

1990

Policy into Practice: A Study of Legislative Impact on Administrative Practice in Washington Schools

James Carter Leffler
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Leffler, James Carter, "Policy into Practice: A Study of Legislative Impact on Administrative Practice in Washington Schools" (1990). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 1187.
<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.1186>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

POLICY INTO PRACTICE: A STUDY
OF LEGISLATIVE IMPACT ON ADMINISTRATIVE
PRACTICE IN WASHINGTON SCHOOLS

by

JAMES CARTER LEFFLER

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
in
EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Portland State University

1990

AN ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION OF James Carter Leffler for
the Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership:
Administration and Supervision presented October 29, 1990.

Title: Policy Into Practice: A Study of Legislative Impact
on Administrative Practice in Washington Schools.

APPROVED BY THE MEMBERS OF THE DISSERTATION COMMITTEE:

[REDACTED]

John D. Lind, Chair

[REDACTED]

Joel Arick

[REDACTED]

Steve Nelson

[REDACTED]

Ken Peterson

[REDACTED]

Sandra Anderson

This research project was designed to obtain data on
factors that influence whether state level Legislative
policies affect the changes in practice at which they are
directed. Specifically, the study examined a teacher

evaluation short form option created in 1985, the original intent of the policy, and the resultant changes in practice. It examined the situations in which the option was utilized, and whether current practice reflected research on effective practices.

Phone interviews were conducted to identify legislative intent and to develop study questions and forced choice items. Systematic sampling techniques were used to distribute surveys to principals in every sixth public school building in the state. The survey collected data on seven areas: respondent and school demographics, use of the option, effects of the option, changes in practice with the policy, perceptions of effective evaluation, and satisfaction with summative and formative evaluation.

While 79.5% of teachers were eligible for evaluation with the short form, 19.6% were evaluated with it. Fifty-one percent of the administrators chose the option to save time. Forty-six percent did not know what effect the policy had been, while 40% perceived the policy to have had little or no effect. Since 1985 half of the principals had changed practice, 66% reported spending more time on teacher evaluation, and 60% report their current practices to be more stringent. Ten and a half percent report having changed practice as a result of the state policy.

There was a correlation between staff size and option


use. While the option did save time for summative evaluation, many reported spending additional time in formative evaluation. Use of the option was restricted by district level policy and by collective bargaining agreement. The decision not to use the option with eligible teachers was often based on utilization of informal data collection outside the classroom setting.


Use of the short evaluation option does save administrator time, is effective for summative evaluation but is not effective for formative evaluation. Formative evaluation options need to be increased. Current policy only addresses summative evaluation directly. Current summative evaluation only provides for ratings of satisfactory and unsatisfactory.

The study does indeed demonstrate that administrative practice does change to some degree as a result of policy, but does not necessarily result in the legislative intent of that policy.

TO THE OFFICE OF GRADUATE STUDIES:

The members of the Committee approve the dissertation
of James Carter Leffler presented October 29, 1990.


John Lind, Chairman


Joel Arick


Steve Nelson


Ken Peterson


Sandra Anderson

APPROVED:


Robert B. Everhart, Dean, School of Education


C. William Savery, Interim Vice Provost for
Graduate Studies and Research

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to respectfully thank my dissertation committee. Dr. Joel Arick from Portland State University provided support and assistance, especially in the area of statistical analysis. Dr. Steve Nelson from the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory contributed support, acted as a willing listener, and was a valuable resource. Dr. Ken Peterson from Portland State University contributed his valued feedback and reaction. Dr. Sandra Anderson, representing the Graduate Office, was generous in contributing feedback and suggestions from her point of view.

I would also like to especially thank Dr. John Lind, my committee chairperson, for his continued encouragement, support, and assistance.

Finally, I gratefully acknowledge the love, support, and encouragement of my wife, Jan Leffler. Without her help I could not have completed this personal goal.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTSiii
LIST OF TABLESviii
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose	2
Statement of the Problem	3
Significance of the Problem	3
Significance of the Study	4
The Policy to be Examined	
Objectives of the Study	6
Specific Research Questions Examined	
Definition of Terms	8
Implications of the Study12
For the Legislature	
For Practicing Administrators	
In General	
Organization of the Study14
II REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	16
School Reform at the State Level16
Policy VS Practice18
Why States Have Mandated Change18
How Many States Have Made Changes?19

What Are the Goals of Teacher Evaluation?20
Summative Evaluation, the Accountability Goal20
Formative Evaluation, the Staff Development Goal21
Problems With a Single Evaluation Model21
Washington State Regulations on Teacher Evaluation22
Components of Effective Evaluation Systems23
Differentiated Evaluation25
Exemplary Teacher Evaluation Systems26
Due Process Considerations in Evaluation26
Characteristics of Effective Formative Evaluation27
Formative Evaluation - Appropriate Practices27
The Principal as Evaluator28
Evaluation as a High Priority28
Effective Practices in Teacher Evaluation29
Summary of the Literature30
III METHODOLOGY32
Phase I: Phone Interviews - Legislative Intent32
Subjects Procedures Instruments	
Phase II: Phone Interviews With Administrators35
Subjects Procedures Instruments	

Phase III: Survey of Administrators36
Subjects	
Procedures	
Instruments	
Hypotheses38
Primary Hypothesis	
Secondary Hypotheses	
Data Analysis.41
Limitations44
IV DISCUSSION OF RESULTS.46
Phase I Phone Interviews -	
Legislative Intent46
Phase II Phone Interviews -	
Practicing Administrators.48
Phase III Mailed Survey.48
Descriptive Analysis of Results49
Legislative Intent	
Intent as Perceived by Practitioner	
Groups	
Change in Practice Related to	
Changes in Statute	
Do Changes Relate to Research?	
Respondent Demographics	
School Demographics	
Use of the Short Form Option	
Does Short Form Provide More	
Time For Weak Teachers?	
When Is the Short Form Option Chosen?	
When the Short Form Option Isn't Chosen?	
Effects of Using the Short Form Option	
Changes in Practice	
Principal Perceptions of Important	
Components of Evaluation	
How Well Do Current Systems Provide For	
Summative and Formative Teacher	
Evaluation	
Statistical Analysis of Results	70

Primary Hypothesis
Secondary Hypothesis

Objectives of the Study	84
What Was the Original Intent of the Change?	
Did Change in Fact Take Place as a Result of the Legislative Change, and if so, What Kinds of Change?	
How Well Do the Actual Changes Relate to the Intended Changes?	
In What Situations is the Short Form Option Selected?	
Have Teacher Evaluation Practices Changed Since the Spring of 1985, and if so, How?	
Research Questions Summary.	91
V SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	97
Summary	97
Conclusions	100
Recommendations	102
Recommendations For Educational Practice	
Recommendations For Further Study	
Closing Remarks	105
REFERENCES	108
APPENDICES	
A PHONE INTERVIEWS TO DETERMINE LEGISLATIVE INTENT	112
B PHONE INTERVIEWS WITH PRACTICING ADMINISTRATORS	116
C MAILED SURVEY OF PRACTICING ADMINISTRATORS . . .	121
D COMMENTS FROM MAILED SURVEY	134

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I	Respondent Demographic and Experience Data . . .	54
II	Evaluation of Staff	56
III	Use of Short Form Option	56
IV	Which Short Form Option Is Used	57
V	Does the Short Form Option Provide More Time To Work With Weak Teachers	58
VI	Rank Order List of Significant Factors When Choosing to Use the Short Form Option	60
VII	Rank Order List of Significant Factors When Choosing Not to Use the Short Form Option	62
VIII	Rank Order List of Why Short Form Option Is Not Used	63
IX	Changes in Teacher Evaluation Practices . . .	66
X	Important Components of Effective Teacher Evaluation, As Perceived by Respondents . .	68
XI	How Well Do Current Systems Provide for Formative and Summative Evaluation With Strong and Weak Teachers	69
XII	Relation of Building Demographics and Use of the Short Form Option Primary Hypothesis. . . .	71
XIII	Use of Short Form Option and Administrator Demographics	74

XIV	Pearson Correlations - Use of Option and	
	Choice Factors	77
XV	Use of Short Form Option and Satisfaction	
	With Current Evaluation Systems	80

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Increased effectiveness of schools is a desire of those within the school system and those outside of the school system. Ways in which to increase effectiveness are being proposed on an almost daily basis, by practitioners, by researchers, by the general public, and by the press. These proposed ways to increase effectiveness have often been preceded or accompanied by an increasing amount of criticism directed at the schools in America.

Partially as a result of this criticism, both policymakers and practitioners have felt pressure to make changes directed at increasing the effectiveness of schools. While practitioners and researchers have studiously dissected and examined effective schooling practices to find promising practices, policymakers have instituted a large number of regulations and policies aimed at increasing accountability and effectiveness.

During each session of the Legislature, new laws, rules, and regulations are enacted. The intent is that by enacting new statutes, or policy, practice will be changed, and presumably changed for the better. As new statutes are being developed, the Legislature gathers in-put from those

individuals and groups to be directly affected by the new policy. Testimony is collected from practitioners, those who will be expected to implement the policy.

While the Legislature provides directives to practitioners through their policy making process, the practitioners provide information and direction through the process of providing testimony during policy development.

It appears that in reality, policy and intent may be different from practice. It also appears that this may be the case even when extensive in-put is collected from practitioners as policy is being developed.

This study examined one change in statute (policy), related to teacher evaluation standards and criteria, and the actual changes in administrative practice which took place.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this study was to examine and compare policy, policy intent, and actual practices related to implementing policy. In doing so, the study centered on one specific policy related to teacher evaluation and supervision. It focused on the policy which provided for a short form option for teacher evaluation, and school administrator use of this option. The study serves as a vehicle for taking a pulse of practitioners (school administrators) who are charged with implementation of

policy enacted by policymakers (Legislators). Did practices reflect the changes intended by the policymakers? Did practices reflect the changes that practitioners lobbied for during policy development? Do current practices in teacher evaluation relate to current research on effective practices? Do practitioners agree with the policy in defining effective evaluation?

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Can a state legislature effect change in educational administrative practices through statutory regulation? Each year, new policies, regulations, and administrative rulings are put into place. The express purpose for the generation of these policies is that of affecting changes in current practice.

It is difficult to determine how effective changes in policy are in generating changes in practice. It is also difficult to determine if such changes are those that were intended when policy was created or changed.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROBLEM

Few would find fault with efforts to increase school effectiveness, or portions of the school system which contribute to effectiveness. Few would also object to changing practices to improve methods of teacher evaluation and supervision. But, can such changes in practice be

initiated by policymaking at the legislative level?

Presently, legislators can only speculate that changes in statute (policy), can cause the desired changes in practice. If practices in evaluation can be identified, and if these practices can be examined in the context of the changes at which the original policy was directed, effectiveness of attempting to implement changes in practice through policy can be examined.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The information gathered from this project is important to policymakers and practitioners. Both groups are interested in effective teacher evaluation and supervision. By answering the research questions put forth in this study, the goal of increased evaluation effectiveness can be examined from several different perspectives.

First, by focusing on the original intent of the policy, it is possible to clarify what the policy intended to change. The link between the intents, as seen from several different perspectives, will clarify original interpretations. Did each of the groups have a different interpretation of the practices at which the policy was directed, or did each of the groups look at the intent from a different perspective? If the changes in practice have not been those which the Legislature originally intended, is the discrepancy a result of what each group saw the intent

to be or a result of other factors?

Second, by examining the changes that have taken place since the enactment of the policy, it is possible to clarify the ways in which practice has evolved.

Third, by comparing the original intent(s) of the policy and the actual changes that have taken place, it is possible to compare policy intent to practice.

Fourth, by concurrently examining changes in practice with those practices which research has shown to be effective, it is possible to draw a clearer picture of where current practice now stands.

The Policy to be Examined

On April 27, 1985 second Substitute House Bill No. 849 received approval from the Washington State House of Representatives with a vote of 97 to 0. With this approval, the 49th legislature provided for changes in statute and subsequent regulation related to teacher evaluation.

One of the changes allowed for a shortened evaluation process option for teachers with four years of satisfactory evaluations under the former longer process. The intent of this section was to change the administrative practices of principals in the area of teacher evaluation.

