Executive Summary

The Kentucky State Teacher Fellows’ program entered its second year of operation in Kentucky in August 2014. Seventeen State Teacher Fellows (STFs) from the inaugural year of the program returned for year two (STFs can continue to serve as STFs if they choose to do so). Hope Street Group (HSG) opened the application process to all teachers in Kentucky to fill the vacancies. Five new STFs were selected.¹

In year two of the program, STFs are focused on many of the year one activities, chief among them are the two data collections that will provide the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) data that can be used to inform decisions.

STFs continue to expand their Professional Learning Communities (PLC) to broaden HSG’s access to teachers that can be tapped to complete surveys, attend focus groups, and engage more deeply in the work of the STFs and the program in general. To date, there are 7,955 Kentucky teachers in a PLN. This represents an increase in the number of total teachers in PLN of 6,122 teachers as compared to the same time last year.

Over the summer and in early fall 2014, the state director worked with Kentucky Department of Education leadership to develop both the survey and focus group items for the fall survey. The survey opened on September 15, 2014, and was open for two weeks. PLN members accessed the survey via Survey Monkey.

Ultimately, 1,129 teachers in Kentucky completed the survey. When the survey closed, HSG staff worked with staff at SAS in Cary, North Carolina, to do a brief analysis of the survey data to identify unusual trends in the data. HSG conducted this brief analysis just prior to the focus groups beginning so the focus groups can be used to further investigate atypical survey findings although none were found for the fall survey.

¹ STFs’ biographies can be found at: http://hopestreetgroup.org/about/2014KTF%20.
STF-led focus groups began on October 6, 2014, and were held across the state over a two week period. In total, 29 focus groups were held. Teachers who were unable to attend a focus group were permitted to respond to the focus group questions via Survey Monkey. Two hundred thirty-eight (238) teachers responded to focus group questions via Survey Monkey. The survey data analysis that begins on page 8 was conducted by SAS staff in Cary, North Carolina over a three week period. The data were analyzed using SAS analytics and are disaggregated using relevant, additional respondent-specific information, i.e., the highest degree attained by the respondent and the number of years the respondent has been teaching. It is worth noting that the majority of teachers who responded to the survey are mid-career teachers with eight to 17 years of experience (see Figure 36), therefore, conclusions drawn about some of the results should be viewed with this notation in mind.

Recommendations based on the data begin on page 9 and continue throughout the report. Recommendations appear in bold print throughout the report. Below is summary of the recommendations.

1. HSG recommends that the KDE develop a plan to address the professional learning needs of teachers with less teaching experience as it relates to Domain 3 of PGES. Specifically, less experienced teachers indicated they needed more professional development to further align their instructional practices to Domain 3 (see question 3, figure 4).

2. HSG recommends that the KDE consider collecting multiple, creative, time-efficient exemplars of PGES evidence documentation from across the state that can be shared statewide with district superintendents, principals, and teachers. HSG also recommends that the KDE consider allowing Kentucky STFs to assist with the collection of evidence exemplars (see question 6, figures 6-9).

3. HSG recommends KDE consider providing additional professional development on the following items related to Domain 1 of PGES: demonstrating knowledge of resources, designing coherent instruction, and designing student assessments (see question 7, figures 10-15).

4. HSG recommends KDE consider providing additional professional development on the following items related to Domain 3 of PGES: managing student behavior and organizing physical space (see question 8, figures 16-20).

5. HSG recommends KDE consider providing additional professional development on the following items related to Domain 3 of PGES: engaging students in learning, using assessment in instruction, and demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness.

6. HSG recommends KDE consider providing additional professional development on the following items related to Domain 4 of PGES: communicating with families, participating in the professional community, and growing and developing professionally.

---

2 This option was presented to teachers as an alternative to using the Virtual Engagement Platform (VEP). Last year, Kentucky teachers had the option of responding to focus group questions via the VEP; however, use of the VEP overall was low. Low usage, coupled with a recommendation from the external evaluator, Policy Studies Associates to discontinue its use resulted in HSG making the decision to do so in late spring of 2014.

3 SAS is Hope Street Group’s vendor for data analysis. For more information on SAS, see: http://www.sas.com/en_us/home.html.
7. HSG recommends the KDE consider investigating the possibility of piloting programs such as The System for Teacher and Student Achievement (TAP) to provide teachers with the option of taking on additional roles and responsibilities and being paid to do so (see question 11, figure 32).

8. HSG recommends the KDE investigate the feasibility of creating a program similar to the Talent Transfer Initiative or Tennessee’s program for its Priority Schools and that it do so in conjunction with an institution of higher education and with input from teachers in the design of the program (see question 13, figure 34).

9. The KDE should consider how state policy could address the concerns raised by focus group participants regarding the use of time during the instructional day. Teachers indicated that they: needed more time to plan, wanted fewer interruptions during instruction, would prefer less paperwork, and fewer meetings. Teachers thought that one possible solution to these matters was to add teacher workdays to the school calendar (see focus group questions 1-5, figures 39-64).
Background
The Kentucky State Teacher Fellows’ program entered its second year of operation in Kentucky in August 2014. Seventeen State Teacher Fellows (STFs) from the inaugural year of the program returned for year two (STFs can continue to serve as STFs if they choose to do so). Hope Street Group (HSG) opened the application process to all teachers in Kentucky to fill the vacancies. Five new STFs were selected.

- Lea Ann Atherton, McCracken School District
- Angela Baker, Berea Independent School District
- Randy Barrette, Menifee School District
- Jana Bryant, Daviess School District
- Lindsey Childers, Trigg School District
- Brad Clark, Woodford County School District
- Kimberly Creekmore, Whitley County School District*
- Kim Delaney, Boone School District
- Paradise Forbes, Williamstown Independent School District
- Joe Harris, Lawrence School District
- Michelle Hendricks, Bullitt School District
- Christine Holajter, Mason School District
- Kipp Hottman, Oldham School District
- Tanya Jury, Bardstown Independent School District
- Ryan Mann, Scott County School District*
- Natalie McCutchen, Simpson School District
- Sherri McPherson, Fayette County School District*
- Pennye Rogers, Todd School District
- Robin Thacker, Henderson County School District*
- Carrie Wedding, Daviess County School District*
- Sarah Yost, Jefferson County School District

*New to the STF program in 2014

STFs’ biographies can be found at: [http://hopestreetgroup.org/about/2014KTF%20](http://hopestreetgroup.org/about/2014KTF%20).

Year Two Activities
In year two of the program, STFs are focused on many of the year one activities, chief among them are the two data collections that will provide the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) data that can be used to inform decisions.

STFs continue to expand their Professional Learning Communities (PLC) to broaden HSG’s access to teachers that can be tapped to complete surveys, attend focus groups, and engage more deeply in the work of the STFs and the program in general. To date, there are 7,955 Kentucky teachers in a PLN. This represents an increase in the number of total teachers in PLN of 6,122 teachers as compared to the same time last year.
Returning STFs have completed one in-person training to date. That training focused on conducting focus groups, specifically, moderating them and streamlining the note-taking process. HSG also recently completed an audit and redesign of all of its trainings. One notable change was the decision to implement more concise, uniform procedures for conducting focus groups. HSG believes the changes made will improve the quality of focus group data and will make focus group moderation easier for STFs.

