

Teacher non-renewal: Lessons for teacher preparation program design

STEVEN W. NEILL, PAUL BLAND, EDWIN CHURCH, CLIMETINE CLAYBURN AND W. MICHAEL SHIMEALL

The Teachers College, Emporia State University, Kansas 66801. Corresponding author S.W. Neill <sneill@emporia.edu>

The goal of this study was to identify areas of teacher performance that were insufficient to the point that the teacher was non-renewed. Teacher preparation programs should consider using the findings of this study to make a thorough examination of their coursework and their field experience requirements to determine if students are being adequately prepared to meet the challenges of teaching today's young people. The study found that teachers generally failed primarily in the area of classroom management. Of the 22 possible teaching skills where teachers could be deficient, four of the top five causes for non-renewal came from within the category of classroom management. Specifically, these areas were creating an environment of respect and rapport, managing student behavior, managing classroom procedures, and establishing a culture for learning.

Keywords: teacher characteristics, preservice teachers, teaching methods, program effectiveness, attitude change, teacher education program, teacher competencies, teacher shortage, teacher dismissal, job performance.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, teacher preparation institutions have come under increasing criticism for not producing enough quality teachers. This assumption is based on teacher shortages as well as other factors. However, as the issue of teacher demand is examined more thoroughly, it becomes clear that the problem is more about retaining the teachers we have rather than recruiting new ones. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, nearly one-third of new teachers leave the profession in their first three years of teaching and approximately one-half of them leave by their fifth year in the profession. A conservative national estimate on the cost of replacing public school teachers who have dropped out of the profession is \$2.2 billion a year. For individual states, cost estimates range from \$8.5 million in North Dakota to a whopping half billion dollars for a large state like Texas. The cost for Kansas is estimated to be over \$51 million (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2005).

Although an adequate supply of potential teachers is certainly an important issue, an even more critical concern involves teacher quality. Boyer (1995) wrote that

... [community] begins with a shared vision. It's sustained by teachers who, as school leaders, bring inspiration and direction to the institution. Who, after all, knows more about the classroom? Who is better able to inspire children? Who can evaluate, more sensitively, the education progress of each student? And who but teachers create a true community for learning? Teachers are, without question, the heartbeat of a successful school. (p. 31)

DuFour and Eaker (1998) indicated, "[schools] are effective because of their teachers, not in spite of them" (p. 206). Allington and Cunningham (2002) "[recognized] that children's homes and backgrounds influence failure or success, we must also realize that what happens in classrooms minute by minute, day after day, determines how much will be learned by how many children" (p. 67). Jensen (2009) summed up what others have said in that "[most] teachers understand that good teaching can change students" (p. 62). Kauchak and Eggen (2005) stated it a different way. "No one, other than parents and other caregivers, has more potential for touching the personal, social, and intellectual lives of students than do caring and dedicated teachers" (p. 3).

Thompson (2007) stated that to be a good teacher one needs "subject matter competency; a cohesive, comprehensible, challenging, and relevant curriculum; high expectations for students, multiple means of assessment; an engaging style of delivery; and the overall objective of not only equipping students with the skills they need to advance toward their personal goals but also encouraging them to use their education to bring about social justice..." (p. 15).

Danielson et al. (2009) created a framework that divides 22 components into four domains of teaching responsibility: planning and preparation; classroom environment; instruction; and professional responsibilities. They reported that those aspects of a teacher's responsibilities have been documented through empirical studies and theoretical research to promote student learning. "Although they are not the only possible description of practice, these responsibilities seek to define what teachers should know and be able to do in the exercises of their profession" (Danielson et al., 2009, p. 15).

Even though great strides have been made in determining what factors contribute to quality teaching, research is lacking as it regards why teachers leave the profession early. More specifically, what factors contribute to teachers' non-renewal? In order for teacher preparation institutions effectively to evaluate and improve their programs, it is important to determine just what skills teachers lack that cause them to leave the profession or experience non-renewal.