This study examined the intent of this legislation from the perspective of several groups which were significant in the development of the legislation (policy). It also examined whether changes in practice did occur, and whether

such changes were related to the original intent. Finally, this study compared the changes in practice to the areas that research has shown to be effective in teacher evaluation.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The study examined five key areas related to policy and administrative practice in teacher evaluation:

- I. What was the original intent of the change?
- II. Did change in fact take place as a result of the legislative change, and if so, what kinds of change?
- III. How well do the actual changes relate to the intended changes?
- IV. In what situations is the short form option selected?
 - a. In what situations and with which teachers is the short form option chosen?
 - b. In what situations and with which teachers is the short form option not chosen?
 - c. When the short form option is chosen, which of the two options is selected?
- V. Have teacher evaluation practices changed since the spring of 1985, and if so, how?

Specific Research Questions Examined

Utilizing the literature search and the results of Phase I interviews, the five keys areas identified on page six were expanded in developing the following fourteen specific research questions to be examined in the study.

1. What was the intent of the Legislature in establishing the short form evaluation option? What administrative practices did they in fact intend to change?
2. What was the intent of the Legislature, as perceived by the Washington Education Association? as perceived by the Washington Association of School Principals?
3. What was the intent of the Legislature, as perceived by the Washington Association of School Administrators? as perceived by the Washington School Directors Association?
4. Did the change in statute in fact change practice?
5. If practice did change as a result of the statutory change, how well do such changes match intended changes?
6. If statutory change did in fact change practice, did the changes take place in variables which are in fact significant, as shown by research on what is effective in formative teacher evaluation?
7. What triggers an administrator to select the short form or the long form of evaluation for use with an individual teacher? (age, years in building,

experience with the teacher, educational level, sex, discipline referrals to the office, parent comments/complaints, desire to reduce the time required for evaluation)

8. Do administrators perceive use of the short form as giving them more time to help weaker teachers?
9. If the short form is used to provide additional time to work with weaker teachers, are administrators in fact spending more time in that role?
10. How effective do administrators perceive current methods for evaluating strong and weak teachers to be?
11. Is it possible to accurately judge a previously successful teacher's competence without any direct classroom observation?
12. If the implied intent of the change was that it would make the system more rigorous, has it in fact increased the system's rigor, and how?
13. Do administrators perceive that either the short or long form of evaluation provides for improvement of instruction (formative evaluation)?
14. Are administrators satisfied with the results of either form of evaluation?

DEFINITION OF TERMS

For purposes of this study, the following definitions will be used.

Summative Evaluation:

Summative evaluation includes those components of the teacher evaluation system which deal with annual evaluation in determining if a teacher meets the minimum acceptable standards of performance. Summative evaluation provides for administrative accountability and support of personnel management decisions such as hiring, firing, promotion, tenure, and recently in some areas, salary or merit. Summative evaluation processes also include specific dimensions to assure the due process right of teachers, specifically those teachers found not to meet minimum standards.

Formative Evaluation:

Formative evaluation includes those components of the teacher evaluation system which deal with providing observation and feedback directed at improving or strengthening the instructional skills of teachers which have met the minimum acceptable standards of performance. Formative evaluation has also been referred to as administrative supervision of instruction. Components of formative evaluation speak to the improvement and development of individual teachers, as well as collective staff development in an entire district.

Standard Evaluation:

Standard evaluation is that set of practices defined by The Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 28A.67.065 subsection (1). This is defined to include,

"During each school year all classroom teachers and certificated support personnel, hereinafter referred to as "employees" in this section, shall be observed for the purposes of evaluation at least twice in the performance of their assigned duties. Total observation time for each employee for each school year shall be not less than sixty minutes. Following each observation or series of observations, the principal or other evaluator shall promptly document the results of the evaluation in writing, and shall provide the employee with a copy thereof within three days after such report is prepared. New employees shall be observed at least once for a total observation time of thirty minutes during the first ninety calendar days of their employment period."

Short Form Evaluation Option:

The short form evaluation option is defined as those practices defined by The Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 28A.67.065 subsection (5). This option is defined as:

"After an employee has four years of satisfactory evaluations under subsection (1) of this section, a school district may use a short form of evaluation. The short form of evaluation shall include either a thirty minute observation during the school year with a written summary or a final annual written evaluation based on the criteria in subsection (1) [listed below] and based on at least two observation periods during the school year totaling at least sixty minutes without a written summary of such observations being prepared. However, the evaluation process set forth in subsection (1) [the standard evaluation process] of this section shall be followed at least once every three years and an employee or evaluator may request that the evaluation process set forth in subsection (1)

[the standard evaluation process] of this section be conducted in any given school year. The short form evaluation process may not be used as a basis for determining that an employee's work is unsatisfactory...nor as probable cause for nonrenewal..."

Teacher Evaluation Criteria Categories:

Teacher evaluation criteria categories are defined by The Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 28A.67.065 subsection (1), and apply to both the standard evaluation and the short form evaluation option.

"For classroom teachers, the criteria shall be developed in the following categories: Instructional skill; classroom management, professional preparation and scholarship; effort toward improvement when needed; the handling of student discipline and attendant problems; and interest in teaching pupils and knowledge of subject matter."

Certificated Staff:

Certificated staff are those school employees whose job requires state certification. This includes principals, assistant or associate principals, ESA (Educational Staff Associate), and teachers. For purposes of this study, emphasis has been on those certificated staff normally included in the education association's collective bargaining agreement, and falling under the jurisdiction of RCW 28A.67.065.

RCW 28A.67.065:

RCW 28A.67.065 is The Revised Code of Washington which defines minimum criteria for the evaluation of certificated

employees, including administrators -- procedure -- scope -- penalty.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

For the Legislature

This study provides specific feedback to the Legislature about the relation of policy and practice, related to teacher evaluation statutes. If the Legislature was in fact trying to convey a message to practitioners, this study provides a reflection of what message was received and whether that message has been ignored by practicing administrators.

The study also affords a picture of changes which have taken place in one aspect of teacher evaluation, if any, since the initiation of the new statute. This study also provides an image of whether the short form option, requested by principals, was actually being used, in what situations, and for what reasons. The Legislature will also receive a look at the current statutory criteria and provide a point for deciding whether current statute still meets the needs it was directed toward, or if it should it be changed.

This study also furnishes information as to those factors which have been significant, from the principal's point of view, in promoting or retarding changes in practice. This information should be useful when planning for future desired changes. By examining factors which have

been significant in the past, future planning can better take these into account.

For Practicing Administrators

This study provides, for practicing school administrators, a reply about the message their testimony sent to the legislature, and about the accuracy of their message. The study also aids administrators in examining and comparing what they told the Legislature they wanted, and what they implemented in practice. They told the Legislature they needed a shorter, less time consuming option for evaluation of successful teachers. The Legislature provided that option, but did the administrators in fact utilize that option? If they are in fact using that option, when do they use it, and how often? The study provides an evaluation of the short form option by examining those cases in which it is not being used.

This study also asks practicing administrators what they see as effective teacher evaluation. It examines whether administrators use different methods of evaluation when working with strong and weak teachers.

The short form option was a response to administrators call for more time to spend with weak teachers. Are they in fact using the time saved by utilizing the short form option with successful teachers to help weaker teachers?

In General

This study provides descriptive information about teacher evaluation in the state of Washington, and about those administrators currently found in schools in the state. The study also contributes to the information available about current practices in the area of teacher evaluation, what practices are considered to be effective in the area of teacher evaluation, and current satisfaction level with formative and summative evaluation for strong and weak teachers.

This study also provides observation, from school principals' point of view, of satisfaction with current evaluation systems when dealing with strong and weak teachers. The study also indicates factors that have precipitated or hindered change in principals' practices in evaluation of teachers.

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

This manuscript is organized into five chapters. Chapter One includes a discussion of the purpose and significance of the study, and questions to be studied. Chapter Two provides a review of research related to the topic of the study. Chapter Three discusses methodological processes and procedures utilized in answering the research questions. Chapter Four provides a presentation and analysis of the results of the study. It also provides an

interpretation of the findings, implications, and applications. The final chapter, Chapter Five, provides the author's conclusions, summary, and recommendations.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

SCHOOL REFORM AT THE STATE LEVEL

During the last two decades, state governments have significantly increased their participation in educational policy making. Doyle and Hartle (1985) found that beginning in the 1970's, education funding in 45 of the 50 states increased. They found that beginning in the mid-1970's, and continuing to today, "states have launched a dizzying number of efforts to improve the schools....in large measure...because of the growing research evidence that school quality is a variable that can be influenced by policy" (page 20).

States have created new policies directed at increasing overall school improvement, and included in those new policies are changes which are directed at teacher evaluation and supervision. Townsend (1987) examined supervision and evaluation policies in Alberta, Canada between 1983 and 1986. Among his conclusions, he found school systems to be adept at developing written policy but much less successful at putting that policy into effective operation.

But, do changes in policy result in changes in practice. Duncan (1986) looked at teacher evaluation practices in Alberta, Canada. In examining practices of principals, he found that while they might place a high priority on teacher evaluation, they often had inadequate time. Less than half strictly followed Board policy in the area of supervision and evaluation. He also found that only 4.5 percent met the minimum criteria to assure due process, and only 1.3 percent met the defined instructional improvement criteria. He found no relationship between the completeness of the evaluation and the presence of a written, formal teacher evaluation policy or the level of adherence to such policy. It is interesting to note that following these findings, Duncan recommended that government legislation be instituted to ensure fair and consistent teacher evaluation.

Yudof (1984) felt that "governance decisions made at the higher echelons are important only insofar as they create favorable conditions for, or impede, the quest for educational excellence in classrooms and schools" (page 456). Doyle and Hartle (1985) agree when they state that "leadership by state officials... offers great promise," but feel that the promise is limited in happening because the "real leadership must take place in the classrooms" (page 22).

The Massachusetts State Department of Education in 1981 noted strong opposition to any state mandate for personnel evaluation.

POLICY VS PRACTICE

One might examine the discrepancies between policy and practice by examining "contexts" of meaning and interpretation between those who make the policies and those who put the policies into practice.

"...the public schools frequently interpret legal mandates and rules in ways that surprise legislators or judges, even when the latter two groups do not accuse educators of bad faith. The surprising interpretations may stem from the fact that legal mandates and rules are given meaning in the particular community inhabited by policy makers and lawyers. Educators are not a part of the legal and policy community; thus they may instead interpret mandates and rules in the social context of educational institutions and their own professional norms. Researchers might examine those different contexts to establish meaning, in the hope of gaining insights into why so many innovations appear to have serendipitous effects" (Yudolf, 1984, page 459).

WHY STATES HAVE MANDATED CHANGE

Wise (1988) proposed that the decade of the 1970's addressed educational accountability by mandating scientific management principles. He also proposed that the decade of the 1980's was concerned with teaching methods and teacher performance which he feels led a number of states to mandate uniform approaches to teacher evaluation. This is what Washington was doing in the spring of 1985 when changes in

policy were made in the areas of teacher supervision and evaluation. This desire for uniformity was at the heart of the changes examined in this study.

HOW MANY STATES HAVE MADE CHANGES?

Duke and Stiggins (1986) and Carey (1981) found that 46 states have enacted statute or administrative regulation which mandates and defines teacher evaluation. Washington was one of those 46 states. Brandt (1987) saw "a tremendous amount of similarity in the criteria that districts and states are coming up with" (page 20). He attributed this partially to the fact that states and districts shared criteria, and partially to the "limited number of criteria you can generate from the research we now have on effective teaching" (page 20). Conley (1986) found that categories of teacher evaluation criteria appeared to remain constant across time in the state of Colorado. He also felt that a trend existed, which showed districts incorporating more research into their development of criteria. He concluded that change took place more readily in areas which did not require additional resource investment, including time.

Wise (1988) felt that this centralized regulation was directed at behaviors that had purportedly been found to produce student achievement. Wise also felt that this gave local administrators no discretion. Many of the mandate's

processes have included specific administrator training. In other words, he saw the mandates being directed not only toward making teaching teacher-proof, but also making evaluation administrator-proof.