New STFs received an additional in-person training to orient them to the program. STFs receive ongoing support from the state director of the program as well as the director of educator engagement and training. Monthly conference calls are held with STFs. Additionally, Kentucky STFs have created smaller work groups/committees of STFs that focus on various aspects of the program’s activities, such as social media, teacher engagement, legislative engagement, editorial board membership, and logistics.

This year, STFs are engaged in a variety of activities that speak directly to the program's maturity. Those activities include:

- Functioning as mentors to a new group of STFs serving in the state of Hawaii;
- Providing editorial feedback and writing support to a new group of STFs serving in the state of Hawaii;
- Working with Achieve, Inc., to provide feedback on sample assessment score reports to inform PARCC, Smarter Balanced, and non-consortia states;
- Becoming regular columnists to The Kentucky Teacher;
- Working to establish a Twitter chat (#HSG Ed Chat);
- Serving on the Bill and Melinda Gates Teacher Advisory Council;
- Serving on the NEA GPS (Great Public Schools) Network;
- Reviewing the Kentucky Core Academic Standards in social studies and science; and
- Reviewing draft legislation for Kentucky legislators.

HSG undertook a number of efforts to make changes to the program’s operation and its trainings as a result of feedback from Kentucky STFs, as well as the recommendations made by Policy Studies Associates after its external evaluation of the program in Kentucky. As result of the changes, HSG is now:

- Providing streamlined, newly sequenced, uniform training for STFs in Kentucky;
- Tracking and reporting the depth of engagement of teachers in STFs’ PLNs;
- Collecting analytics on social media activity; and
- Making a concerted, coordinated, and strategic effort to engage teachers in rural parts of Kentucky.

HSG recently received grant approval from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation to work with 270 Strategies to develop a set of potentially replicable strategies to deploy in southeastern and far western Kentucky to engage teachers there to ensure that the data collected by STFs represent portions of the state where data collection has lagged and teachers have been reluctant to engage in STF activities.
This grant also provides funding to work with the Kentucky Education Association (KEA) to develop a supplemental survey for release to Kentucky teachers that helps inform KEA decision-making and allows them to better understand some of the results of the recent Teaching, Empowering, Leading, and Learning (TELL) survey administration. This work will begin in earnest in early 2015 and will conclude in late spring or early summer.

Fall Data Collection
HSG changed data analytics vendors in the summer of 2014. After investigating a myriad of options, HSG elected to contract with SAS in Cary, North Carolina, largely because the company could offer both the qualitative and quantitative analysis necessary to provide the data to the KDE and other state partners.

Over the summer and in early fall 2014, the state director worked with Kentucky Department of Education leadership to develop both the survey and focus group items for the fall survey. The survey opened on September 15, 2014, and was open for two weeks. PLN members accessed the survey via Survey Monkey.

Ultimately, 1,129 teachers in Kentucky completed the survey. When the survey closed, HSG staff worked with staff at SAS in Cary, North Carolina, to do a brief analysis of the survey data to identify unusual trends in the data. HSG conducted this brief analysis just prior to the focus groups beginning so the focus groups can be used to further investigate atypical survey findings although none were found for the fall survey.

STF-led focus groups began on October 6, 2014, and were held across the state over a two week period. In total, 29 focus groups were held. Teachers who were unable to attend a focus group were permitted to respond to the focus group questions via Survey Monkey. Two hundred thirty-eight (238) teachers responded to focus group questions via Survey Monkey. The survey data analysis that begins on page 5 was conducted by SAS staff over a three week period. The data were analyzed using SAS analytics and are disaggregated using relevant, additional respondent-specific information, i.e., the highest degree attained by the respondent and the number of years the respondent has been teaching. It is worth noting that the majority of teachers who responded to the survey are mid-career teachers with eight to 17 years of experience (see Figure 36), therefore, conclusions drawn about some of the results should be viewed with this notation in mind.

The recommendations that appear in this section are based on the data analysis and are also a reflection of emerging effective practices undertaken in states and large school districts in the

---

4 Given the low number of respondents to the survey, some caution should be drawn in interpreting the results of the data analysis; however, research that suggests that higher response rates on surveys do not necessarily change the survey results. The research that is referred to here can be found in Appendix B.

5 This option was presented to teachers as an alternative to using the Virtual Engagement Platform (VEP). Last year, Kentucky teachers had the option of responding to focus group questions via the VEP; however, use of the VEP overall was low. Low usage, coupled with a recommendation from the external evaluator, Policy Studies Associates to discontinue its use resulted in HSG making the decision to do so in late spring of 2014.
United States. Given the low number of respondents to the survey, some caution should be drawn in interpreting the results of the data analysis.

The fall survey and focus group questions can be found in Appendix A.

**Spring Data Collection**
The spring data collection planning will begin very soon. Topics for that collection could potentially include additional inquiry into a number of findings from the fall data collection.

HSG is planning to spend the next eight weeks developing strategic plans to increase the response rate to the survey and increase participation in the focus groups. HSG recognizes that the ability to generalize the findings of both the surveys and focus groups is largely predicated on the number of respondents. The analytics that HSG is now collecting on the emails sent to teachers in PLNs announcing the availability of a survey and focus groups will be a key piece of evidence it will use to develop strategies for increasing the response rates. Kentucky STFs will also play a key role in determining the strategies, deploying them, and debriefing after the spring survey on their value relative to the increase (or lack thereof) in response rates.

HSG has also developed a debrief process for data collections that HSG staff lead and participate in after data collections have concluded. Staff just recently conducted the first of the two debriefs that will occur this year. These debriefs are designed to streamline the data collection process and identify areas in which improvements should be made. This effort supports HSG’s ongoing commitment to evidence-informed decision making and continuous program improvement.

**External Evaluation**
Policy Studies Associates in Washington, DC will conduct the year two evaluation of the STF program in Kentucky. Staff members from Policy Studies Associates have already made one site visit to Kentucky this school year and will make one additional visit in the spring of 2015. Their findings will be used by HSG staff to make evidence-informed decisions and programmatic improvements.
Survey Data

Question 1: Based on the Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES) related professional learning experiences that you have attended, with which of the following domains are you the most familiar? Select all that apply.

a. Planning and Preparation  
b. Classroom Environment  
c. Instruction  
d. Professional Responsibilities  
e. Not familiar with any domains

Figure 1

The data point from this question that is most notable is the number of teachers who are unfamiliar with any of the domains (see far left-hand column). Planning and preparation, classroom environment, and instruction are the domains that teachers seem to be most familiar with.
Questions 2: Is there a shared vision of effective teaching in your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.60%</td>
<td>1.66%</td>
<td>2.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.04%</td>
<td>1.78%</td>
<td>2.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.48%</td>
<td>3.55%</td>
<td>4.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.81%</td>
<td>5.33%</td>
<td>5.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.17%</td>
<td>3.11%</td>
<td>4.17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of teachers (58.54 percent), regardless of highest degree attained or years of teaching experience, agree that there is a shared vision of effective teaching in their school.