Research into the reasons for leaving the profession early gives us some insight. "Of the teachers leaving the field out of dissatisfaction, 43% report that inadequate support from their school administration was a main reason, and about a quarter say student discipline problems drove them out" (Ingersoll, 2002, p. 13A). Little research has been conducted to look at this problem from a different angle. Teachers are frequently asked about their reasons for leaving the profession. To examine this problem from the point of view of those who supervise teachers who leave the profession early to determine if causes can be validated or questioned would seem important. Certainly it is human nature to put the blame for the lack of success on someone else and researchers have seldom looked at this problem from the point of view of administration. For example, do teachers leave the profession because of a lack of administrative support or because teacher behaviors are such that administrators cannot support?

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

This study examines the problem of teacher non-renewal from the perspective of the building administrator. The goal of the study is to assist teacher preparation institutions to evaluate their programs and identify areas that may need to be either eliminated or re-enforced. The study was designed to answer two questions:

What do building principals report as the most common factors that contribute to teacher non-renewal?

What steps should teacher preparation institutions take to assure that candidates are better prepared to deal with factors that lead to teacher non-renewal?

RESEARCH DESIGN

The design adopted in this research project used both quantitative and qualitative methods to identify the most common factors that contribute to teacher non-renewal. A questionnaire was developed (Appendix A), which included three major sections: (a) demographic section that identified the principal, the school and district, and district and school size; (b) section indicating non-renewal factors asking principals to detail the reasons why individual teachers were

non-renewed; (c) section of comments where principals were allowed to elaborate on the information provided in the survey.

The above approach was selected for the following five reasons: (a) survey methodology that allows a large group of potential principals to be questioned as personal interviews by phone or in person with a potentially large group of principals would have been impractical; (b) the study design allowed the issue to be examined from a quantitative point of view with more principals' views examined; (c) using a standardized instrument insured that each principal was asked the same questions; (d) the potential influence of an interviewer's facial expressions, demeanor, and variations in follow-up questions could be eliminated; and (e) open-ended questions allow the principals' answers to be analyzed without ascribing meaning or intent based on the interpretation of a physical response or interviewer bias (Babbie, 2001; Gillham, 2000).

The advantages implicit in this approach allowed the clear depiction of the principals' beliefs through the development of a rank or priority order. Using these priority orders, it was possible to identify teaching skills that are more frequently missing in teachers who are non-renewed. The use of a fixed percentage scale allowed principals to determine the most important problems.

The qualities of an effective teacher identified for the study's questionnaire came from the work of Danielson et al. (2009). The *Framework for Teaching* is a research-based set of components of instruction. In this framework, teaching is divided into 22 components. Each component defines a distinct quality of effective teaching. The 22 components are then grouped into four domains (Danielson et al., 2009). Principals were given the option to rate each non-renewed teacher on each of these 22 components identifying each as either "a major factor in dismissal," "a contributing factor in dismissal" or "not a factor in dismissal."

The compilation of responses to the comments section allowed the identification of variations that might have influenced specific non-renewal decisions. The principals then had the opportunity to identify situations that they felt might not have been addressed in the questionnaire. The use of open-ended questions provided principals with flexibility not found in the sole use of a questionnaire (Gillham, 2000).

METHODS

Adopted questionnaire

In the adopted questionnaire, principals were asked to identify the specific teaching skills that was absent in teachers who were non-renewed. The principals were also asked to identify the specific professional shortcoming that resulted in teacher dismissal.

These responses were aggregated into percentages and assigned to each variable determined by the principals' selections. These data were inputted into a spreadsheet program using Microsoft Excel. Excel was selected because of its simplicity and the fact that the study design did not call for complex statistical measures. Computations were conducted to determine an average percentage for each variable and to assign a rank to each variable. The results were calculated as percentages and then ranked to determine their impact on the eventual non-renewal decision.

Subjects

Two hundred and eighteen principals in Kansas agreed to complete a questionnaire. Principals were asked to report on teachers they had recommended for non-renewal in the last two years. The principals were not paid for their participation in this research study. Principals were afforded a copy of the results of this study if they so choose.

The survey process was implemented with the assistance of the staff at the United School Administrators (USA). The survey was distributed to all current building principals in Kansas utilizing SurveyMonkey, the online survey software and questionnaire tool. The support of USA was crucial to the development of this study.