WHAT ARE THE GOALS OF TEACHER EVALUATION?

In looking at research, it becomes clear that teacher evaluation is directed at two goals (Stiggins 1986), summative and formative. Summative evaluation is focused on ensuring a minimally competent staff while formative evaluation is focused on further developing the skills of staff (staff development).

SUMMATIVE EVALUATION, THE ACCOUNTABILITY GOAL

One purpose of evaluation is directed at accountability, also described as summative teacher evaluation by Millman (1981). It is intended to support personnel management decisions such as hiring, firing, promotion, tenure, and in some cases, salary or merit. It is essentially concerned with protecting the public from poor teachers. Along with protecting the public, law generally includes specific dimensions in this area to assure the due process right of teachers, specifically those teachers found to not meet minimum standards.

FORMATIVE EVALUATION, THE STAFF DEVELOPMENT GOAL

A second, and less universal, purpose of evaluation is directed at improving the instructional skills of teachers. Millman (1981) also refers to this as formative evaluation or supervision. Millman describes the need for evaluations to address both teachers' strengths and weaknesses, so that remedial training can be planned. Duke and Stiggins (1986) found that of the 46 states with regulations or law, 36 included teacher improvement as a purpose of such evaluation. This goal is directed at improvement and development of teachers, both individually and collectively.

PROBLEMS WITH A SINGLE EVALUATION MODEL

Brandt (1987) felt that it was difficult to "develop and maintain a goal-setting model when you have to comply with mandated systems that require everybody to be treated as though they're on notice all the time" (page 23). Brandt is concerned that such state defined programs -- "whether they require use of a single system or they force local districts to conform to certain kinds of requirements in order to get approved -- take away the flexibility of local districts to build systems that are more conducive to improving instruction" (page 23). To some degree, this holds true for individual administrators within a district as well as districts within a state.

WASHINGTON STATE REGULATIONS ON TEACHER EVALUATION

The Revised Code of Washington (RCW 28A.67.065) spoke directly to the first goal of accountability and due process rights. The short form evaluation spoke indirectly to the second goal, supervision for improvement of instruction. When it has been assured that a teacher meets the minimum requirements, the short option allows administrators to move quickly from summative evaluation to formative evaluation. "After an employee has four years of satisfactory evaluations under subsection (1)," the long form of evaluation, "a school district may use a short form of evaluation." This short form "may not be used as a basis for determining when an employee's work is unsatisfactory... nor as probable cause for ...non-renewal" (page 2).

Torrens (1988) defined ideal teacher evaluation conditions and compared those to current practices in Washington State, as recommended by "The Common School Manual 1987." In examining the Legislative policies, she found that the legislature "required information to be drawn from available research in the following categories: (1) purposes of evaluation, (2) frequency of evaluation, (3) conduct of evaluation, (4) procedures to be used, and (5) the use of the results of evaluation" (page2). Torrens utilized available research on teacher evaluation criteria to develop a survey instrument which was administered to 297 school districts, with a 67 percent response rate. In

conclusion, Torrens arrived at five policy additions for recommendation to the state superintendent of public instruction. They were,

"...(1) Developing cooperatively with the people involved in and affected by the evaluation process, a district's purpose for teacher evaluation and a regular review by these people of the districts's evaluation process; (2) Limiting the number of evaluatees per evaluator by using peers (other teachers) as evaluators, (3) Using either multiple evaluators or using at least two additional lines of evidence to classroom observations in the summative evaluation report; (4) Designing a model of evaluation using these suggested policy additions with the final step to include the using of data from the summative evaluation to make decisions relative to the district's purpose for evaluation; (5) requiring a structured session of oral or written feedback after each observation that is used as a part of a summative evaluation report" (page 3).

Buck and Parsley (1973) examined teacher evaluation policies and practices in Washington. At that time, they came to seven conclusions:

"a) most districts utilized a district-wide evaluation model; b) the purpose of teacher assessment was instructional improvement; c) principals were the primary evaluations, with peer evaluators increasing; d) observation was the most frequent method for evaluation, with the uses of performance objectives and self-evaluation techniques increasing; e) personal characteristics and instructional skills were the criteria used in evaluation; f) the rating instrument and the conference were the most common assessment forms; and g) most districts are now reviewing or revising evaluation programs" (page 8).

COMPONENTS OF EFFECTIVE EVALUATION SYSTEMS

What are the components of effective evaluation systems? Gibb (1989) studied and compared perceptions of

elementary teachers and supervisors relative to teacher evaluation practices and policies. Generally, she found that both teachers and supervisors perceived policies and processes differently relative to the policy and process statements of the study. But both thought that the main purpose of evaluation should be formative and not summative. The study's recommendations included (1) focusing on formative evaluation, with different processes to be developed for retention and dismissal issues, (2) tying staff development and evaluation at the district level, (3) increasing the number of evaluations, (4) including pre and post conferences, (5) allowing both teachers and supervisors to provide in-put into system development, and (6) additional training of observers.

Evidence indicates that most systems of teacher evaluation impact summative evaluation and have "little or no impact on teacher or school involvement" (Stiggins and Bridgeford, 1985, page 54). Significant differences between the two goals appear to make it difficult for a single evaluation system to effectively address both. Barber and Klein (1983) felt that it compromised the role of administrators in motivating teacher development to try to use a single system for both formative and summative evaluation.

DIFFERENTIATED EVALUATION

Glatthorn and Holler (1987) describe differentiated teacher evaluation. The model developed by the Clavery County (Maryland) Schools has won wide acceptance by providing different levels of evaluation and observation. Glatthorn and Holler described this model as having three distinct levels. The first, which they labeled "an informal observation" is directed at short observations which provided the administrator with information about curriculum implementation and general instructional patterns. It also provided for more frequent non-evaluative feedback for the teachers.

The second level referred to as "a rating observation," which lasted a minimum of 30 minutes and provided a basis for performance evaluation. This level utilized a standardized rating observation form, with the emphasis on rating of "essential skills of teaching."

The third level, which Glatthorn and Holler referred to as "a non-rating observation," focused around systematic observations and data collection of instructional performance. This provided the teacher with diagnosis and development feedback. This feedback was directed at individual development and did not become a part of the "official" personnel record.

EXEMPLARY TEACHER EVALUATION SYSTEMS

Research For Better Schools, described by Buttram and Wilson (1987), reviewed "exemplary teacher evaluation systems." They found five areas common to progressive systems. First, it was found that the evaluation systems were linked to research on effective teaching practices. Second, training was provided for evaluators. Third, administrators were held more accountable to conducting evaluations. Fourth, deficiencies identified by evaluation were focused on through staff development. Fifth, teachers became active partners in the evaluation process. Oldham identified a trend toward teacher involvement in 1974. Della-Dora (1987) would agree that effective teaching methods constitute only a third of the total system. He felt that an effective system must also include effective administrative practices and the presence of sound organizational development.

DUE PROCESS CONSIDERATIONS IN EVALUATION

It is common for regulations on teacher evaluation to specify procedures for observing and recording classroom activities. If problems exist, this record of observations becomes evidence of need for action, and specific sequential steps are outlined for such action. These steps are directed at insuring due process for the teacher. If no problems exist, this record of observations is placed on

file and no further action takes place.

CHARACTERISTICS OF EFFECTIVE FORMATIVE EVALUATION

Evaluations directed at professional growth provide teachers with assistance in identifying and defining strengths and areas for development. Performance criteria are altered to meet the specific situation, whereas with accountability issues, they must be rigidly defined and standardized to be able to withstand legal scrutiny. Support in identification of areas for development may come from the administrator, from peers, from students, and from self evaluation. As a part of that process, the responsibility shifts to the individual teacher to act on the feedback and establish self improvement goals. At the same time, the role of the supervisor shifts to that of providing support and assistance for the teacher as they pursue their self improvement goals. "Teachers are more likely to consider and act upon feedback that describes their classroom performance without judgement and in terms they understand and accept" (Stiggins 1986, page 54).

FORMATIVE EVALUATION - APPROPRIATE PRACTICES

What are appropriate evaluation practices directed at improvement of instruction? Stiggins (1986) and Weber (1988), would lead us to believe that a variety of options exist, including: self-assessment, peer assessment, student

assessment, standardized test performance, and other data selected and collected in relation to specific types of desired feedback. Duckett et al (1982) stress the need to vary this process according to the teacher's stage of professional development and teaching situation.

THE PRINCIPAL AS EVALUATOR

Lamb and Thomas (1981) state that, "Because a school's success depends largely on how well teachers teach, it is up to the principal to make sure instruction is of the highest quality" (page 45). Educational Research Service in Teacher Evaluation: Practices and Procedures (1989) studied evaluation procedures across the United States. They found that principals observing teachers was the most commonly used data-collection method. They also found that peers or lead teachers are "rarely used." The Revised Code of Washington (RCW 28A.67.065) specifies the failure of an evaluator (principal) to evaluate or supervise certificated employees is "sufficient cause for the nonrenewal of any such evaluator's contract" (page 3).

EVALUATION AS A HIGH PRIORITY

Duke and Stiggins (1981) propose, "Where evaluation is not regarded as a high priority, supervisors may begin to take shortcuts" (page 24). Has the short form evaluation option in Washington become such a shortcut? In an effort

to reduce the amount of time administrators spend on evaluation of teachers with a successful track record, has the short form become, in practice, a shortcut which does not meet the second intent of teacher evaluation, that of providing for improvement and development of the instructional skills of teachers?

EFFECTIVE PRACTICES IN TEACHER EVALUATION

What makes an administrator effective in all aspects of teacher evaluation? More specifically, what practices have been shown to be effective in evaluating teachers?

Conley (1987) reviewed studies conducted by Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin and Bernstein (1984), and McGreal (1983) to arrive at what he considered to be eight critical attributes of effective evaluation systems. These needs were for:

1. participants to accept the validity of the system.
2. participants to thoroughly understand the mechanics of the system.
3. those being evaluated to know that the performance criteria have a clear, consistent rationale.
4. proper training of the evaluators with regard to the procedural and substantive use of the system.
5. levels of evaluation, with each level having a different goal.
6. clear distinction between summative and formative

evaluation.

7. a variety of evaluation methods.
8. evaluation to be an identified district priority.

SUMMARY OF THE LITERATURE

Efforts directed at school improvement have spawned a number of state level policies to be developed in the last 20 years. Policies directed at standardizing teacher evaluation and supervision have been developed by 46 of the states.

While policymakers at the state level have sought to impact administrative practice through policymaking, the effect of such policies has been different than anticipated. Whether these discrepancies are a result of intentional misapplication, or a result of a difference in interpretation of contexts is not clear.

What is clear from research is that teacher evaluation and supervision has more than one goal. Effective systems need to address both summative and formative evaluation if actual improvement of instruction is to take place.

In Washington state, the Legislature did address policy changes in the area of teacher evaluation. These policy changes spoke directly to summative evaluation processes and indirectly to formative evaluation processes. Consistent with established research, the policies in Washington did address areas considered to be necessary for effective

evaluation and supervision.

The establishment of a short form option for evaluation of teachers provided alternative methods for evaluating those who have established a record of successfully meeting the requirements of summative evaluation. What has been the effect, in actual practice, of this option?

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This study was conducted in three distinct phases. Subjects, procedures, and instruments were different for each of the phases to match the purpose of that phase. The first two phases were phone interviews, and the third phase was a mailed survey.

Questions to be examined in the study were centered around several key points:

- I. What was the original intent of the change?
- II. Did change in fact take place as a result of the legislative change, and if so, what kinds of change?
- III. How well do the actual changes relate to the intended changes?
- IV. In what situations is the short form option selected?
- V. Have teacher evaluation practices changed since the spring of 1985, and if so, how?

PHASE I: PHONE INTERVIEWS - LEGISLATIVE INTENT

Five groups were heavily involved in drafting and testifying for the original legislation. First, members of

the legislature were instrumental in drafting and working for the statute. Second, the Washington Education Association provided testimony and lobbying efforts directed as the legislation. This group, representing the teachers of the state, presented strong opinions from that point of view. Third, the Washington Association of School Administrators, representing the management side of school districts also provided testimony to the legislature with regard to anticipated impact of the proposed statutory change. Fourth, the Association of Washington School Principals, representing the view of evaluators (principals) provided testimony and pressure to include the short form option as a part of the legislative package. Fifth, the Washington School Directors Association, representing school boards across the state, provided testimony in the drafting of the final version of the statute.