HSG recommends that attention be paid to this area as some action might be warranted based on both this survey data as well as the most recent TELL Survey data; however, additional data may be required to make a strategic decision about how to address this issue particularly because a similar question on the TELL Survey (Q7.1) suggests that a “shared vision” was believed to be in place in the majority of schools. The TELL Survey found that only 13 percent of teachers disagreed that a shared vision was present and 3 percent strongly disagreed; however, the term “shared vision” on the TELL Survey did not
specify what the shared vision was in relation to, whereas, this survey asked specifically about effective teaching.
Question 3: Are the professional learning opportunities you have participated in aligned to your instructional needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3

A majority of teachers (66.51 percent), regardless of the highest degree attained or years of experience, feel that their professional learning opportunities are aligned to their instructional needs. Teachers with 8-25 years of experience were more likely to say they felt that the professional learning opportunities were aligned to their instructional needs than teachers with less teaching experience.
Question 4: How do your instructional practices align to PGES Domain 3: Instruction?

a. I am not sure how my instructional practices align to Domain 3.
b. I know they do not align, therefore, I need to completely redesign my instructional practice.
c. I need more professional learning opportunities to further align my instructional practice to Domain 3.
d. I feel confident that my instructional practices align with Domain 3.

Figure 4

The majority of teachers, regardless of highest degree attained or years of teaching experience, feel confident about their instructional practices. Teachers with 1-3 years of experience clearly indicated that they need more professional development in this area as the majority of respondents selected “c.”

HSG recommends that the KDE develop a plan to address the professional learning needs of teachers with less teaching experience. Possible options include: offering additional, targeted professional learning opportunities and using more experienced teachers to conduct peer observations and provide actionable feedback to less experienced teachers. There might also be an opportunity to have some dialogue with the institutions of higher
education in Kentucky that prepare teachers and how their pre-service curriculum could be modified to reflect the emphasis on the PGES Domains.

It might also be worth collecting additional data on this particular item to make evidence-informed decisions about how best to address this matter.
Question 5: In light of the PGES Framework, how has your understanding of PGES Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities changed? Select all that apply.

a. I rely more heavily on the support of other teachers.
b. I am more accurate in assessing my strengths and weaknesses,
c. I seek feedback on my practice from my peers.
d. I have assumed more leadership roles within my school to impact my school culture,
e. I am more active in shaping decision making at the school level,
f. I have not made any changes based on my understanding of PGES Domain 4,

Figure 5

The most notable results of this question are the numbers of teachers who indicated that they have not made any changes based on their understanding of Domain 4. This could be because teachers were already engaged in the types of activities Domain 4 includes. Otherwise, teachers seem to be engaged in a broad range of activities (see A, B, C, D, and E) that support Domain 4.
Question 6: Please rank the items below in order of importance with "1" being most important to you and "4" being least important to you in terms of the types of support needed to successfully implement PGES in your classroom.

a. I need professional learning opportunities.
b. I need actionable feedback from my administrators.
c. I need the opportunity to learn from my fellow teachers.
d. I need resources that will allow me to document PGES evidence.

Figures 6-9 display the results of this question.

Most respondents ranked this second among the available options. The focus group data seem to be consistent with these data, that additional professional learning may be necessary for teachers both to help them improve instruction and to better understand the PGES system. Focus group data seemed to suggest that the latter would reduce the amount of time PGES takes.
Most respondents ranked this fourth among the available options. This may indicate that administrators are providing teachers with the feedback they need.
Most respondents ranked this first among the available options. This data point indicates that teachers want the opportunity to learn from their fellow teachers. The focus group data supports this finding as well. Teachers indicated in focus groups that they want more time to plan and work together (see Figures 37 and 54); however, they noted that peer observations were time consuming.

The extent to which teachers have the opportunity to learn from their fellow teachers most likely varies in schools, therefore, possible state-based action on this matter should probably be delayed until additional data or evidence are gathered.

HSG recommends that Kentucky STFs could also be consulted on this matter to provide KDE leadership with some specific ways state action could support district-and school-based efforts to provide teachers with the time they need to work, plan, and learn from each other.

It is worth noting that Q2.2 b on the TELL Survey also addresses this issue and 53 percent of teachers indicated that they have fewer than three hours per work week to collaborate with peers.
Of the teachers surveyed, 27.44 percent ranked this as number one among their needs and 33.84 percent ranked this as number four among their needs. Because there was not a preponderance of early-, mid-, or late-career teachers who ranked it first or fourth, it is difficult to draw conclusions from these results.

This finding suggests that there are variances in the way PGES evidence is documented between (and possibly within) districts. Teachers clearly cited limitations of time for evidence documentation in both the survey and focus group responses. HSG recommends that the KDE consider collecting multiple, creative, time efficient exemplars of PGES evidence documentation from across the state that can be shared statewide with district superintendents, principals, and teachers.

HSG also recommends that the KDE consider allowing Kentucky STFs to assist with the collection of evidence exemplars. STFs could be particularly helpful by collecting potential exemplars, determining their quality, and communicating the availability of such exemplars to teachers in their PLN and schools. Communication from teachers to district superintendents, principals, and teachers has the potential to be particularly effective with securing buy-in for adopting new procedures for documenting evidences. Ultimately, this
is one area where a potential time savings could be realized and would most likely be well-received by teachers given their feedback that time is a high-value commodity.
Question 7: With “1” being the domain component with which you are most familiar, and “6” being the component with which you are least familiar, rank in order of your familiarity, the components within Domain 1: Preparation and Planning of the PGES framework.

a. Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy  
b. Demonstrating Knowledge of Students  
c. Setting Instructional Outcomes  
d. Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources  
e. Designing Coherent Instruction  
f. Designing Student Assessments  
g. I am not aware of any of the Domain component attributes for Domain 1.

Figures 10-15 display the results of this question.

*Figure 10*

Most respondents ranked demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy as the component attribute with which they are most familiar.
Most respondents ranked demonstrating knowledge of students as the second component attribute with which they are most familiar.
Most respondents ranked demonstrating knowledge of setting instructional outcomes as the third component attribute with which they are most familiar.
Most respondents ranked demonstrating knowledge of resources as the fourth component attribute with which they are most familiar.
Most respondents ranked designing coherent instruction as the fifth component attribute with which they are most familiar.
Most respondents ranked demonstrating knowledge of designing student assessments component attribute with which they are least familiar.

There was no preponderance of evidence that suggested that there were significant differences in the familiarity of these items among early-, mid-, and late-career teachers, therefore, 7 d, e, and f are most likely all areas where professional learning could be targeted at the local and state levels. HSG recommends the KDE consider providing additional professional learning in these areas.
Question 8: With “1” being the domain component with which you are most familiar and “5” being the domain component with which you are least familiar, rank in order of your familiarity, the components within Domain 2: Classroom Environment of the PGES framework.

a. Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport  
b. Establishing a Culture for Learning  
c. Managing Classroom Procedures  
d. Managing Student Behavior  
e. Organizing Physical Space  
f. I am not aware of any of the Domain component attributes for Domain 2.