Nine hundred and fifty principals were contacted electronically and given the opportunity to participate in this study. Two hundred and eighteen agreed to participate (23% return rate). Of the 218 who responded, 44 reported having non-renewed a total of 107 teachers (Table 1).

Each principal was asked to provide a limited amount of demographic information. These items included principal's name, school, and district name as well as school and district size. Responses to these items allowed the opportunity to examine trends in non-renewal that might be specific to district or school size (Appendix A).

Data collection

The electronic mailings to the principals included a letter of introduction, consent information, and the questionnaire. The questionnaires were sent to principals electronically during May of 2010.

Data analysis

Analysis of each variable (professional shortcoming that resulted in teacher dismissal) was conducted by applying an average percentage that served to establish a priority list of shortcomings (Alreck & Settle, 1995). The mean was selected because it is commonly accepted as the best measure of central

Table 1. Survey response results.

Years	Principals contacted	Principals responding	Principals reporting non-renewals	Total non-renewals reported
2008-2010	950	218	44	107

tendency, regularly used in quantitative research, and is more stable than the median or mode (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003; Hittleman & Simon, 2002). The resulting data provided the answer to first of the research questions by determining what principals believed caused these teachers to be non-renewed.

The data were analyzed through an examination of those shortcomings that were identified most frequently by principals. A ranking was developed based on the data to allow those most critical elements to be identified and addressed.

Of the 44 principals who identified being involved in a non-renewal, 24 identified specific examples in answering the comments section. Data provided from these responses was first unitized and then analyzed through the search for emergent categories, themes, and patterns (Marshall & Rossman, 1999).

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

In reviewing the survey data, several factors emerged as critical deficiencies leading to teacher non-renewal (Table 2). The deficiencies were listed in order of in priority and included: (a) creating an environment of respect and rapport, (b) managing student behavior, (c) managing classroom procedures, (d) establishing a culture for learning, (e) communicating with students, (f) engaging students in learning, (g) designing coherent instruction, (h) showing professionalism, (i) communicating with families, (j) demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness, (k) demonstrating knowledge of students, (l) growing and developing professionally, (m) setting instructional outcomes, (n) reflecting on teaching, (o) demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy, (p) participating in a professional community, (q) using assessment in instruction, (r) designing student assessments, (s) maintaining accurate records, (t) using questioning and discussion techniques, (u) demonstrating knowledge of resources, and (v) organizing physical space.

As these rankings were examined, a significant trend developed when Danielson's et al. (2009) four domains were considered. As shown in Table 3, four of the five most significant deficiencies came within the domain of classroom environment. Clearly, teachers who were non-renewed consistently experienced problems with establishing a classroom environment consistent with learning. The most significant factors were management of student behavior and creating an environment of respect and rapport.

Table 2. Ranking skill deficiencies that lead to teacher non-renewal.

Rank	Total	Characteristic
1	1.55	Creating an environment of respect and rapport
2	1.55	Managing student behavior
3	1.49	Managing classroom procedures
4	1.47	Establishing a culture for learning
5	1.43	Communicating with students
6	1.33	Engaging students in learning
7	1.20	Designing coherent instruction
8	1.19	Showing professionalism
9	1.14	Communicating with families
10	1.10	Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness
11	1.05	Demonstrating knowledge of students
12	0.95	Growing and developing professionally
13	0.93	Setting instructional outcomes
14	0.90	Reflecting on teaching
15	0.85	Demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy
16	0.81	Participating in a professional community
17	0.77	Using assessment in instruction
18	0.76	Designing student assessments
19	0.71	Maintaining accurate records
20	0.66	Using questioning and discussion techniques
21	0.58	Demonstrating knowledge of resources
22	0.46	Organizing physical space

BUILDING PRINCIPAL COMMENTS

The comments provided by building principals also contributed to painting an accurate picture relative to reasons for non-renewal (Appendix B). As the comments were evaluated and themes were developed, three major areas of concern became obvious. Administrators identified problems regarding teacher dispositions, classroom management and teacher preparation.

Teacher dispositions

Building principals often indicated that a central problem was a poor attitude from the teacher regarding all aspects of the teaching. Teachers who were non-renewed frequently did not react well to administrative initiatives aimed at assisting the teacher.

Table 3. Ranking of components divided into domains.