Part One interviews were conducted with representatives of each of these groups to gather information as to the intent of the legislation, as perceived by their respective group.

Subjects

Initial interviews took place with staff at the Superintendent of Public Instruction's office, and with staff from both the House and Senate Education Committees. Initial interviews were conducted with the following people:

- o Dr. Ted Andrews, Director of Professional Education, Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, Olympia
- o Dr. John Swiger, Administrative Assistant for Personnel, Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, Olympia
- o Larry Davis, Senior Research Analyst, Washington State Senate Education Committee, Olympia
- o Susan Patrick, Senior Research Analyst, Washington State House Education Committee, Olympia

As a result of these preliminary interviews, subjects were identified for phase one interviews regarding legislative intent. The subjects were:

- o A member of the Washington Education Association who provided testimony on the legislation on the behalf of the Washington Education Association
- o A member of the School Directors Association who testified as a representative of that association.
- o A member of the House of Representatives who sponsored the original legislation
- o A member of the Association of Washington School Principals who provided testimony on behalf of that organization, and who worked with the School Directors Association representative to encourage the inclusion of the short form evaluation option in the legislation.

Procedures

Subjects for interview in Phase One were contacted by phone. The study was explained, and subjects were asked if they would be willing to take part in an individual interview. Subjects agreeing to be interviewed were asked to identify a time for the phone interview, and were asked to sign a mailed Informed Consent Form prior to that interview.

Instruments

Data were collected through structured individual phone interviews. The results of ten to fifteen hours of phone interviews in Phase One and Phase Two were used to construct the mailed survey for Phase Three. Appendix A contains a copy of the phase one phone interview cord outline.

PHASE II: PHONE INTERVIEWS WITH ADMINISTRATORS

Subjects

The group most directly affected by the changes in statute were building administrators. They were the primary group directly responsible for teacher evaluation. The study also gathered information from K-12 practicing administrators throughout Washington. A cross section of administrators was selected, representing a variety of building sizes, district sizes, and geographic locations in the state of Washington.

Procedures

Subjects of known expertise and experience were contacted by phone and asked if they would be willing to complete a phone interview. Phone interviews were then conducted with these selected building principals, regarding their use of the short form evaluation option, changes in practice (if any) that are a result of the short form option, and their opinions of effective elements of teacher evaluation.

Instruments

The phone instrument utilized in Phase II was developed as a result of the responses collected from the Phase I interviews and from the study questions. A copy of the phase two phone interview cord structure can be found in Appendix B.

PHASE III: SURVEY OF ADMINISTRATORS

Subjects

Practicing administrators, statewide, were sampled for survey. Administrators were selected randomly from the Washington Education Directory which lists all public school administrators in the state of Washington.

The Washington Education Directory lists all public school buildings in the state. These are listed alphabetically by grade level within each district. Districts are listed alphabetically within each county in

the state. Counties are listed alphabetically within the state. A table of random numbers was used to identify a page in the directory. Beginning with that page, every sixth building listed was selected from the 297 districts in the state. A questionnaire was mailed, by name, to each selected building principal. Vocational schools and alternative schools were not included in the sampling as they have staff members with some varying types of certification.

Procedures

Subjects for the mailed survey in Phase Three were contacted by mail with a survey and postage-paid return envelope. The mailing also included a non-attached cover sheet asking for name and address if subjects were interested in a copy of the survey results. An informed consent form was also included for return.

Follow-up reminder postcards were mailed to non-responding individuals after two weeks.

Instruments

Utilizing the results of the interviews conducted in Phase I and Phase II, and the study questions, the final instrument was developed and mailed to practicing administrators. See Appendix C for a copy of the complete instrument.

HYPOTHESES

Of the specific research questions listed on page seven, the first three were answered in Phase I of the study, the Interviews to determine legislative intent. Specific research questions four through six were answered as a result of the Phase III mailed survey. Specific research questions seven through fourteen were also answered during Phase III. Several of this last group of questions were used to formulate one specific primary hypothesis and several secondary hypotheses statements to be examined.

Primary Hypothesis

The study addressed one major hypothesis.

1. The use of the short form option for teacher evaluation is unrelated to school demographics.
 - a. There is no significant difference in grade level of assignments between those who use the short form option and those who do not.
 - b. There are no significant difference in number of total staff evaluated between those who use the short form option and those who do not.
 - c. There is no significant difference in number of staff eligible for evaluation with the short form between those who use the short form option and those who do not.

Secondary Hypotheses

Three secondary hypothesis were examined in the study.

1. The use of the short form option for teacher evaluation is unrelated to administrator demographics.
 - a. There are no significant differences in age between those who use the short form option and those who do not.
 - b. There are no significant differences in sex between those who use the short form option and those who do not.
 - c. There are no significant differences in title between those who use the short form option and those who do not.
 - d. There are no significant differences in educational level between those who use the short form option and those who do not.
 - e. There are no significant differences in experience in the educational field between those who use the short form option and those who do not.
 - f. There are no significant differences in experience in administration between those who use the short form option and those who do not.
 - g. There are no significant differences in length of time in current location between those who use the short form option and those who do not.
2. The use of the short form option for teacher evaluation

is unrelated to administrative rationale for choosing to use the option.

- a. There is no correlation between use of the short form option and the total number of certificated staff eligible evaluated.
 - b. There is no correlation between use of the short form option and the total number of certificated staff eligible for evaluation with the short form.
 - c. There is no correlation between use of the short form option and factors administrators utilized in deciding when to use the short form option with eligible teachers.
 - d. There is no correlation between use of the short form option and factors administrators utilized in deciding when not to use the short form option with eligible teachers.
3. The use of the short form for teacher evaluation is unrelated to administrator's satisfaction with their current evaluation system.
 - a. There is no significant difference in the amount of time spent with evaluation of strong teachers between those who use the short form option and those who do not.
 - b. There is no significant difference in the amount of time spent with evaluation of weak teachers between those who use the short form option and

those who do not.

- c. There is no significant difference in satisfaction with current systems for formative evaluation with strong teachers between those who use the short form option and those who do not.
- d. There is no significant difference in satisfaction with current systems for summative evaluation with strong teachers between those who use the short form option and those who do not.
- e. There is no significant difference in satisfaction with current systems for formative evaluation with weak teachers between those who use the short form option and those who do not.
- f. There is no significant difference in satisfaction with current systems for summative evaluation with weak teachers between those who use the short form option and those who do not.
- g. There is no significant difference in perceived importance of components of effective teacher evaluation between those who use the short form option and those who do not.

DATA ANALYSIS

Information gathered during the intent interviews and the administrative practice interviews was summarized and used to formulate questions and choices on the survey

instrument of practicing administrators.

The survey instrument collected data on eight independent variables: respondent sex, respondent age, respondent title, respondent educational level, respondent educational experience, respondent grade level assignment, total number of certificated staff in respondent's building, and number of certificated staff in building eligible to be evaluated with the short form option.

The survey instrument also collected data on eighteen other independent variables. Two questions were directed at determining if the short form option is used, and how often. Four questions addressed the practices of those who use the short form option, and assessed which form, whether it provided more time, and which teachers it was and was not used with. One question asked non-users why they did not use this evaluation option. One question asked whether the short form evaluation had had any effect on the system as a whole. Five questions were directed at determining changes in evaluation practice over the last five years. The last five questions dealt with principal's definitions and perceptions of effective evaluation systems.

For the primary hypothesis, which examined the relation between school demographics and whether or not the short form option was used for teacher evaluation, t-tests were run. Use of the short form option was compared to both total certificated staff evaluated and total certificated

staff eligible for evaluation with the short form option.

Use of the short form option and its relation to school grade level was examined through the use of chi-square.

For the first secondary hypothesis, dealing with administrator demographics, t-tests were run to examine the relationship between use of the short form option, and factors of age, years in education, years in administration, and years in current work location. Chi-square was used to examine use of the short form option and factors of sex, title, and educational level.

For the second secondary hypothesis, regarding administrative rationale and use of the short form option Pearson correlations were calculated between use of the option and total certificated staff evaluated, total certificated staff eligible for evaluation with the short form option, significant factors in deciding to use the short form option, and significant factors in deciding not to use the short form option.

For secondary hypothesis number three, which dealt with use of the short form option and administrative satisfaction with current systems of teacher evaluation, t-tests were run between use of the option and the following: time spent with evaluation of strong teachers, time spent with evaluation of weak teachers, satisfaction with systems for formative evaluation of strong teachers, satisfaction with systems for summative evaluation with strong teachers,

satisfaction with systems for formative evaluation with weak teachers, satisfaction with systems for summative evaluation with weak teachers, and perceived importance of components of effective evaluation.

LIMITATIONS

The limitations of this study include the usual limitations of survey research and several other limitations particular to the subject and to the research process.

Telephone interviews were initially conducted with members of each of the groups who were instrumental in working on the original legislation. Key respondents were identified for each group, but not all persons were interviewed.

Telephone interviews were also conducted initially with a group of practicing administrators from across the state. Self-reported views were collected from respondents who were recognized as having expertise and experience in their field.

The telephone surveys provided information and choices which were used in developing survey items and response choices. While survey format provided space for respondents to write out comments or other choices, most of those surveyed only responded to those choices which were provided on the instrument.

The mailed survey responses represent the self-reported

views of randomly selected administrators. One in six administrators was mailed a survey and a 100% response rate for those selected was not achieved.

The survey, by its self-reporting nature, may have a limited objectivity of response. Since confidentiality was guaranteed to respondents, follow-up interviews were not collected. While confidentiality was guaranteed, it may be noted that some respondents went to lengths to further disguise their identity. Respondent surveys were received with obscured receipt stamps cut off, with response code numbers on return envelopes marked out, with stamped return envelopes not being used, and with unsigned consent forms.

By the nature of the policy being studied, the generalizability may be impaired outside of the state of Washington.

The study may be limited by the difficulty of establishing validity in an area which is highly dependent upon respondent opinion and knowledge of the area.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

PHASE I PHONE INTERVIEWS - LEGISLATIVE INTENT

Phase I consisted of four telephone interviews. Interviews took place with individuals who work directly with legislative development and with implementation of statute related to teacher evaluation.

Four persons were initially contacted. Dr. Ted Andrews, Director of Professional Education, and Dr. John Swiger, Administrative Assistant for Personnel, both at the State Superintendent of Public Instruction's Office provided initial information. They also recommended further contacts from each of the professional organizations involved in the policy development.

Larry Davis, Senior Research Analyst with the Senate Education Committee, and Susan Patrick, Senior Research Analyst with the House Education Committee were also contacted. These individuals provided copies of testimony and draft copies and revisions of the original statute. Each also provided the names of specific persons to contact within each of the professional groups.

Information gathered from these interviews was used, along with research questions, to develop the cord structure

for the interviews in Phase I.

In Phase I interviews, members of the following groups were interviewed: Washington Education Association, Washington School Directors Association, House of Representatives, Association of Washington School Principals, and the Washington Association of School Administrators.

In general, individuals felt that the Legislature was reacting to pressures to provide increased accountability in revising the entire teacher evaluation statutes. Many remembered the provision of the short form being a result of pressures from administrator groups who were concerned about time pressures.

The principals' association provided the strongest support for the provision of the short form option. The other professional groups perceived the option as a non-issue and in many cases supported the option because of their affiliation with the principals' association.

The Washington Education Association provided testimony in opposition to the option. It was their stand that it would have negative impact on successful teachers. Many teachers felt that their best opportunity to demonstrate their skills and knowledge was within the context of the evaluation process. Providing a shortened process, which might take place without any formal feedback to teachers, was perceived as negative rather than positive, as had been

argued by some of the other groups.

Most of the groups felt that the provision of the short form option had had little effect.

PHASE II PHONE INTERVIEWS - PRACTICING ADMINISTRATORS

Research questions and responses from the Phase I interviews were utilized in formulating a interview cord structure to be used in Phase II.