Figures 16-20 display the results of this question.

Figure 16

Most respondents ranked creating an environment of respect and rapport component attribute as the one with which they were most familiar.
Most respondents ranked establishing a culture for learning as the second component attribute with which they are familiar.
Most respondents ranked establishing a culture for learning as the third component attribute with which they are familiar.
Most respondents ranked establishing a culture for learning as the fourth component attribute with which they are familiar.
Most respondents ranked establishing a culture for learning as the component attribute with which they are least familiar.

There was no preponderance of evidence that suggested that there were significant differences in the familiarity of these items among early-, mid-, and late-career teachers, therefore, 8 d and e are most likely both areas where professional learning could be targeted at the local and state levels. HSG recommends the KDE consider providing additional professional learning in these areas.
Question 9: With “1” being the domain component with which you are most familiar, and “5” being the domain component with which you are least familiar, rank in order of your familiarity, the components within Domain 3: Instruction of the PGES framework.

a. Communicating with Students
b. Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques
c. Engaging Students in Learning
d. Using Assessment in Instruction
e. Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness
f. I am not aware of any of the Domain component attributes for Domain 3.

Figures 21-25 display the results of this question.

Most respondents ranked communicating with students as the component attribute with which they are most familiar.
Most respondents ranked using questioning and discussion techniques as the component attribute with which they are second most familiar.
Most respondents ranked engaging students in learning as the component attribute with which they are third most familiar.
Most respondents ranked using assessment in instruction as the component attribute with which they are fourth most familiar.
Most respondents ranked demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness as the component attribute with which they are least familiar.

There was no preponderance of evidence that suggested that there were significant differences in the familiarity of these items among early-, mid-, and late-career teachers, therefore, 9c, d, and e are most likely all areas where professional learning could be targeted at the local and state levels. HSG recommends the KDE consider providing additional professional learning in these areas.
Question 10: With “1” being the Domain component with which you are most familiar, and “6” being the Domain component with which you are least familiar, rank in order of your familiarity, the components within Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities of the PGES framework.

a. Reflecting on Teaching
b. Maintaining Accurate Records
c. Communicating with Families
d. Participating in the Professional Community
e. Growing and Developing Professionally
f. Showing Professionalism
g. I am not aware of any of the Domain component attributes for Domain 4.

Figures 26-31 display the results of this question.

*Figure 26*

Most respondents ranked reflecting on teaching as the component attribute with which they are second most familiar.
Most respondents ranked maintain accurate records as the component attribute with which they are third most familiar.
Most respondents ranked communicating with families as the component attribute with which they are fourth most familiar.
Most respondents ranked participating in the professional community as the component attribute with which they are fifth most familiar.
Most respondents ranked growing and developing professionally as the component attribute with which they are sixth most familiar.
Most respondents ranked showing professionalism as the component attribute with which they are most familiar.

There was no preponderance of evidence that suggested that there were significant differences in the familiarity of these items among early-, mid-, and late-career teachers, therefore, 10 c, d, and e are most likely all areas where professional learning could be targeted at the local and state levels. HSG recommends the KDE consider providing additional professional learning in these areas.
Question 11: Would you be interested in an opportunity to take on an additional role within your school while still maintaining your primary role as a classroom teacher if you were compensated financially for taking it on?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A majority of teachers responded in the affirmative to this question suggesting that a majority of respondents are indeed interested in taking on additional roles in their schools if they were compensated for doing so. Mid-career teachers were most interested in taking on additional roles, while late-career teachers were less interested in doing so.

HSG recommends the KDE consider investigating the possibility of piloting programs such as The System for Teacher and Student Achievement (TAP) to provide teachers with the option of taking on additional roles and responsibilities and being paid to do so. TAP currently has state-based projects in: Indiana, Louisiana, South Carolina, and Texas. Previous federal Teacher Incentive Fund grants (TIF grants) have been awarded to districts and states that propose to use TAP as a core strategy for changing compensation systems.
for educators. Currently, there is no active, open competition for TIF grants; however, a new competition is expected to be announced in the spring of 2015.

HSG can also provide the KDE with a supplemental policy brief on statewide and district-based efforts to provide this type of option to teachers should the KDE think such a resource would be valuable.
Question 12: Which of the following roles do you fulfill in your school? Select all that apply.

- a. Mentor new teachers in the school or district
- b. Leader of Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings
- c. PGES Peer Observer
- d. Professional development trainer to teachers in my school or district
- e. Provider of evidence-based instructional resources and strategies
- f. None of the above

The answers to this question further support the recommendation made for the preceding question. It appears that some teachers have voluntarily taken on additional roles and receive no compensation for doing so.
Question 13: Would you be willing to work in a school that has had a history of low student performance if you were given additional compensation to work there?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 34

More teachers responded in the affirmative to this question than in the negative or the unsure category.

Because there are many factors that impact a school’s teaching and learning conditions, merely paying teachers to work in low-performing schools will not result in an effective turnaround effort. Strategic compensation for teachers in low-performing schools should ideally be directed to teachers who have demonstrated their instructional effectiveness. A recently released study from Mathematica Policy Research funded by the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) on the Talent Transfer Initiative indicates that in the case of the 10 school districts (in seven states) where a

---

6 See: [http://escholarship.org/uc/item/0269b641](http://escholarship.org/uc/item/0269b641)

payment of $20,000 was paid over two years in five installments to “high value-added” teachers to work in under performing schools did have a positive impact on student achievement in those schools. Other findings were notable, in particular, that the teachers who were part of the initiative continued to work in the schools after their two-year commitment had expired.

A study done by Vanderbilt University documents similar findings in Tennessee’s Priority Schools. A $5,000 bonus paid to effective teachers to work in these schools also had a positive impact\textsuperscript{8}.

Some states have taken action on the policy front to ensure that the teachers paid for taking on assignments in low-performing are indeed teachers who have a proven track record of instructional effectiveness. Florida, for example, passed a bill in its last legislative session that permits school districts to assign a newly hired teacher who was rated effective or highly effective to a hard-to-staff school. For more information on Florida’s legislation, see: http://www.myfloridahouse.gov/Sections/Documents/loaddoc.aspx?FileName=_h0433er.docx&DocumentType=Bill&BillNumber=0433&Session=2014.

HSG recommends the KDE investigate the feasibility of creating a program similar to the Talent Transfer Initiative or Tennessee’s program for its Priority Schools and that it do so in conjunction with an institution of higher education and with input from teachers in the design of the program.