Domain	Component	Rank
Planning and preparation	Demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy	15
	Demonstrating knowledge of students	11
	Setting instructional outcomes	13
	Demonstrating knowledge of resources	21
	Designing coherent instruction	7
	Designing Student Assessments	18
Classroom environment	Creating an environment of respect and rapport	1
	Establishing a culture for learning	4
	Managing classroom procedures	3
	Managing student behavior	1
	Organizing physical space	22
Instruction	Communicating with students	5
	Using questioning and discussion techniques	20
	Engaging students in learning	6
	Using assessment in instruction	17
	Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness	10
Professional responsibilities	Reflecting on teaching	14
	Maintaining accurate records	19
	Communicating with families	9
	Participating in a professional community	16
	Growing and developing professionally	12
	Showing professionalism	8

Specific examples include:

Teacher was not willing to grow professionally, and take suggestions intended to further the teacher’s skills. Sarcasm was often used communicating with elementary students. Curriculum was not developmentally appropriate for the students being taught, nor was the teaching engaging students.

This individual did a wonderful job with the students in the classroom, but she taught what she wanted to teach, when she wanted to teach it. She was not a team player, and was not honest with administration.

Basically there was no growth. Several suggestions were made, modeling was done, but there was not any follow through on the part of the educator. For this person dealing with people in general was difficult. No skills with parents, disrespectful towards colleagues and students.

Classroom management

Building principals also voiced a concern regarding teacher inability to manage the daily problems that occur in a classroom. Frequently the problems identified centered on an inability to connect on any meaningful level with students. Some typical principal responses included:

Classroom control was the major factor. The inexperienced teacher did not follow through with discipline or expectations and lost her upper level classes.

This individual has been through two separate teaching assignments in our district and has been non-renewed twice. She was not able to handle secondary students effectively to create a quality learning environment. This caused problems with time on task and the students ran over her. She has the knowledge base, but can't control the kids.

Teacher could not develop a rapport with students. Lacked discipline and regard for rules. Was defensive with parents and other staff members.

Teacher preparation

Several principals voiced a concern about the quality of teacher preparation. The teachers they non-renewed seemed to them to have become licensed without the basic skills necessary for an effective teacher. This is indicated by comments such as:

Teacher was not well trained for the position. Teacher did not have the basic skills needed to create an environment conducive to learning. Instructional practices were weak. Classroom management was weak. Organization was weak.

I had two coaches in this classroom the second week of school and they took over instruction by the first of November. I don't know how she received her degree in education and passed the teachers test.

Has a lot of "smarts" on the curriculum (mathematics), but very little knowledge and ability on how to impart that knowledge to the students in an effective manner. He tended to always have his back to the students (i.e. taught to the board) and allowed one or two people per class period to drive the pace of instruction. In other words, he only had the attention of one or two students; the rest were either watching passively or off-task completely.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of this study made it clear that these teachers who were non-renewed struggled predominately in the area of establishing an effective classroom environment. Obviously,

these teachers had successfully completed the formal teacher preparation process and they had passed the requisite testing. Despite this preparation, they appeared ill-prepared to meet the expectations for effective classroom teachers. Those involved in the design and implementation of teacher preparation programs had cause, therefore, to examine what is currently in place for the training of future teachers regarding classroom environment. Certain questions should be considered in evaluating and re-designing a teacher preparation program and could be developed based on the following questions:

1. Does the program include specific coursework in classroom management?
2. Is the clinical experience sufficient in terms of length of time?
3. Does the clinical experience provide a realistic experience with the teacher candidate having an opportunity to implement the strategies they were taught?
4. Do the cooperating teachers involved in various clinical experiences model good classroom management practices?

COURSEWORK IN CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

Several studies served to validate the findings of this research regarding the significance of coursework in classroom management. One study found that practicing teachers felt that classroom management was the main weakness of their pre-service education (Houston & Williamson, 1993). A Texas study verified this finding by determining classroom management as the number one problem facing teachers (Brock & Grady, 1996).