In Phase II, specific questions and response choices were developed to be used on the mailed survey in Phase III. Ten to fifteen hours of interviews were conducted and taped.

It was found that few administrators were using the option extensively. Those who used it did so in conjunction with other types of formative evaluation. Many of those interviewed felt strongly that the option was not effective evaluation. Question choices and areas to be rated on the mailed survey were all developed from interview responses. Most also indicated the types of evaluation that they felt were effective and reasons for having changed practice. Almost none of the people interviewed indicated that they had changed practice because of the change in policy at the state level.

PHASE III MAILED SURVEY

A total of 273 surveys were mailed to school principals in Washington State. Surveys were mailed to every sixth

school building within the state of Washington, utilizing systematic sampling. Of the 273 surveys mailed, 171 or 62.64% usable surveys were returned. The survey contained twenty-six single or multiple-part items, which collected data on seven areas of interest. A copy of the survey instrument can be found in Appendix C.

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

Legislative Intent

The first research question examined in the study asked: What was the intent of the Legislature in establishing the short form option? In revising the entire statute related to teacher evaluation, the Legislature was attempting to respond to pressure to increase school effectiveness and make the process more accountable.

At the same time, pressure was being put on the Legislature from groups of practitioners asking for more administrative time. The principal's association exerted pressure for the Legislature to recognize the fact that new regulations often require additional administrator time and that time was at a premium.

Overall, the intent was to make the system of teacher evaluation more stringent and accountable, while the provision of the short form was intended to provide one time-saving alternative for principals.

Intent as Perceived by Practitioner Groups

The second and third research questions examined in the study centered around the legislative intent as perceived by practitioner groups. The Washington Education Association perceived the short form option as a negative reinforcement to successful teachers. It was stated in interviews and testimony that successful teachers had too little time to talk with administrators and explain their teaching skills in a meaningful way, and that provision of the short form option would remove some of that opportunity.

The Washington Association of School Principals perceived the overall statute as one additional burden on their already overtaxed time. The association also reported in interviews that they perceived the provision of the short form option as recognition from the Legislature of their concerns over time.

The Washington Association of School Administrators saw the provision of the short form option as a non-issue. They did recognize teacher evaluation as one of the most important roles of a principal, but did not feel strongly in favor of or in opposition to the short form option. Politically they provided support for the principal's association stand in favor of providing the option, in part due to the fact that their membership included principals.

The Washington School Directors' Association stand paralleled that of the association of school administrators.

The short form option was a non-issue, they supported the notion that teacher evaluation was among the most important roles of the principal, and they politically supported the stand of the principal group.

Change in Practice Related to Change in Statute

In answering the fourth and fifth research questions, we find that changes in practice did in fact take place as a result of the changes in statute. Those principals who use the short form option did feel that it saved them time. This change is limited however. Many practicing principals reported in interviews that while the option does save time for summative evaluation, it is not effective or comprehensive enough to be used alone in evaluating teachers. Principals report instances where the option is used to save time to complete summative evaluation but they then spend much additional time in working with teachers on formative evaluation. Personal goal setting, team teaching, and demonstrations and modeling by the principal were mentioned as only a few of the additional activities being conducted. A majority of the principals report spending more time on teacher evaluation than before the statute. A majority also spend more time in evaluation of weak teachers.

In fact, practice did change as a result of the statutory provision of the short form option. However, the changes do not necessarily relate to the original purpose

which was to ease the time burden placed on administrator time by teacher evaluation.

Do Changes Relate to Research?

In answering specific research question number six, it was found that even though the changes are not strongly tied to the original intents of the statute, some of the changes which did take place are consistent with what research tells us is effective teacher evaluation.

Few of the principals report using only the short form option, but utilize it with further formative evaluation methods. This is consistent with the weaknesses identified with the use of a single evaluation model which does not address summative and formative evaluation.

Principals report now spending more time with evaluation, and consider evaluation to be a high priority. In looking at the reasons why practices have changed, it is apparent that much change is based on either additional training or reading of research on effective schools.

Research indicates that the use of the short form option, by itself, may not be effective due to limited interaction between the evaluator and the teacher, and due to its only addressing summative evaluation. In interview and survey responses, these are the same reasons given for not using the option, many do not consider the option alone to be effective teacher evaluation.

The practices of principals is more closely tied to

what research tells us than was the original statute. The statute itself, both totally and with regard to the short form option, only addressed summative evaluation. Research strongly indicates that evaluation systems need to address both summative and formative evaluation, and that the two areas need to be directly linked together.

Respondent Demographics

Research question number seven was examined through the first six survey items which provided demographic and descriptive information about the respondents including sex, age, title, educational level, experience in education, administration, and current location, and present grade level.

Of the respondents, a majority (66.67%) were male, with a mean age of 46.407 and a range of 31-61 years. A total of 97, or 56.73% were in the age range 41-50 years. A majority (94.15%) of the respondents were principals, with the remaining 5.85% being Assistant or Associate Principals.

In examining the respondents' educational level, 70.76% reported having a Master's degree plus additional graduate work. Additional data may be found in Table I.

School Demographics

In examining respondents' grade level assignment, 66.08% were currently working at the elementary level, and 19.30% were at the senior high level.

Respondents reported that they evaluated between 1 and 107 certificated staff members, with a median of 24, and a mean of 24.935 staff evaluations per administrator. In total, respondents were responsible for evaluating 4192 certificated staff members.

Of the 4192 certificated staff, 3334 (79.53%) qualify for evaluation with the short form evaluation option by having had satisfactory evaluations for the past four years.

TABLE I

RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHIC AND
EXPERIENCE DATA

Sex	Frequency	Percent	
	114	66.67%	Male
	57	33.33%	Female
Age	Range 31-61		
	Mean 46.407		
	Median 45		
	Freq.	Percent	Range
	26	15.20%	Age 31-40
	97	56.73%	Age 41-50
	42	24.56%	Age 51-60
	2	1.17%	Age 61 and over
	4	2.34%	Omit
Title	Freq.	Percent	Title
	161	94.15%	Principal
	10	5.85%	Assistant or Associate Principal
Educational Level	Freq.	Percent	Level
	4	2.34%	BA plus graduate work
	2	15.79%	MA or MS
	121	70.76%	MA or MS plus graduate work
	5	2.92%	Ed. Specialist
	14	8.19%	PhD or EdD

Of the 3334 who were eligible for the short form option, 823 (24.69%) were actually evaluated with one of the short form evaluation options. Nineteen percent of the total staff evaluated by respondents were evaluated with the short form option. It was found that a mean of 19.845 certificated staff per building were eligible for evaluation with the short form option while only 4.87 per building were actually being evaluated with this option. Further information is included in Table II.

Use of the Short Form Option

Of the 171 respondents, 73 (42.69%) report that they use either of the short form options or a combination of the two options for evaluation of certificated staff. Ninety-eight (57.31%) do not use either of the short form options. Data on use of the short form is reported in Table III.

Four items gathered information from the respondents that did use the short form option for evaluating teachers. Respondents were asked whether they used the option with a single 30-minute observation and a written summary or the option with two sixty minute observations and no written summary, or whether they used both short form options.

TABLE II
EVALUATION OF STAFF

A. Present Grade Level Assignment			
	Total	Percent	Level
	113	66.08%	Elementary
	18	10.53%	Intermediate or Middle School
	7	4.09%	Junior High
	33	19.30%	Senior High
B. Number of Staff Evaluated by Respondents			
	Range	1-107 Staff	
	Mean	24.9 Staff	
	Total Staff Evaluated by Respondents		4192
C. Number of Staff Eligible for Short Form Evaluation Option			
	Range	0-62 per building	
	Mean	19.8 per building	
	Total number eligible		3334
	Percent Eligible		79.53%
	(of total evaluated in B above)		
D. Number of Staff Evaluated With Short Form Option			
	Range	0-33 per building	
	Mean	4.8 per building	
	Total number		823
	Percent of eligible		24.69%
	(of those eligible in C above)		
	Percent of total		19.63%
	(of those evaluated in B above)		

TABLE III
USE OF SHORT FORM OPTION

73	42.69%	Do Use Short Form
98	57.31%	Do Not Use Short Form

Of the respondents that use either short form option for evaluating teachers, about half (53.25%) use the option of a single 30 minute observation with a written summary, while about one fourth (25.97%) use the option which calls for 2 observations for a total of 60 minutes, with no written summary. A total of 20.78% use a combination of both options. Table IV provides additional information in this area.

TABLE IV

WHICH SHORT FORM OPTION IS USED

Which Option Is Used	
53.25%	30 minute observation with a written summary
20.78%	2 observations for total of 60 minutes with no written summary
25.97%	both options

Does Short Form Use Provide More Time For Weak Teachers?

Respondents were also asked whether or not the use of the short form option provided them with more time to work with weak teachers.

Of those responding, 66.29% felt that the short form option(s) for teacher evaluation did provide them with more time to work with weak teachers. Table V provides further data on this question.

TABLE V

DOES THE SHORT FORM OPTION PROVIDE MORE TIME
TO WORK WITH WEAK TEACHERS

Does use of the short form option provide more time
to work with weak teachers?

Total	Percent	
59	66.29%	Yes
27	30.34%	No

When Is The Short Form Option Chosen?

Two questions asked respondents to identify the significance of specific factors when deciding whether to use the short form option for evaluating eligible teachers. Respondents were asked to rate each item on a scale of 1 (no significance) to 4 (very significant).

Respondents identified those factors which were significant in choosing to use the short option. Over seventy percent (71.83%) reported that previous experience with the teacher was significant or very significant in choosing to use the short form option with specific teachers, while 51.43% reported that the desire to save time was the reason for choosing the short option. Student achievement, out of class observations, and the perception that the short form option was a reward for the teacher were also identified as significant in choosing the short form option.

Respondent comments also mentioned other reasons for choosing the short form option for evaluation. Utilizing the short option with individual goal-setting and teacher

effort toward improvement were also identified. Comments also indicate that some administrators do not use either option because they felt it was not sufficient in providing feedback to teachers. References to collective bargaining agreements were also mentioned in several instances. One respondent allowed teachers with four years of satisfactory evaluations to choose the method of evaluation, while others reported using a rotation basis and limits on the number of teachers to be evaluated with either short form option. Table VI shows a rank order list of significant factors when choosing to use the short form option with teachers.

When the Short Form Option Isn't Chosen?

Respondents were asked to identify significant factors in choosing not to use either short form option with teachers that were eligible based on satisfactory evaluations during the previous four years.

Three items were identified by 50% or more of the respondents as being significant or very significant. Of the respondents, 65.63% considered additional feedback to the teacher as being important. A total of 57.81% did not choose the short option because it had been used the two previous years, and by statute could not be used for three years in a row. Student comments were identified by 50% of the respondents.

Other significant reasons were identified through comments. Length of experience in teaching was identified

TABLE VI
RANK ORDER LIST OF SIGNIFICANT FACTORS
WHEN CHOOSING TO USE THE
SHORT FORM OPTION

Respondents Rating Factors
as Significant or
Very Significant

Factor	Total	Percent
Previous experience with teacher	51	71.83%
Wanted to save time	36	51.43%
Student Achievement	34	48.58%
Out of class observations	33	45.83%
Short form was a reward	32	45.71%
Frequency of discipline referrals to office	27	38.57%
Student Comments	23	32.86%
Parent Comments	22	31.43%
Other	13	18.06%

as a significant reason for not using the option with eligible teachers, as were concerns and comments from other staff members. Again, the collective bargaining agreement was listed as a factor in the decision, as was a rotation of staff members being evaluated with the option. One principal commented that he needed to be in classrooms more, and that he had broken staff into groups and utilized different evaluation methods with different groups. One administrator reported that since there were less than thirty teachers in the building to be evaluated, that they had been encouraged to use the long form for all. It was also felt, by one respondent, that even great teachers desire specific feedback to help them improve (formative evaluation). Table VII shows a rank order list of significant factors when choosing not to use the short form option with teachers.

Those respondents that stated that they did not use the short form option with any teachers were asked to identify why they did not use either option.