\textsuperscript{8} See: http://www.tnconsortium.org/data/files/gallery/ContentGallery/Effective_TeacherRetention_Bonuses_Evidence_from_TN.pdf
Few teachers, regardless of years of teaching experience or highest degree attained were in favor of this concept (57.02 percent answered “no” and 25.49 percent answered “not sure”). While many efforts to change the basis for teacher compensation have been tried over the years in school districts and in a few states, by and large, teachers have not been receptive to those efforts. Overall, teacher support of pay-for-performance initiatives tends to be stronger when the program or initiative is not solely focused on pay-for-performance, but include other elements as well, such as paying teachers for taking on leadership roles or mentoring their less experienced colleagues.

The most notable state-based, state wide effort to pay teachers, at least in part, based on their students’ performance occurred in Minnesota. The state’s Q Comp program is still in operation.

[9 See: http://www.nga.org/files/live/sites/NGA/files/pdf/1112TEACHERPAY.PDF]
and is voluntary for school districts and charter schools. This school year, 69 school districts and 66 charter schools are participating in the program. The program has five core components:

- Career Ladder/Advancement Options;
- Job-embedded Professional Development;
- Teacher Evaluation;
- Performance Pay; and
- Alternative Salary Schedule.

Additional information about Q Comp can be found at: http://education.state.mn.us/MDE/SchSup/QComp/.

There are some valuable resources available to guide state education agencies interested in pay-for-performance programs or initiatives. Included among them are the National Center on Performance Initiatives at Vanderbilt University and the RAND Corporation’s publication on effective practices in performance pay.

Given the data collected on this question, HSG recommends that the KDE should not pursue a program or initiative that emphasized paying teachers, in whole (or part), for their students’ performance without gathering additional information, teacher input, and research. This data point indicates that such a program would, without these precursors, potentially not be well received by teachers.
Question 15: How many years of teaching experience do you have?

Figure 36

Years Experience

- 8-12 years: 256
- 18-25 years: 252
- 13-17 years: 210
- 4-7 years: 161
- More than 25 years: 135
- 1-3 years: 112
Question 16: Which grade level(s) do you teach?

Figure 37
Question 17: What is your highest level of educational attainment?

Figure 38

- Master's Degree: 47.42%
- Post-Master's Degree: 40.32%
- Bachelor's Degree: 10.92%
- Doctoral Degree: 1.33%
Focus Group Data

Overview
The fall focus groups set out to answer three open-ended questions. The three questions surveyed were:

1. What are the biggest obstacles in PGES implementation, and how would you address them?
2. Outside of instruction, what professional responsibilities and tasks occupy the majority of your time during the school day?
3. What changes could administrators make that would optimize time during your workday?

Responses were collected from focus groups and responses respondents provided via Survey Monkey (referred to throughout this portion of the report as “survey answers”). The results were then sent to the SAS Institute for review. SAS combined the survey answers and the focus group answers into an individual document for each question.

Using SAS Contextual Analytics and SAS Visual Analytics, SAS analyzed the open-ended responses to each question and produced visualizations, such as Term Maps, and corresponding metrics that further describe the results. Term Maps produce a visual observation of the collection of answers to the three surveyed questions. Each term map identifies the most utilized terms, concepts, topics and categories from the open-ended responses.

SAS findings concluded that the majority of teachers said they needed more time to plan and grade, and less paperwork. Focus group and survey participants identified that time was the biggest obstacle due to the need to plan lessons, grade papers and complete other paperwork. The results also identified that teachers suggested an additional teacher workday would help optimize their time.

SAS utilized text analytics software that produced a term map for each document. A term map shows the term of interest as the center node. Nodes that appear around the center node represent links to terms that correspond to rules for predicting the appearance of the center node in the document. Node names that are preceded by a tilde (~) indicate terms that do not appear with the term of interest.

For example, suppose that the center node kitchen has successive nodes table > food > ~formal, which are linked to kitchen. The diagram indicates that if the terms table and food both appear in the document and the term formal does not, then there is a strong probability that the term kitchen will also appear in the document.

The size of the node indicates the relative number of documents that include that combination of terms. The darker the node, the more reliable the rule is for predicting that the term of interest will appear in a document.
The numbers in the tooltip indicate the number of documents that contain that combination of terms (including the term of interest) and the total number of documents that contain the term, respectively.

The results also analyze the number of times a term appears in the document and groups multiple terms into topics and categories. SAS can then view the topics in three ways; table view, Cloud View, and Document Summary view. Each view of the selected topic provides a different insight into the data: Table view, lists the terms and their weights. A Cloud view, displays a word cloud for the terms in the selected topic. Document summary view, displays a list of the documents that contain the selected topic. The relevancy score shows how well the document matches the topic. The best match has a score of 1.

**Notable findings are noted in bold lettering.**
Findings

Question 1: What are the Biggest Obstacles in PGES implementation, and how would you address them?

The results for Question 1 showed that the biggest obstacles in **PGES implementation are time and training**. We can see that the top terms that repeated throughout the answers were time, teacher, work, and plan. With time reoccurring in 204 out of 437 responses (See Figure 40). With a 47 percent response rate of time, teachers identified that the biggest obstacle for them is time. Understanding the process and having more common planning was the common solution. From the term map below (Figure 39), time linked with school, spend, complete and paperwork, explains that participants acknowledged that too much time is spent during the school day to complete paperwork. The topics and categories produced for question 1 showed that in addition to time; process, paperwork, and peer observations were also obstacles.

*Figure 39*
The table view (see Figure 40) shows the five most reoccurring terms were time, teacher, work, and plan. Term maps can be viewed for each of these terms (see Figures 41-43).

**Figure 40**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Number of Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td></td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plan</td>
<td>0.341</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 41: teacher**
Figure 42: work
The cloud view (see Figure 44) shows that time is clearly the biggest obstacle for teachers. With time appearing 47 percent and teacher following at 24 percent.

Figure 44
As the document indicates time is the largest obstacle, **topics around time include: training, teaching, work, paperwork, and planning.** Those topics can also be displayed in a word cloud (see Figure 45) showing that time and plan have the majority of weight followed by paperwork and complete.

*Figure 45*
The topics and categories were produced from these term maps by grouping together the words that appeared together most frequently. These topics include:

1. Time, plan, paperwork, complete;
2. Implement, teacher, process;
3. Work, teach, goal, observation; and
4. Plan, planning, lesson, time.

For these topics, we can see the sentiment from a few of the responses (see Figure 46). Sixty (60) percent were neutral while 30 percent have a negative sentiment corresponding to each response and only 10 percent of responses were positive.

**Figure 46**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Sentiment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POSSE is very time consuming. Instead of focusing on my students, I am typing out reflections, extended lesson plans, and completing data notebooks. Teachers need time to complete these tasks, not during our planning time.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the paperwork. It takes so much time. Its hard to complete that paperwork plus do lesson plans and teach and do everything we do not have common plan and most outside of school weekly if not daily.</td>
<td>0.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entirely too much personal time spent on the whole process. I want to teach not use my planning to complete evaluation paperwork!</td>
<td>0.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much time spent collecting evidence and completing requirements. It actually takes time away from planning</td>
<td>0.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time. Administrators need to give planning time to work on POSSE instead of our own time.</td>
<td>0.863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time. There is already so much to do as a teacher; this takes away from time we have to spend on actually preparing for our classes. We need to be given time, during school, to work on this. Or be given a day to complete this during the school year.</td>
<td>0.837</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The document table displays a document in its entirety (see Figure 47). The highlighted terms were used to match the document with the topics and categories. As we have concluded, participants indicated that time and paperwork were the biggest obstacles. We can see many of the responses below in the document view. The document view also shows the sentiment of each response.