Teacher preparation programs need to evaluate the quality of the classroom management instruction that they provide. An examination of the problem of classroom management published in *Education Week* found that teacher preparation institutions recognized the need for classroom management instruction and found that most provided some form of instruction. However, beginning teachers continue to indicate that they struggle in this area "which suggests...that candidates are still not being prepared adequately" (Honawar, 2007, p. 8). A Northwest Regional study (Burke, 2010) found that less than two-thirds of new teachers described themselves as well-prepared or very well-prepared for classroom management.

LENGTH OF CLINICAL EXPERIENCE

No research had been conducted regarding the proper amount of clinical experience necessary to prepare properly pre-service

teachers for their professional responsibilities. Each teacher preparation program should examine this issue by seeking input from all involved. Particular emphasis should be placed on program graduates so that they can reflect on their own preparation and thus inform the teacher preparation institution of recommended practices.

REALISTIC CLINICAL EXPERIENCE

The traditional student teaching experience provides a limited amount of realistic experience when it comes to classroom management issues because the cooperating teacher has already set the climate. The student teacher either continues with the already successful classroom climate established by the cooperating teacher or experiences the environment that exists. Student teachers seldom are in a position actually to create the classroom environment as they would in their own classroom.

MODELING CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

The selection of cooperating teachers often is influenced by issues other than who would be the best model for the pre-service teacher. As mentioned earlier, the nature of the clinical experience results in the student teacher inheriting the classroom environment of the cooperating teacher. That as the case, effort should be made to assure that the cooperating teacher is capable of modeling effective management techniques. The student teacher would benefit from the experience of observing proper educational practices even if they do not have the option of implementing their own strategies.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of this study, a number of teachers struggle with common management of the classroom environment. The problem is frequently serious enough that the decision is made to non-renew the teacher. Higher education institutions that prepare teachers must conduct a thorough self-examination to verify that all possible steps are taken to ensure that candidates have the skills and dispositions necessary to be successful. That review should include a critical look at the quality of coursework in classroom management, the length and realistic nature of the clinical experience, and selecting cooperating teachers who are capable of modeling quality classroom management strategies. Critical self-assessment is always a difficult process for any institution but it is an absolute necessity when we are endeavoring to prepare effective teachers for the challenges they will face in an ever-changing career field.

REFERENCES

- Allington, R., & Cunningham, P. (2002). *Schools that work: Where all children read and write*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Alliance for Excellent Education. (2005). *Teacher attrition: A costly loss to the nation and to the states*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Alreck, P. L., & Settle, R. B. (1995). *The survey research handbook* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Babbie, E. (2001). *The practice of social research* (9th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Boyer, E. (1995). *The basic school: A community for learning* (1st ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Brock, B.L. & Grady, M.L. (August 1996). Beginning Teacher Induction Programs. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of Professors in Educational Administration (50th, Corpus Christi, TX, August 6-10, 1996).
- Burke, A. (2010). *How well prepared and supported are new teachers? Results for the Northwest Region from the 2003/04 schools and staffing survey*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance.
- Danielson, C., Axtell, D, Bevan, P., Cleland, B., McKay, C., Phillips, E., & Wright, K. (2009). *Implementing the framework for teaching in enhancing professional practice: An ASCD action tool*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- DuFour, R., & Eaker, R. (1998). *Professional learning communities at work*. Bloomington, IN: National Educational Service.
- Gall, M. G., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2003). *Educational research: An introduction* (7th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Gillham, B. (2000). *Developing a questionnaire*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Hittleman, D. R., & Simon, A. J. (2002). *Interpreting educational research* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Honawar, V. (2007, December 12). Ed. schools beef up classroom-management training. *Education Week*, p. 8.
- Houston, W.R. & Williamson, J.L. (1993). Perceptions of Their Preparation by 42 Texas Elementary School Teachers Compared with Their Responses as Student Teachers. *Teacher Education and Practice*, v8 n2 p27-42 Fall-Win 1992-93.
- Ingersoll, R. (2002, August 15). High turnover plagues schools. *USA Today*, p. 13A.
- Jensen, E. (2009). *Teaching with poverty in mind*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Kauchak, D., & Eggen, P. (2005). *Introduction to teaching: Becoming a professional*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.

Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. B. (1999). *Designing qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Thompson, G. L. (2007). *Up where we belong: Helping African American and Latino students rise in school and life*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Appendix A: Questionnaire

General Information

1. Principal’s name:
2. School:
3. District and Building Size (place an “X” by the appropriate response):
 - _____ Less than 300 FTE
 - _____ 301 to 500 FTE
 - _____ 501 to 800 FTE
 - _____ 801 to 1200 FTE
 - _____ More than 1201 FTE
4. School Size (place an “X” by the appropriate response):
 - _____ Less than 100
 - _____ 101 to 300
 - _____ 301 to 500
 - _____ 501 to 750
 - _____ 751 to 1000
 - _____ Greater than 1000

The following questionnaire (Table 4) is designed to determine the professional shortcomings that resulted in teacher dismissal. Please examine each of the twenty-two aspects of quality teaching to determine which ones contributed to the dismissal. In the comments section, please describe specifically the problems identified as “a major factor in dismissal.”

Appendix B: Principals’ responses to open-ended questions

Principal A

Inability to implement a program or curriculum and refusal to accept coaching or feedback designed to improve said implementation. Also, inappropriate conversations with students and failure to maintain appropriate teacher-student boundaries.

Principal B

Teacher used sarcasm and a my way or the highway approach to discipline of young children. Did not deal effectively with parents who voiced concerns.

Principal C

Teacher was not making adequate progress in improving instruction.

Table 4. Questionnaire given to principals.

Aspects of quality teaching	A major factor in dismissal	A contributing factor in dismissal	Not a factor in dismissal
1. Demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy			
2. Demonstrating knowledge of students			
3. Setting instructional outcomes			
4. Demonstrating knowledge of resources			
5. Designing coherent instruction			
6. Designing student assessments			
7. Creating an environment of respect and rapport			
8. Establishing a culture for learning			
9. Managing classroom procedures			
10. Managing student behavior			
11. Organizing physical space			
12. Communicating with students			
13. Using questioning and discussion techniques			
14. Engaging students in learning			
15. Using assessment in instruction			
16. Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness			
17. Reflecting on teaching			
18. Maintaining accurate records			
19. Communicating with families			
20. Participating in a professional community			
21. Growing and developing professionally			
22. Showing professionalism			

Principal D

1. This particular teacher did such a poor job of developing relationships with students, and sowing such a large amount of student distrust that any instructional strength was irrelevant. The culture of the classroom was such that learning did not occur at a very high rate.
2. This teacher engaged in a series of behaviors that were not professional, despite documentation in their file directing them to refrain from such behavior. This behavior created too much of a continued safety factor for students, and the lack of reflection or planning to avoid these behaviors indicated that they would not stop.
3. This teacher had great rapport with students but was instructionally very poor, especially in terms of setting objectives for learning and planning for ways to engage students in their own learning. The relationship building should have allowed this teacher to get kids to do anything, but there

was no serious regard for the profession that indicated they wanted to get better.

Principal E

1. Teacher was not well trained for the position. Teacher did not have the basic skills needed to create an environment conducive to learning. Instructional practices were weak. Classroom management was weak. Organization was weak.

2. Teacher was not ready for the classroom. Teacher had been hired by a previous administrator. Several staff members tried to help this teacher, but the teacher refused to implement the suggestions.

Principal F

No comments

Principal G

1. As long as someone else planned it they could present it She would have been a very average teacher in 5 years

2. I had two coaches in this classroom the second week of school and they took over instruction by the first of November. I don't know how she received her degree in education and passed the teachers test.

Principal H

1. Teacher could not develop a rapport with students. Lacked discipline and regard for rules. Was defensive with parents and other staff members.

2. Had a poor attendance record. No confidence in herself and lacked motivation.

Principals I and J

No comments

Principal K

Lack of focus, too lax in her approach.

Principal L

No comments

Principal M

1. This instructor did not have the respect of the students and could not control student behavior. Part of this is the teacher was not confident in his own teaching ability.

2. This teacher was very immature even after having taught in another district and two years in mine. No control over student behavior and no personal growth as a professional.

3. This person did not work well with the administration and the other teachers in the building. Was not a person who could find things on their own. Not very good at working with children.

Principal N

Teacher was not willing to grow professionally, and take suggestions intended to further the teacher's skills. Sarcasm

was often used communicating with elementary students. Curriculum was not developmentally appropriate for the students being taught, nor was the teaching engaging students.