A majority of the respondents (64.08%) reported that they did not use either short form option for teacher evaluation because it was not in use in their district. Twenty-nine respondents (20.42%) reported that they did not use either option because they did not consider it to be effective evaluation. Fifteen (10.56%) of the respondents reported that they were not aware of the short form option.

TABLE VII
RANK ORDER LIST OF SIGNIFICANT FACTORS
WHEN CHOOSING NOT TO USE THE
SHORT FORM OPTION

Respondents Marking Rating
Factors as Significant or
Very Significant

Factor	Total	Percent
Teacher needed additional feedback	42	65.63%
Short form used 2 previous years	37	57.81%
Student Comments	32	50.00%
Parent Comments	28	44.75%
Observations Out of the Classroom	27	42.18%
Student Achievement	27	42.18%
Frequency of discipline referrals to office	26	40.63%
Other	18	28.13%

Other reasons for not using either option were reported by 4.93% of the respondents. Other listed reasons included: being new to the state, being a new administrator, being new to a building, collective bargaining agreement restrictions, and a desire to spend more time on formative evaluations. One district required two years of long evaluation by a principal before using the short form option. Results are presented in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII
RANK ORDER LIST OF WHY SHORT FORM OPTION
IS NOT USED

Total	Percent	Reason
91	64.08%	not in use in their district
29	20.42%	do not believe it is effective evaluation
15	10.56%	not aware of the short form
7	4.93%	other
N=142		

Effects Of Using the Short Form Option

Respondents were asked to identify the effect of having the short form option for teacher evaluation. Of 163 respondents, 46.01% did not know what the effect had been, 39.88% reported that the option had little or no effect, 9.20% considered the option to have weakened the system, and 3.68% saw the system as having become more stringent.

Changes in Practice

Five questions asked respondents to identify whether or not they had changed practices in teacher evaluation since

spring 1985, when the short form option took effect. Over fifty percent (50.6%) of the respondents reported that they had changed practices in teacher evaluation since spring 1985. Of the remaining fifty percent, 37.50% reported that they had not changed practice and 11.90% reported that they were not evaluating teachers in 1985.

Respondents were also asked to help identify in what ways their teacher evaluation practices had changed since 1985. Of the total respondents returning the survey, 66.06% reported that they spend more time on teacher evaluation than they did in 1985. Ninety-nine (60.61%) reported that they use a more stringent system of teacher evaluation than in 1985, and 65.18% report using a different type of evaluation system than they did in 1985.

The survey asked respondents to identify why they had changed practices in teacher evaluation since 1985. Respondents report having had further training in teacher evaluation as the first reason for having changed practice, with 34.50% reporting that. The second highest reason, with 25.15% reporting, was that administrators had read effective schools research, and 18.71% report having changed after having read research on effective schools and effective teaching. It is interesting to note that 22.80% report that the teacher evaluation system in their district has changed since 1985. Only 10.53% report that they have changed practices in teacher evaluation because of state policy

changes. However, some of the changes in district evaluation systems may be a reflection of the change in statute.

Comments from respondents provide additional reasons for administrators having changed practices in teacher evaluation. As in previous questions, references were made to the collective bargaining agreement, moving to a new district, and additional training. Increased staff size and increased responsibility were also listed as incentives to change.

When asked to compare the amount of time they spend in evaluating both strong and weak teachers now with the amount of time spent in 1985, 62.50% of respondents report spending the same amount of time with strong teachers, while only 35.40% report spending the same amount of time with weak teachers. Over sixty percent (63.98%) report spending more time in evaluation of weak teachers, while only 9.38% spend more time with strong teachers. Of those reporting, none spend less time with evaluation of weak teachers than they did five years ago, but 28.13% report spending less time with strong teachers.

Table IX provides more detailed results for the questions discussed above.

TABLE IX
CHANGES IN TEACHER EVALUATION PRACTICES

A. Have principals changed their practices in teacher evaluation since spring 1985?

Total	Percent	
85	50.60%	Yes, they have changed practice
63	37.50%	No, they have not changed practice
20	11.90%	Were not evaluating teachers in 1985

B. How have practices changed?

Total	Percent	
109	66.06%	Spend more time on evaluation
99	60.61%	Use a more stringent system of evaluation
112	65.18%	Use a different type of evaluation system

C. Why did principal practices change?

Total	Percent	
59	34.50%	have had further training
43	25.15%	have read effective schools research
39	22.80%	evaluation system in district has changed
32	18.71%	have read research on how we should teach
19	11.11%	other
18	10.53%	state policy has changed
16	9.36%	district is restructuring

D. Compared to five years ago, how much time do principals spend with evaluation of strong and weak teachers:

With Strong Teachers		With Weak Teachers
62.50%	same amount of time	35.40%
28.13%	less time	0
9.38%	more time	63.98%

Principal Perceptions of Important Components of Evaluation

What do principals see as important components of effective teacher evaluation? Of the 171 respondents, 60% or more marked the following six items as being important or very important: personal contact between the principal and the teacher (77.78%) , sufficient administrative time for evaluation (69.59%), reinforcement for teachers (66.67%), correction of weaknesses (64.91%), administrative training in evaluation techniques (61.99%), and frequent feedback to teachers (60.82%).

Other important components identified in individual respondent comments included: goal setting with teachers, district priority for administrative time, modeling, staff development courses, and strong interpersonal relationship skills for the principal or evaluator. Also identified was the need for evaluation to be directed at teacher growth, or formative evaluation. Table X shows a rank order list of components identified by respondents as being significant or very significant.

How Well Do Current Systems Provide For Summative and Formative Teacher Evaluation

Four questions were directed at determining how well current systems of evaluation provided for summative and formative evaluation with both strong and weak teachers. Over 79% of respondents felt their current system was satisfactory or very effective in providing for formative

TABLE X
 IMPORTANT COMPONENTS OF EFFECTIVE TEACHER
 EVALUATION, AS PERCEIVED BY RESPONDENTS

77.78%	Personal contact between principal and teacher
69.59%	Sufficient administrative time for evaluation
66.67%	Reinforcement of teachers
64.91%	Correction of weaknesses
61.99%	Administrative training in evaluation techniques
60.82%	Frequent feedback to teachers
52.29%	District places priority on evaluation
51.46%	Staff development program in district
46.78%	Evaluation system reflects current research
40.94%	District developed evaluation criteria
40.12%	Modeling practices by principal
27.49%	Use of teachers/mentors to help with evaluation
16.37%	State places a priority on evaluation
12.28%	State developed evaluation criteria
6.43%	Other

N=171

evaluation with strong teachers, but only 52% felt that way when dealing with weak teachers. Over 81% of respondents felt their current system was satisfactory or very effective in providing for summative evaluation with strong teachers, but only 62% felt that way when dealing with weak teachers. Table XI provides more detailed information in this area.

TABLE XI

HOW WELL DO CURRENT SYSTEMS PROVIDE FOR FORMATIVE AND SUMMATIVE EVALUATION WITH STRONG AND WEAK TEACHERS

How well does respondents' current system provide for formative and summative evaluation with STRONG teachers?

Formative		Summative
17.54%	very effectively	19.41%
52.05%	satisfactorily	62.35%
23.98%	less than satisfactorily	15.88%
6.43%	poorly	2.35%

How well does respondents' current system provide for formative and summative evaluation with WEAK teachers?

Formative		Summative
15.20%	very effectively	14.62%
36.84%	satisfactorily	47.37%
37.43%	less than satisfactorily	27.49%
10.53%	poorly	9.94%

N=171

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

Primary Hypothesis

The primary hypothesis related to research question number seven. The use of the short form option for teacher evaluation is unrelated to school demographics. The primary hypothesis examined use of the short form option and the factors of school grade level, total certificated staff evaluated, and total staff eligible for evaluation with the short form option. Chi-square and t-tests were calculated on the factors.

a. It was hypothesized that there are no differences in grade level of assignments between those who use the short form option and those who do not. This hypothesis must be accepted.

b. It was hypothesized that there are no differences in number of total staff evaluated between those that use the short form option and those that do not. Administrators who use the short form of evaluation have significantly higher numbers of certificated staff that they evaluate (number of staff $M=27.21$) than do administrators who do not use the short form (number of staff $M=23.19$) at the $t(166) = 2.064; p \leq .041$. See Table XII for means and standard deviations. The null hypothesis was rejected.

Further examination was conducted by completing an analysis of co-variance with the significant factors of educational level of administrator and total staff in the

TABLE XII
RELATION OF BUILDING DEMOGRAPHICS AND
USE OF THE SHORT FORM OPTION
PRIMARY HYPOTHESIS

A. Relation of School Level and Use of Option (Chi-square)

	Use Option	Do Not Use Option
Elementary	42.86%	57.14%
Intermediate or Middle	33.34%	66.66%
Junior High	42.86%	57.14%
Senior High	48.48%	51.52%

B. Relation of Total Staff Size and Use of Option (t-test)

	Use Option	Do Not Use Option
Mean	27.205	23.189
SD	14.292	10.931

$$t(131) = 1.994; p \leq .05$$

C. Relation of Number of Staff Eligible For Short
Evaluation Option and Use of the Option (t-test)

	Use Option	Do Not Use Option
Mean	20.479	19.358
SD	10.533	9.372

building. When use of the short form option and total staff is adjusted by educational level of the administrator, the result was not significant. The null hypothesis must be accepted.

c. It was hypothesized that there were no differences in number of staff eligible for evaluation with the short form between those buildings where the short form options is used and those buildings where it is not used. This hypothesis must be accepted.

Secondary Hypotheses

1. The first secondary hypothesis examined the relationship between use of the short form option and administrator demographics of sex, age, title, educational level, years in education, years in administration, and years in current location. Chi-square and t-tests were calculated for each of the factors. See Table XIII.

a. There are no differences in age between those who use the short form option and those who do not. This hypothesis must be accepted.

b. There are no differences in sex between those who use the short form option and those who do not. This hypothesis must be accepted.

c. There are no differences in title between those who use the short form option and those who do not. This hypothesis must be accepted.

d. There are significant differences in educational

level between those who use the short form option and those who do not. Only at the doctoral level, do more principals use the short option than do not. At all levels of education, except the doctoral level, more respondents do not use the short form option for evaluation than do so, $\chi^2(4) = 13.497$; $p \leq .009$. Respondents who used the short form option had an educational level between MA/MA and Ed. Specialist, while respondents who didn't use the short option were between MA/MS and MA/MS plus graduate work.

In examining the two significant factors of educational level of the administrator and the total staff in the building, analysis of covariance was calculated for use of the short option with adjustment of total staff number to educational level. It was found that educational level was still significant after being adjusted, $F(165) = 4.282$; $p \leq .040$. Null hypothesis rejected.

e. There are no differences in experience in the educational field between those who use the short form option and those who do not. This hypothesis must be accepted.

f. There are no differences in experience in administration between those who use the short form option and those who do not. This hypothesis must be accepted.

g. There are no differences in length of time in current location between those who use the short form option and those who do not. This hypothesis must be accepted.

TABLE XIII

USE OF SHORT FORM OPTION AND ADMINISTRATOR DEMOGRAPHICS

Age of Administrator and Use of Option		t-test
	Use Option	Do Not Use Option
Mean	46.930	46.021
SD	5.543	6.451
Sex and Use of Option		Chi-square
	Use Option	Do Not Use Option
Males	40.35%	59.65%
Females	47.37%	52.63%
$\chi^2(1) = .765; p \leq .382$		
Title and Use of Option		Chi-square
	Use Option	Do Not Use Option
Principal	42.86%	57.14%
Assistant or Assoc. Princ.	40.00%	60.00%
$\chi^2(1) = .031; p \leq .859$		
Educational Level and Use of Option		Chi-square
	Use Option	Do Not Use Option
BA Plus	0%	100%
MS/MA	18.52%	81.48%
MS/MA Plus	48.76%	51.24%
Ed.Spec.	20.00%	80.00%
Edd/PhD	57.14%	42.86%
$\chi^2(4) = 13.497; p \leq .009$		
Years in Education and Use of Option		t-test
	Use Option	Do Not Use Option
Mean	22.726	21.418
SD	5.633	7.502
Years in Administration and Use of Option		t-test
	Use Option	Do Not Use Option
Mean	12.00	11.558
SD	6.648	7.559
Years in Current Location and Use of Option		t-test
	Use Option	Do Not Use Option
Mean	6.822	6.053
SD	7.649	5.784

Again, t-tests were used to test the hypotheses.