**Figure 47**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Sentiment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Time</strong> for peer observations and principal observations. Make sure money is available for subs so we do not have to use planning time.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>All the paperwork takes too much time. It’s hard to complete that paperwork plus do lesson plans, and teach and do everything we do not have extra time to do the new paperwork.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td><strong>Time</strong> provide subs so <strong>planning time</strong> is preserved.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Extra time to do the new paperwork</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td><strong>Time</strong> too much time to do it and not sure it will improve education or effect my <strong>planning time</strong>.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td><strong>Finding time</strong>, finding a team with common <strong>planning</strong> on with <strong>time</strong> after school to work</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td><strong>Time</strong> constraints (intentional planning), peer evaluations (communication), consistency throughout school (admin leadership and follow-through)</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>The biggest obstacle is having to implement it at all. I would think more bureaucratic paperwork would improve teaching and learning. Success adequate <strong>planning time</strong> to ensure that the goals I select are truly integral to my classroom instruction instead of just being another “hobby” I think the <strong>Planning time</strong> - the extent required for the observations, the amount of observations required - a solution could be to lessen the amount of observations.</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Peer observation is a big concern for me - it’s not the actual time spent in another classroom because I think we gain from those experiences, it is the hours to do the paperwork.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>I have already completed a peer observation for this school year. The time spent in the room was about 15 minutes and I actually enjoyed it.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td><strong>Time</strong> spent at school - the hours devoted to meeting, developing, researching, testing, teaching, retesting and reporting are much greater than the 15 minutes I spent in my peer’s classroom.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>I feel more time to address the requirements by giving one adequate <strong>planning time</strong>.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>I am spending 25 hours outside of school to complete my necessary responsibilities including FOSS. We need more help. This isn’t right or fair.</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>I need <strong>time</strong> for <strong>planning</strong>, I need <strong>time</strong> for training without my <strong>planning</strong> being taken to do it. Could you build days into our scheduling? I’m not sure how</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Elementary teachers need more <strong>planning</strong> time or more help. I am tired of working every night until 10 pm</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>I am the third teacher to take this building in a year. The time we spend here is responsible. KDE has to hear us and give us more help.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>I agree with the time aspect, and enthusiasm is low. We already get <strong>planning</strong> time handed. I think we should go through each of those</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Taking the time to do all of the <strong>paperwork</strong></td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>First, the computer input system is very difficult to use. The loss of data is overwhelming. We spend too much time filling out templates instead.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td><strong>TIME</strong>. Build in PD half days throughout the year, or offer some paid leave to teachers in the full cycle of the process for the purpose of planning.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td><strong>TIME</strong>. CONSUMPTION—rather than <strong>planning</strong> <em>time</em> for training to teach us how to implement TCPES and using that <em>time</em> to fill PD “hour”</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>The time to fully understand and fill out all possible parts correctly. To address these issues I would say make forms simpler and use the motto TIME!!! This is true for teachers as well as administrators. Every minute (or hour, or day) I spend on finding or writing about my evidence is time I did not have.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Too much evidence having to be gathered, especially data that does not directly impact my classroom and my students’ learning in any way. Time to clearly what the expectations are. Principals districts should be providing and paying for these trainings. Teachers are already asked to do</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Amount of time <strong>spend</strong> on baseline data</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td><strong>Time</strong> is the most evident factor. We are adding so many requirements to our school paperwork that there is very little time to properly <strong>plan</strong> class.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 2
Outside of instruction, what professional responsibilities and tasks occupy the majority of your time during the school day?

The results for Question 2 showed that Outside of instruction, professional tasks and responsibilities that occupy the majority of participants’ time are planning, meetings, grading and paperwork. Plan/planning was the most reoccurring with 34 percent, followed by meetings with 29 percent, then grading with 24 percent, and finally paperwork with 20 percent. We can see the relationship between each of these with term maps. The plan term map indicates that planning is linked with curriculum, growth, time, day, and instructional (see Figure 48).

Figure 48: plan
Meeting is linked with student and work, indicating that meeting with students is a top responsibility of the participants (see Figure 49).

Figure 49: meet
Looking at the grade term map and the paper term map (see Figures 50 and 51 respectively), grading papers and teaching spending time grading paperwork are also top time consuming responsibilities (see Figure 52).

Figure 50: grade
Figure 51: paper

Figure 52
The topics and categories were produced from these term maps by grouping together the words that appeared together most frequently (see Figure 53).

These topics include:

1. Lesson, plans, preparing lessons, grade;
2. Program review, parent, student, meetings, committees;
3. Grading, student assessments, data, tests; and

Analyzing the topics and categories produced from these term maps we can view that lesson planning is the most weighted terms followed by grade. We can see that even though lesson only appears 10 percent of the time in responses, it carries a weight of over 50 percent in connection to planning.
This indicated that lesson planning is referred to as the top time occupying responsibility, followed by grading. Analyzing the sentiment of the responses we can see 86 percent of responses were neutral while 10 percent of responses had a negative sentiment and only 4 percent had a positive sentiment (see Figure 54).

**Figure 54**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Sentiment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning of lessons, and grading papers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calling parents, sending emails to parents, grading papers, but most of all planning lessons.</td>
<td>0.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning, researching and preparing lessons, Creating assessments and evaluating student work.</td>
<td>0.633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paperwork and lesson planning</td>
<td>0.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson planning and miscellaneous paperwork</td>
<td>0.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough time to prepare for the instruction, lesson plans, Cds, tracking of SGG.</td>
<td>0.865</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As we have concluded, participants indicated that planning, meetings, grading and paperwork were the most time consuming responsibilities outside of instructing. We can see many of the responses below in the document view (see Figure 55). The document view also shows the sentiment of each response.

