)
Whole group PD at the district		47% (428)
Whole group PD at my school		31% (282)
WEA sponsored PD		28% (255)
ESD sponsored SGG seminars		26% (240)
Local association sponsored PD		22% (201)
Content specific training		20% (184)
One-on-one with state trainer		19% (178)
PLC		16% (147)
One-on-one with evaluator		16% (148)
One-on-one with district trainer		11% (97)
Conversations with colleagues		10% (93)
What was the <u>MOST</u> effective ways you learned about student growth goals?		
Conversations with colleagues		68% (623)
Whole group PD at my school		53% (491)
One-on-one with evaluator		47% (428)
PLC		43% (398)
Whole group PD at the district		31% (283)
Content specific training		18% (167)
One-on-one with district trainer		15% (137)
TPEP website		10% (91)
ESD sponsored SGG seminars		6% (54)
WEA sponsored PD		5% (45)
Local association sponsored PD		3% (29)
One-on-one with state trainer		1% (11)



The following set of survey questions on professional development were asked on the second survey only (May).

My school provided me adequate training for me to write my student growth goal(s).	
Completely Agree	11% (104)
Agree	52% (475)
Disagree	30% (273)
Completely Disagree	7% (69)
My district provided me adequate training for me to write my student growth goal(s).	
Completely Agree	10% (94)
Agree	49% (449)
Disagree	33% (304)
Completely Disagree	8% (74)
Training provided by my school positively encouraged me to implement student growth goals in my classroom.	
Completely Agree	8% (76)
Agree	55% (502)
Disagree	31% (288)
Completely Disagree	6% (55)
Training provided by my district positively encouraged me to implement student growth goals in my classroom.	
Completely Agree	8% (77)
Agree	52% (477)
Disagree	33% (604)
Completely Disagree	7% (63)

Most teacher respondents felt their school (63%) and district (59%) provided them adequate training to write their growth goals.

Teachers also felt the training provided by their school (63%) and district (60%) encouraged them to implement student growth goals in the classroom.

Student Growth Implementation and Measurement

A majority of teachers did not change their student growth goal before spring break (67%) because their initial goal was good (66%).

30% of those who did not change their goal did not know it was an option.

I adjusted my student growth goals before spring break.	
Yes	33% (306)
No	67% (615)
I did not change my student growth goal because:	
My initial goal was good	66% (406)
I did not know that was an option	30% (183)
Because this is a practice year	12% (71)
I did not think about it	9% (57)
Other	3% (19)
I was told I could not change	1% (8)
I have not been tracking SGGs	1% (6)



Of those who changed their student growth goal, 49% responded 'other' and listed a variety of reasons.

Assessments used to measure student growth varied with the highest responses for formative assessments (63%), summative assessments teachers created (57%) and common assessment created by a PLC (49%).

I changed my student growth goal because:	
It was not rigorous enough	17% (51)
It was too rigorous	19% (60)
It was not measureable	17% (54)
Other	49% (152)
I used the following assessments to measure student growth:	
Formative assessments	63% (584)
Summative assessments I created	57% (518)
Common assessments created by my PLC	49% (449)
Other	27% (249)
Summative assessments created by curriculum authors	26% (242)
Common assessments created by the district	25% (230)
Common assessments created at my school	23% (208)
CBA's created by OSPI	15% (141)
Summative assessments created by another teacher	11% (102)
MSP or HSPE scores	9% (83)
Developmental Reading Assessment	3% (29)
Second-Grade Fluency and Accuracy Assessment	2% (17)
Washington English Language Proficiency Assessment	2% (17)
Washington Kindergarten Inventory of Skills	2% (16)

Perception of Job Intensification

	Survey #1	Survey #2
I feel more pressure and job related stress as a result of writing and implementing student growth goals.		
Completely Agree	40% (411)	32% (290)
Agree	41% (423)	43% (395)
Disagree	16% (170)	22% (204)
Completely Disagree	3% (28)	3% (30)
Working on setting and writing student growth goals has increased my weekly workload.		
Completely Agree	34% (348)	
Agree	45% (467)	
Disagree	20% (204)	
Completely Disagree	1% (13)	
Writing student growth goals has increased my weekly workload by:		
1-2 hours	70% (549)	
3-4 hours	22% (173)	
5 hours or more	8% (59)	

Perception of job intensification dropped slightly between the first and second surveys. In May 75% of teachers felt pressure and stress resulting from writing and measuring student growth goals, down from 81% in December.

Teacher participants perceive student growth goals add to the stress of their work (79%) and has increased their weekly workload – most respondents (70%) say by 1 – 2 hours more weekly.