2. The use of the short form option for teacher evaluation is unrelated to administrative rationale for choosing to use the option. This second secondary hypothesis considered the correlations between use of the short form option and total certificated staff evaluated, total staff eligible for short form evaluation, significant factors in choosing to use the short form option and significant factors in choosing not to use the short form option. Pearson correlations were run for each of the factors.

a. There is no correlation between use of the short form option and the total number of certificated staff evaluated. This hypothesis must be accepted.

b. There is no correlation between use of the short form option and the total number of certificated staff eligible for evaluation with the short form. This hypothesis must be accepted.

c. There is no correlation between use of the short form option and factors administrators utilize in deciding when to use the short form option with eligible teachers. This hypothesis must be accepted.

d. There is no correlation between use of the short form option and factors administrators utilized in deciding when not to use the short form option with eligible teachers. Three factors were found to be significant.

There was a low positive correlation between choosing

not to use the short form evaluation option with eligible teachers and parent comments, $r(61) = .211$, $p \leq .05$.

There was a low positive correlation between choosing not to use the short form evaluation option with eligible teachers and observations out of the classroom setting, $r(62) = .237$, $p \leq .05$.

There was a low positive correlation between principals choosing not to use the short form evaluation option with eligible teachers and student achievement, $r(62) = .218$, $p \leq .05$.

Table XIV shows the results of statistical analysis for secondary hypothesis two. The null hypothesis was rejected.

3. The use of the short form for teacher evaluation is unrelated to administrator satisfaction with their evaluation system. T-tests were run between use of the short form evaluation and factors.

a. There is no significant difference in the amount of time spent with evaluation of strong teachers between those who use the short form option and those who do not. Administrators who use the short form option spend less time evaluating strong teachers ($m=1.594$) than do administrators who do not use the short form option ($m=1.978$) at $t(158) = 4.336$; $p \leq .001$.

b. There is no significant difference in the amount of time spent with evaluation of weak teachers between those who use the short form option and those who do not. This

TABLE XIV

PEARSON CORRELATIONS - USE OF OPTION AND CHOICE FACTORS

Factor	Correlation to Use of Option
Total Staff Evaluated	-0.158
Staff Eligible For Short Form	-0.056
Factors When Choosing To Use Short Option	
Previous Experience With Teacher	-0.025
Short Form Perceived as a Reward	0.079
Wanted to Save Time	-0.071
Frequency of Discipline Referrals	0.090
Parent Comments	-0.099
Observations Out of Classroom	-0.150
Student Achievement	-0.142
Student Comments	-0.127
Other	0.123
Factors When Choosing Not To Use Short Option	
Short Form Used Previous 2 Years	-0.039
Teacher Needed Additional Feedback	-0.077
Frequency of Discipline Referrals	0.096
Parent Comments	0.211 (.05 sign.)
Observations Out of Classroom	0.237 (.05 sign.)
Student Achievement	0.218 (.05 sign.)
Student Comments	0.134
Other	0.318 (.01 sign.)

hypothesis must be accepted.

c. There is no significant difference in satisfaction with current systems for formative evaluation with strong teachers between those who use the short form option ($m=2.959$) and those who do not ($m=2.694$). Administrators who use the short form option are more satisfied with their current evaluation system as it provides for formative evaluation of strong teachers at $t(169) = 2.168$; $p \leq .032$. The null hypothesis was rejected.

d. There is no significant difference in satisfaction with current systems for summative evaluation with strong teachers between those who use the short form option and those who do not. This hypothesis must be accepted.

e. There is no significant difference in satisfaction with current systems for formative evaluation with weak teachers between those who use the short form option and those who do not. This hypothesis must be accepted.

f. There is no significant difference in satisfaction with current systems for summative evaluation with weak teachers between those who use the short form option and those who do not. This hypothesis must be accepted.

g. There is no significant difference in perceived importance of components of effective teacher evaluation between those who use the short form option and those who do not. Five of the components were found to be significant, and therefore rejected the null hypothesis.

A trend exists between administrators who do not use the short form option and the importance of district developed criteria for effective teacher evaluation at $t(168) = 1.809$; $p \leq .072$. ($m=2.945$ for those who do use the option and $m=3.206$ for those who do not use the option)

Administrators who do not use the short form option, place a high importance on the district's placing a priority on evaluation for effective teacher evaluation $t(169) = 3.411$; $p \leq .001$.

Administrators who use the short form option, place a high importance on the use of teachers and mentors to help with evaluation for effective evaluation was significant at $t(169) = 2.128$; $p \leq .035$. ($m=3.068$ for those who do use the option and $m=3.500$ for those who do not use the option)

A trend exists between administrators who use the short form option and the importance of providing frequent feedback to teachers for effective evaluation at $t(168) = 1.812$; $p \leq .072$. ($m=2.945$ for those who use the option and $m=2.612$ for those who do not use the option)

Administrators who use the short form option, place a higher importance on modeling of practices by the principal for effective evaluation than do those who do not use the option $t(169) = 2.070$; $p \leq .040$. Table XV provides more detailed results in this area.

TABLE XV

USE OF SHORT FORM OPTION AND SATISFACTION
WITH CURRENT EVALUATION SYSTEMS

Amount of Time Spent With Evaluation of Strong Teachers and
Use of Option (t-test)

	Use Option	Do Not Use Option
Mean	1.594	1.978
SD	0.551	0.557

Amount of Time Spent With Evaluation of Weak Teachers
and Use of Option (t-test)

	Use Option	Do Not Use Option
Mean	2.696	2.620
SD	0.494	0.488

Satisfaction With Formative Evaluation With Strong Teachers
and Use of Option t-test

	Use Option	Do Not Use Option
Mean	2.959	2.694
SD	0.753	0.817

Satisfaction With Summative Evaluation For Strong Teachers
and Use of Option t-test

	Use Option	Do Not Use Option
Mean	3.00	2.979
SD	0.601	0.721

Satisfaction With Formative Evaluation For Weak Teachers and
Use of Option t-test

	Use Option	Do Not Use Option
Mean	2.685	2.480
SD	0.848	0.888

Satisfaction With Summative Evaluation For Weak Teachers and
Use of Option t-test

	Use Option	Do Not Use Option
Mean	2.712	3.796
SD	0.905	11.479

TABLE XV
USE OF SHORT FORM OPTION AND SATISFACTION
WITH CURRENT EVALUATION SYSTEMS
(continued)

District Developed Evaluation Criteria and			
Use of Option	t-test		
	Use Option	Do Not Use Option	
Mean	2.945	3.206	
SD	0.998	0.877	
District Places Priority on Evaluation and			
Use of Option	t-test		
	Use Option	Do Not Use Option	
Mean	3.068	3.500	
SD	0.871	0.777	
State Developed Evaluation Criteria and			
Use of Option	t-test		
	Use Option	Do Not Use Option	
Mean	2.493	2.449	
SD	0.930	0.826	
State Priority on Teacher Evaluation and			
Use of Option	t-test		
	Use Option	Do Not Use Option	
Mean	2.411	2.485	
SD	0.879	0.980	
Staff Development Program in District and			
Use of Option	t-test		
	Use Option	Do Not Use Option	
Mean	3.123	3.235	
SD	0.927	1.063	
Administrative Training in Evaluation Techniques and Use			
of Option	t-test		
	Use Option	Do Not Use Option	
Mean	3.411	3.180	
SD	0.779	0.864	

TABLE XV

USE OF SHORT FORM OPTION AND SATISFACTION
WITH CURRENT EVALUATION SYSTEMS
(continued)

Evaluation System Reflects Current Research and Use of			
Option	t-test	Use Option	Do Not Use Option
Mean		3.123	3.286
SD		0.912	.0849
Sufficient Administrative Time For Evaluation and			
Use of Option	t-test	Use Option	Do Not Use Option
Mean		3.630	3.480
SD		0.697	0.840
Use of Teachers and Mentors to Help With Evaluation and			
Use of Option	t-test	Use Option	Do Not Use Option
Mean		2.945	2.612
SD		1.026	1.001
Frequent Classroom Observations and Use of Option			
	t-test	Use Option	Do Not Use Option
Mean		3.479	3.408
SD		0.709	0.758
Frequent Feedback to Teachers and Use of Option			
	t-test	Use Option	Do Not Use Option
Mean		3.616	3.412
SD		0.615	0.800
Modeling Practices by Principal and Use of Option			
	t-test	Use Option	Do Not Use Option
Mean		3.260	2.980
SD		0.817	0.919
Reinforcement of Teachers and Use of Option			
	t-test	Use Option	Do Not Use Option
Mean		3.658	3.520
SD		0.583	0.749

TABLE XV
 USE OF SHORT FORM OPTION AND SATISFACTION
 WITH CURRENT EVALUATION SYSTEMS
 (continued)

Correction of Weaknesses and Use of Option	t-test	
	Use Option	Do Not Use Option
Mean	3.562	3.388
SD	0.745	0.881
Personal Contact Between Principal and Teacher and		
Use of Option	t-test	
	Use Option	Do Not Use Option
Mean	3.761	3.646
SD	0.572	0.754

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

What Was the Original Intent of the Change?

At the time of the original legislation, the state Legislature was dealing with a wave of educational reform following the release of the A Nation At Risk report and other pressures. Accountability was a major issue in educational reform, and the Legislature's intent was to provide voters with some guarantees of stricter control. During the same legislative session, stronger graduation requirements and other similar statutes were put into place. The reform of the Washington Administrative Codes, and specifically the sections dealing with teacher evaluation, was directed at increasing accountability in this area.

During discussions of these pending changes, much testimony was provided by the Washington Association of School Principals. Much of the testimony of this group was directed at the inclusion of the short form option for teacher evaluation. This group stated strongly, that in the case of teachers with a consistent pattern of achievement and competence, for an administrator to spend hours in meeting evaluation requirements was not reasonable. With regard to summative evaluation, the area addressed most strongly in the Washington Administrative Code, administrators did not see it as reasonable to spend hours in completing evaluation on proven teachers. The group stated that their job responsibilities had greatly increased

in the past few years, with no adjustments in the amount of time allocated to successfully complete these tasks.

Time was the major issue with the principals and their association. The short form option was stressed as a reasonable alternative for decreasing the amount of time needed to complete summative evaluation requirements on proven teachers.

For the Washington Association of School Directors, the provision of the short form option was not an issue. They did believe strongly that the evaluation of teachers was "the most important role for the principal." The School Directors Association worked with the Principal's Association in support of including the short form option.

The Washington Education Association provided testimony which indicated its concern about the short form option. It was perceived that teachers would not see evaluation with the short form option as a positive move. Even strong teachers appreciated being evaluated in a comprehensive manner which allowed them time to meet with their building administrator.

In summary, the intent of the Legislature was to provide administrators with a time-saving way for providing summative evaluation for strong teachers. The unspoken intent was that the time that was saved in providing summative evaluation for proven teachers could be more effectively used in working with weak teachers, and in

working with all teachers in formative evaluation.

Did Change in Fact Take Place as a Result of the Legislative Change, and if so, What Kinds of Change?

For most administrators, practices did not change with the availability of a short form option. Only 42.69% of the responding administrators use either short form option to evaluation eligible teachers. Of the teachers evaluated by the respondents, only about a fourth (24.69%) of those who are eligible for evaluation with the short form are actually evaluated in this manner.

When the short form option was chosen, it was often in order to save time. Over half (51.43%) of respondents report a desire to save time as being a significant or very significant factor in choosing to use the short option. The only factor reported as significant by more respondents was previous experience with the teacher (71.83%).

In reading comments from survey respondents, and in reviewing comments from Phase Two interviews with administrators, it is apparent that many administrators do not perceive that the shortened evaluation process, provided by the short form option, is truly effective teacher evaluation, by itself. Of those who use the option, many indicate that they use the option in conjunction with other activities to provide for both formative and summative evaluation. The administrators' goal was to provide a wide range of feedback to teachers, for their improvement. Many

reported using goal setting and evaluation processes with strong teachers. Others report using the short form option to meet summative evaluation requirements and then working with teachers in other ways to provide for improvement. Use of the short option does provide for more time, and it is likely that much of this time is directed at working with weaker teachers as well as spending additional time with strong teachers. Approximately two-thirds (66.29%) of the administrators who use the short option, report that use does provide them with more time for this purpose.