**Figure 55**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Sentiment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Planning/grading from instruction. Instruction takes up all the time. Writing grants, discipline referrals, emailing parents, writing letters to PTO.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Collab planning, data crunching, planning/delivering pd...I'm an inst. coach, but still carry a heavy load. One foot in my classroom, one foot in my...</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Relationship building with the kids and other teachers, in the classroom while kids are working all the time. BEING w/SS's Same.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>This year was ridiculous. First we had 3 days of useless PD. Then we all had to do about 10 hours or more of online PD for the state, or maybe the...</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>My school day begins at approximately 6:45 and ends at 3:00, for a total of 495 minutes. Of those 495 minutes, here is the breakdown of my...</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Before school duty to supervise students prior to the start of the day. After school duty to supervise students before buses pick up students. I spend...</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Daily meetings take a majority of our time. I spend in meetings. ARC's, content, team meetings. Very little time.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>It doesn't allow my school day to be full of anything other than instruction for the most part and my administrators are good about keeping other things at...</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Program Review!!!! We have done a great job in our building to improve our scores with all program review areas and I am proud of that, however, a few years ago I would have said PLT's but our school has done a great job to really allow this sort of professional conversation to be meaningful.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>As a first grade teacher, I think I spend a large part of my day taking care of personal needs of my students. I don't know if people realize how much...</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>At the secondary level I really feel that our class rotations allow us to focus on instruction more than a first grade teacher but we lose time to all the...</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>It seems I have so many things to prepare for meetings that it majorly cuts into my instructional time and plan. Such as testing data for the...</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Outside of instruction, ARC meetings and common planning occupy the majority of time during the school day. With that said, grading student work...</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>My time is evenly divided between communications, planning, assessment evaluation/feedback, and improving my personal knowledge, because I...</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Planning, we spend a lot of time walking kids back and forth from the bathroom, twice a day my team well take a bathroom break which can grow...</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Most of my school hours are spent providing instruction. I do the same things listed above straight and on weekends. Something has to give.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Filling in for teachers when sub shortage, therefore, no planning time.</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>Meetings have consumed a huge amount of time this year. Parent/teacher, Common Planning, ARC's, parent phone conversations, Testing...</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Planning, analyzing data, time for RTI probes, completing DRA's.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>English PLCs, which are usually during our lunches, and planning for the speech and debate team, which is what I do many times during my...</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>PLC meetings and Team meetings. I spend most of my planning is in meeting so I have to plan after school when I have time.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>Paperwork and meetings. Definitely not planning time. This is completed all on my own time.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>Tracking behaviors for students with behavior plans, keeping data on the rest of my class, shifting around plans to meet student needs, making sure...</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>Our school does not have instructional specialists of any kind, no curriculum specialists, nothing. So we are all on our own doing what the...</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>Special education paperwork, monitoring data for IEPs, code maintenance, creating materials for special education students since there are...</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>Planning...is really the only time I have during the day that is noninstructional.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>We are required to continue our education as well as dedicate time to professional growth and training. With the addition of parent review...</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 3
What changes could administrators make that would optimize time during your workday?

The results for Question 3 showed that administrators could make changes such as providing more time to plan, reducing instructional time interruptions, requiring less paperwork, reducing meetings, and adding more teacher workdays for planning and training. Time was the most reoccurring word, with 42 percent of responses, followed by planning at 32 percent, meeting at 24 percent, and teacher workday at 19 percent.

The time term map (see Figure 56) shows that participants used time in relation to: needing more time for planning and training, wanting administrators to reduce interruptions during instructional time, and organizing time better by changing the work week.

Figure 56: time
The plan term map (see Figure 57) indicates planning linked to unnecessary, meeting, and the need to simplify.

Figure 57: plan
The meet term map (see Figure 58) shows meetings in relation to parents, departments, teachers, and planning.

*Figure 58: meet*
The teacher term map (see Figure 59) shows teachers in a very strong weight to day. Participants indicated that they needed additional teacher workdays.

*Figure 59: teacher*

![Teacher Term Map](image)

The topics and categories were produced from these term maps by grouping together the words that appeared together most frequently. These topics were:

1. Time, day, schedule, school, week;
2. Plan, common, content, time, allow;
3. Meet, email, administrator, require, little; and
4. Teacher, work, stop, day.

Analyzing the topics and categories produced from these term maps, we can see that although time reoccurs the most at 42 percent, teacher has more weight in relation to time (see Figures 60 and 61).
Figure 60

Figure 61

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Number of Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td></td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plan</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td></td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meet</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td></td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analyzing the sentiment for these we can see that 53 percent of responses had a neutral sentiment while 30 percent of responses were positive and 17 percent had a negative sentiment (see Figure 62).

**Figure 62**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Sentiment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More planning time during the day or more frequent collaboration work days without students</td>
<td>8.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide clear, efficient documentation strategies/procedures. Actively embed time for teachers in school day/year (e.g, plan period is simply not enough for the amount of work).</td>
<td>8.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give dedicated time for team planning and for in-school interventions. Rethink use of the school day. Let teachers assume the power to do what they know is right for students.</td>
<td>8.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To limit meetings during planning to just one or no more than 2 days a week. We have had as many as 3 different meetings or trainings in one week which is very stressful when you already have so much to do.</td>
<td>8.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule a release day once per grading period per department</td>
<td>8.613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To create more time in the day administrators could only require teachers to meet in their PLC’s one day a week instead of two.</td>
<td>8.609</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As we have concluded, participants indicated that they would benefit from more time allotted, fewer meetings, more planning time, reduced interruptions, and more teacher workdays or change in the schedule. We can see many of the responses below in the document view (see Figure 63). The document view also shows the sentiment of each response.

**Figure 63**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Sentiment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Provide clear, efficient documentation strategies/procedures. Actively embed time for teachers in school day/year (e.g. plan period is simply not enough)</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>This year I have outdoor carpet duty only 3 days out of the week, instead of 5. In the mornings so I spend the extra time working with students and negative behaviors.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Change traditional 5 days a week scheduling to a college-like scheduling with 3 days a week for core classes, 2 days a week for electives, and off one day.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Give us release days or substitute faculty meetings with work time on PGES, or recognize we know what we're doing.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Right, Kamel! I write grants, take paras days, pay my own way to learn cool stuff, my other Te don't want to do all that. Flipped meetings are fun!</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>&quot;I really don't think that there is much more that they could do but I think that it may be a little more productive if we have PLC's by department.&quot;</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>I think at my campus our administration has done a good job of minimizing unnecessary distractions. Unfortunately, work just takes time and unless they've worked there, they don't understand the context...</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Limit interruptions to the instructional day as much as possible. We have addressed this at our school but still have some interruptions.</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>I absolutely agree - I feel that a lot of the mandates that are pushed down are put into place by people who have never been in the classroom or are far removed from classroom teaching.</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>I don't think this is a concern at my building but I know it is for many - master schedule. We have the freedom as an elementary school to design a schedule that makes sense for us.</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Not sure. So much is expected that it is impossible to streamline or optimize time during the day. The only solution I have found is to work smarter.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Administrators should allocate content area teachers for ARC meetings. We should have a minimum number of ARC meetings that a teacher can attend.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>When I am saying this I am talking about our Kentucky Education system as a whole (not our administrators). I feel and believe that the system bleeds in many ways.</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Administrators could optimize instructional time in class by providing a video camera, in an effort to reduce behavioral problems. Sometimes,</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>We asked my principal if we could spend the mandatory PD day planning our instruction through winter break.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>We think PLC's should be embedded during the school day. At my school we only have one faculty meeting a month and the other times are used for planning.</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>We are so fortunate to have our AP planning structure. In five years I have 2 days of math PLC, one day of math PLC, one day of embedded, and our AP planning.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Our mandatory PD day was teacher-led. I and the other lead teacher created a WebQuest so it was completely self-directed around the theme of</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>I have to teach six classes. We're on 7 period day with 50 min classes and one planning and duty (study hall, cafeteria duty). Planning is not really</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>I would appreciate an early release day once a month.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Time built in the school day for Program Review.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>I think the administration considers the teachers time very valuable during the school day. Time during PLCs would be helpful.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>&quot;Our administration does a good job of helping teachers optimize their time during the day.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>From a preschool teacher. Our district does not follow the state suggested guidelines of best practice for preschool (a 4 day double session with this).</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>Meetings should be held to a minimum. Also, limiting the &quot;appointments&quot; made that require the teacher to be present would be helpful. Would it</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Honestly I'm not sure what could be done to improve this. They are very respectful of our planning time... they just aren't enough of it. Unless they can</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deduction and Recommendation(s)

From these results, an underlying theme of time was apparent. Participants' specified that lack of time was their biggest obstacle in PGES implementation. Participants then stated that planning, paperwork, meetings, and grading, occupied most of their time outside of instructional time.