Principal O

Unfortunately, this non-renewal is totally based on this teacher's non-ability to be a team player. Teacher liked to hide behind policy when possible, did not treat children or colleagues with respect as they should, and had a problem with authority figures. All this resulted in doubt as to the best interest of our students which resulted in non-renewal.

Principals P, Q and R

No comments

Principal S

1. Teacher's means of managing students was unacceptable. Teacher demonstrated negative attitudes towards students repeatedly. Interactions were frequently inappropriate with students

2. Teacher struggled with classroom management. Classroom was not conducive to learning.

Principal T

No comments

Principal U

1. This instructor relied heavily on his grade level peers, great repose with kids but no classroom management which led to poor classroom instruction

2. This individual did a wonderful job with the students in the classroom, but she taught what she wanted to teach, when she wanted to teach it. She was not a team player, and was not honest with administration.

Principal V

Has a lot of 'smarts' on the curriculum (mathematics), but very little knowledge and ability on how to impart that knowledge to the students in an effective manner. He tended to always have his 'back to the students (i.e., taught to the board)' and allowed one or two people per class period to 'drive the pace of instruction.' In other words, he only had the attention of one or two students; the rest were either watching passively or off-task completely.

Principal W

1. Lack of fit in the classroom, didn't get along well with students or parents, preparation was lacking in the classroom.

2. Typically if there was a problem in 5th or 6th grade, it involved this person's classroom - discipline-wise, potential bullying, didn't have things graded. It was a mess.

Principal X

1. Basically there was no growth. Several suggestions were made, modeling was done, but there was not any follow through on the part of the educator. For this person dealing with people in general was difficult. No skills with parents, disrespectful towards colleagues and students.

2. This person had a total lack of professionalism. Wanted to do their own thing instead of following the state and district guidelines.

3. This educator was a very nice person; however, she was way too timid to be teaching students with special needs. She lacked the knowledge of how to interact with our students, write and carry out appropriate IEP goals, run an IEP meeting, and was just very unsure of herself.

Principals Y, Z, AA, BB, CC and DD

No comments

Principal EE

Content knowledge was strong, however knowledge of students and how they learn best was lacking. Was not at “team player” on the team assigned.

Principal FF

No comments

Principal GG

1. Classroom control was the major factor. The inexperienced teacher did not follow through with discipline or expectations and lost her upper level classes.

2. Without an established set of expectations, there was little opportunity to engage students in learning.

Principal HH

There is only one teacher I have listed as a non-renewal member of my staff. This teacher was tenured. This teacher resigned. The KNEA was helpful in this situation.

Principal II

No comments

Principal JJ

Not willing to do the work that was needed.

Principal KK

No comments

Principal LL

Teacher had organizational, communicative, and instructional problems. A plan was set up and the teacher given input.

Principal MM

Non-renewed teacher was unable to monitor and change her attitude towards students, specifically students who were not “model” students. There was no discipline with dignity. Many times she humiliated students to the point where they would cry.

Principal NN

1. This individual was making inappropriate comments to students during the school setting. He was placed on a plan of improvement, but failed to abide by that plan. He seemed to want to be the students’ friend as opposed to maintaining a student-teacher professional relationship. He lost the respect of students and staff as a result.

2. This individual has been through two separate teaching assignments in our district and has been non-renewed twice. She was not able to handle secondary students effectively to create a quality learning environment. This caused problems with time on task and the students ran over her. She has the knowledge base, but can’t control the kids.

3. This teacher has many tools to work with in her toolbox, but she has difficulty relating to the students. She taught an elective, and frankly there were a very limited number of students wishing to enroll. No students equals no need for a teacher. We want to keep the program, so we opted to non-renew so we could find a teacher that can make connections with the students.

Principals OO, PP, and SS

No comments

Principal TT

1. This teacher did not demonstrate any understanding of instructional purpose or expectations. She believed her purpose was custodial, in nature.

2. This teacher had very little to draw from, he leaned heavily on his teammates.

3. This teacher simply was not emotionally mature enough for a teaching position. His unprofessional behavior interfered with his ability to perform his duties effectively.