Participants indicated that having more time planning and understanding the PGES process could address the obstacle of time in PGES implementation. Participants also suggested administrators could optimize teachers' time by adding additional teacher workdays, providing time for more common planning, and allowing more time for teaching, planning, and training.

The KDE should consider how state guidance, policy, and professional learning could address the concerns raised and the recommendations made by participants. The most obvious and potentially easiest effort to address their concerns would be to provide more professional learning to teachers on PGES based on the data collected and analyzed from the survey.
It is worth noting that the most recent TELL Survey results support the participants’ perceptions about how time is used (and not used) in their schools. See Figure 65 for important comparative data.

**Figure 65**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TELL Survey Item</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time is available to work with colleagues (Q2.1 b)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-instructional time is sufficient (Q2.1 d)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efforts are made to minimize paperwork (Q2.1 e)</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TELL Survey Item</th>
<th>Amount of Time Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative planning time (Q2.2 b)</td>
<td>44% said less than or equal to one hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14% said none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time completing paperwork (Q2.2 e)</td>
<td>35% said 1-3 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6% said 3-5 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10% said 5-10 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1% said more than 10 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent in committee and staff meetings (Q2.2 d)</td>
<td>40% said 1-3 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6% said 3-5 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10% said 5-10 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kentucky Survey Questions Fall 2014

1. Based on the Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES) related professional learning experiences that you have attended, with which of the following domains are you the most familiar? Select all that apply.
   a. Planning and Preparation
   b. Classroom Environment
   c. Instruction
   d. Professional Responsibilities

2. Is there a shared vision of effective teaching in your school?
   YES  NO  NOT SURE

3. Is the professional development you receive aligned to your instructional needs?
   YES  NO  NOT SURE

4. How do your instructional practices align to PGES Domain 3: Instruction?
   a. I am not sure how my instructional practices align to Domain 3.
   b. I know they do not align, therefore, I need to completely redesign my instructional practice.
   c. I need more professional learning opportunities to further align my instructional practice to Domain 3.
   d. I feel confident that my instructional practices align with Domain 3.

5. In light of the PGES Framework, how has your understanding of PGES Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities changed? Select all that apply.
   a. I rely more heavily on the support of other teachers.
   b. I am more accurate in assessing my strengths and weaknesses.
   c. I seek feedback on my practice from my peers.
   d. I have assumed more leadership roles within my school to impact my school culture.
   e. I am more active in shaping decision making at the school level.
   f. I have not made any changes based on my understanding of PGES Domain 4.

6. Please rank the items below in order of importance with 1 being most important to you in terms of the types of support needed to successfully implement PGES in your classroom. Select all that apply.
a. I need professional learning opportunities.
b. I need actionable feedback from my administrators.
c. I need the opportunity to learn from my fellow teachers.
d. I need resources that will allow me to document PGES evidence.

7. **With “1” being the domain component with which you are most familiar, and “6” being the component with which you are least familiar, rank in order of your familiarity, the components within Domain 1: Preparation and Planning of the PGES framework.**

   a. Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy
   b. Demonstrating Knowledge of Students
   c. Setting Instructional Outcomes
   d. Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources
   e. Designing Coherent Instruction
   f. Designing Student Assessments
   g. I am not aware of any of the Domain component attributes for Domain 1.

8. **With “1” being the domain component with which you are most familiar and “5” being the domain component with which you are least familiar, rank in order of your familiarity, the components within Domain 2: Classroom Environment of the PGES framework.**

   a. Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport
   b. Establishing a Culture for Learning
   c. Managing Classroom Procedures
   d. Managing Student Behavior
   e. Organizing Physical Space
   f. I am not aware of any of the Domain component attributes for Domain 2.
9. With “1” being the domain component with which you are most familiar, and “5” being the domain component with which you are least familiar, rank in order of your familiarity, the components within Domain 3: Instruction of the PGES framework.

a. Communicating with Students
b. Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques
c. Engaging Students in Learning
d. Using Assessment in Instruction
e. Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness
f. I am not aware of any of the Domain component attributes for Domain 3.

10. With “1” being the Domain component with which you are most familiar, and “6” being the Domain component with which you are least familiar, rank in order of your familiarity, the components within Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities of the PGES framework.

a. Reflecting on Teaching
b. Maintaining Accurate Records
c. Communicating with Families
d. Participating in the Professional Community
e. Growing and Developing Professionally
f. Showing Professionalism
g. I am not aware of any of the Domain component attributes for Domain 4

11. Would you be interested in an opportunity to take on an additional role within your school while still maintaining your primary role as a classroom teacher if you were compensated financially for taking it on?

YES  NO  NOT SURE

12. Which of the following roles do you fulfill in your school? Select all that apply.

a. Mentor new teachers in the school or district
b. Leader of Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings
c. PGES Peer Observer
d. Professional development trainer to teachers in my school or district
e. Provider of evidence-based instructional resources and strategies
f. None of the above

13. If you currently fill any of the roles described in the options for question 12, are you being compensated financially for filling that role?

YES  NO  NOT SURE
14. Would you be willing to work in a school that has had a history of low student performance if you were given additional compensation to work there?

YES  NO  NOT SURE

15. Would you be interested in a compensation system where you were paid based, in part, on student performance and your professional accomplishments?

YES  NO  NOT SURE

16. How many years of teaching experience do you have?

(Insert Text Box)

17. What grade level(s) do you teach?

(Insert Text Box)

18. What is your level of educational attainment?
Examples: BA, Masters, Rank 1, NBCT, etc.

(Insert Text Box)

19. To what professional organizations do you belong?
Examples: KEA, KAPE, Advance KY, KMEA, KWLA, etc.

(Insert Text Box)

20. How did you hear about this survey?

a. An email from a KY State Teacher Fellow
b. Twitter
c. Facebook
d. A professional organization that I belong to. Please write in the name of that organization.

Focus Group Questions

1. What are the biggest obstacles in PGES implementation, and how would you address them?

2. Outside of instruction, what professional responsibilities and tasks occupy the majority of your time during the school day?

3. What changes could administrators make that would optimize time during your work day?
Appendix B