Over half (50.60%) of the respondent administrators report that they have changed practices in teacher evaluation since the spring of 1985. If you remove the respondents that were not evaluating teachers in the spring of 1985, you find that 57% have changed practice.

Compared to five years ago, over sixty percent report now spending more time on evaluation, report now using a more stringent system of evaluation, and report now using a different type of evaluation system. When reasons for having changed are examined, 10.53% of the respondents report the state policy as the reason for changing.

What were the reasons for change? Respondents list further training, reading research, and district restructuring as primary reasons.

With regard to evaluation of strong and weak teachers, about sixty percent report spending the same amount of time

in evaluation of strong teachers and more time in evaluation of weak teachers. No respondents report spending less time in evaluation of weak teachers.

How Well Do the Actual Changes Relate to the Intended Changes?

The major intent of providing the short form option was to save administrator time. Replies from respondents that use the option show that it does in fact save time. How that time is utilized varies from administrator to administrator, though a majority (66.06%) report spending more time on evaluation than in the past.

In What Situations is the Short Form Option Selected?

By statute, only those teachers with a minimum of four consecutive years of satisfactory evaluations are eligible for evaluation with the short form option. A teacher can only be evaluated with the short form process for two years in a row; at least every third year the standard process must be used.

This study asked administrators to identify the significant factors they consider when deciding to utilize the short form option with eligible teachers, and to identify the significant factors they consider when deciding not to utilize the short form option with eligible teachers.

It is important to note that in choosing whether to use the short form option for evaluation, administrators responding to the survey and in comments, list

experience as a key factor. Previous experience with a teacher was an important factor in choosing to use the option. The opinion that the teachers needed additional feedback was an important factor in choosing not to use the short option. It was also interesting to note that in most cases, when the short option was used for (summative) evaluation, additional methods and activities were completed which addressed formative evaluation areas. It appeared that many administrators utilized the short form option as a means of completing required summative evaluation, which was often threatening by nature. They then moved the teacher evaluation process to one of skill development and individual goal setting.

One administrator reported, "I did the short option and got it (summative) out of the way and then went into the other mode. I came into the classroom and took turns teaching lessons with the teachers....it takes the pressure off, we get evaluation out of the way and then move on."

Administrator comments point out that they must be familiar with the staff before they, as evaluators, are comfortable with the process. Several comments also indicated districts requiring that an administrator not use the option during their first two years of evaluating an individual teacher, or in a building.

The second most commonly listed reason for not using the short form option, with 57.81% of respondents marking

the item as significant or very significant, was that the short form had been used the previous two years.

Even though the Legislature provided the short form option, in part to save administrative time, it appears that local policy and collective bargaining agreements have removed the option for many. Almost two-thirds (64.08%) of those who do not use either option do so because the option is not used in their district.

Have Teacher Evaluation Practices Changed Since the Spring of 1985, and if so, How?

Of the respondents, over half report that they have changed practices in teacher evaluation since the legislation in 1985. Of the remaining respondents, just over 37% reported that they have not changed practice, and the remainder were not evaluating teachers in 1985.

Three types of change were identified by respondents who had changed practices. Ninety-nine percent of those who had changed, report now using a more stringent system for teacher evaluation. Sixty-six percent of the respondents report currently spending more time on teacher evaluation than in 1985. Over sixty-five percent report that they now use a different system for evaluation of teachers.

Why have respondents changed practice? It is interesting note, for purposes of this study, that less than eleven percent of the respondents report having changed practice because of changes in state policy. The most

common reason for changing practice was that the administrator had taken additional training. Other reasons that were commonly cited were having read research on effective schools and research on effective teaching.

Less common reasons for changing practice, along with changes in state policy, were changes in district policy and evaluation systems, and collective bargaining agreements.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS SUMMARY

1. What was the intent of the Legislature in establishing the short form evaluation option? What administrative practices did they in fact intend to change?

The Legislature's intent was to address accountability issues. Their intent was to more specifically identify those components to be included in the evaluation process. The components were collected from research and from examples provided by other states. The inclusion of the short form option was a result of testimony provided by the Washington Association of School Principals and their concerns regarding time.

Overall, the Legislature intended that the six specific evaluation criteria categories be included in all teacher evaluations. With regard to the short form option, the intent was that the areas be addressed, but the data collection processes preceding the evaluation be shortened in order to save administrative time.

It is interesting to note that with the Legislative increase in control, they only addressed summative evaluation.

2. What was the intent of the Legislature, as perceived by the Washington Education Association? as perceived by the Washington Association of School Principals?

The major concern of the Washington Education Association was that the short option was in fact a negative reinforcement for successful teachers. In examining testimony by this group, it was perceived that teachers do not have enough direct contact, quality time to discuss with their supervisors the things that they are doing in their classroom. They considered the short form option to provide even less opportunity for discussion and feedback, especially the option which provided for observations without an annual summary write up.

The school principals' association was concerned with alleviating time pressures. Their testimony was concerned with the fact that the summative evaluation process did not justify their time, or meet the evaluation needs (formative needs) of teachers with a history of successful teaching.

3. What was the intent of the Legislature, as perceived by the Washington Association of School Administrators? as perceived by the Washington School Directors Association?

The Washington Association of School Administrators was most concerned by the changes in policy regarding teacher

evaluation and the inclusion of the six categories. No strong position regarding the short form option was found for this group.

The Washington School Directors Association came out most strongly in their declaration that the evaluation of teachers was "the most important role for the principal." With regard to the short form option, they supported the principals' association's effort to have the short option included in the policy.

4. Did the change in statute in fact change practice?

Yes, the change in statute did lead to change in practice, but much more in the area of overall evaluation than with regard to the short evaluation option. Over sixty-six percent of the respondent principals report that they now spend more time on teacher evaluation than before the policy change. None of the respondents report spending less time with evaluation of weak teachers, and twenty-eight percent report spending less time with evaluation of strong teachers.

5. If practice did change as a result of the statutory change, how well do such changes match intended changes?

With the Legislature's intent for including the short form option being that of saving administrative time, there is some evidence that this may be occurring. Twenty-eight percent of the respondents report spending less time with evaluation of strong teachers. At the same time, over

sixty-six percent spending more time overall on teacher evaluation. It is difficult to tell if the overall increase in time is a result of the change in specificity level of the evaluation categories, a result of the increased staff size, or a result of principals now including more formative evaluation processes into their practices.

6. If statutory change did in fact change practice, did the changes take place in variables which are in fact significant, as shown by research on what is effective in formative teacher evaluation?

In reviewing critical attributes of effective evaluation systems, as discussed on page 29, it appears that changes did in fact occur related to seven of the eight areas identified by Conley (1987) in reviewing studies by Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin and Bernstein (1984). The attribute of having a clear distinction between summative and formative evaluation was not addressed.

7. What triggers an administrator to select the short form or the long form of evaluation for use with an individual teacher?

Previous experience and the desire to save time were the two most commonly identified reasons principals chose to use the short form option with teachers. A desire to provide more extensive feedback, student comments, and the use of the short form option the two previous years were the most common reasons for not selecting the option for use

with eligible teachers.

8. Do administrators perceive use of the short form as giving them more time to help weaker teachers?

Yes, over sixty-six percent of the respondents felt that the use of the short option did provide more time to help weaker teachers.

9. If the short form is used to provide additional time to work with weaker teachers, are administrators in fact spending more time in that role?

Almost sixty-four percent of the respondents report spending more time with evaluation of weak teachers now. It is difficult to determine if that additional time is a result of using the short form option or not.

10. How effective do administrators perceive current methods for evaluating strong and weak teachers to be?

In general, principals are more satisfied with their current summative and formative evaluation systems for strong teachers than with weaker teachers.

11. Is it possible to accurately judge a previously successful teacher's competence without any direct classroom observation?

The consensus of administrators, as interviewed in Phase Two, was that it was not possible to judge teaching competence without direct classroom observation.

12. If the implied intent of the change was that it would make the system more rigorous, has it in fact increased the

system's rigor?

Over sixty percent of the respondents report their current evaluation system to be more stringent than five years ago, it not possible to determine if this change can be attributed directly to the policy under study.

13. Do administrators perceive that either the short or long form of evaluation provides for improvement of instruction (formative evaluation)?

With strong teachers, over sixty-nine percent of the respondents rate current systems as being satisfactory or very effective. With weaker teachers, over fifty-one percent rate their current system as being satisfactory or very effective.

14. Are administrators satisfied with the results of either form of evaluation?

As with the question above, respondents indicate a higher level of satisfaction with both summative and formative evaluation when dealing with strong teachers than when dealing with weaker teachers.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

SUMMARY

This study utilized two separate sets of phone interviews to determine the original intent of the policy under study, and a mailed survey which studied current practice related to the policy. Two hundred seventy-three practicing administrators in Washington were surveyed, with a return rate of 62.64%.

Of the respondents, 66.67% were male, the mean age was 46.407 years, and 70.76% had attained a Master's Degree plus graduate work or higher. Of the respondents 66.08% worked at the elementary level, and the mean number of certificated staff evaluated was 24.935.

Of the certificated staff evaluated by the respondents, 79.53% were eligible for evaluation with the short form option and 19.63% were evaluated with the option. A total of 42.69% of the administrators report using the short form option, with the majority (53.25%) using the option of a single 30-minute observation with a written summary.

Use of the option does provide additional time to work with weak teachers, as reported by 66.29% of the respondents, while 51.43% report that they chose to use the

option to save time.

When teachers are evaluated with the short form option, the most common reasons for choosing the option are teacher's experience, to save administrator time, student achievement, and observations of the teacher outside of the classroom setting. When eligible teachers are not evaluated with the option, the most common reasons for not using the option were the opinion that the teacher needed additional feedback, the fact that the option had been used before, student comments, and parent comments.

Of the respondents who report that they do not use the option, 64.08% report that the option is not used in their district, and 10.56% report that they are not aware of the option.

In looking at the effect of the change in policy, 46.01% report that they don't know what the effect has been, while 39.88% report that the change had little or no effect.

Since the spring of 1985, 50.6% of the principals reported that they have changed practices in teacher evaluation. It is reported by 66.60% that they now spend more time in evaluation, while 60.61% feel their current evaluation system is more stringent than before.

Of those who changed, 34.5% reported doing so because of further training, 43.86% reported doing so because of reading research, and 22.8% reported doing so because their district evaluation system had changed. While only 10.53%

reported doing so because of the changes in state policy, it is likely that changes in district evaluation systems may have come about as a result of the changes in policy at the state level.

Administrators identified important components of teacher evaluation. The most important components, by administrator perception were: personal contact between teacher and administrator, administrative time, reinforcement of teachers, correction of teacher weaknesses, administrative training in evaluation techniques, and frequent feedback to teachers.

The short form option is used more by administrators with more teachers to evaluate. In looking at the number of staff to evaluate and the number of staff eligible for evaluation with the short form, the number of total staff is a significant factor in selection of the option while the number of staff eligible is not significant.

The Washington Association of School Principals lobbied strongly in favor of the option to save administrative time. It appears that the statute has provided that for administrators, though most do not use it without providing other formative evaluation.

The Legislature made policy changes directed at increasing accountability. While other components of the legislation did provide for this, the short form option was limited in that it only dealt with summative evaluation.

For the Washington School Directors Association, the short form option was not an issue. The Washington Education Association did not see the short form evaluation as being a strong positive reinforcement to successful teachers. When used by itself, it is not a strong positive reinforcement, but comments would indicate that administrators who use the option do so, in most cases, in conjunction with individualized goal setting and other formative evaluation techniques.

The unspoken intention of providing the short option was that it would save time. While use of the option may do that, 66.06% of reporting administrators report spending more time with teacher evaluation than before the option was available, and 63.98% report spending more time with evaluation of weak teachers.

CONCLUSIONS

The Legislative intent of providing the short form option was to provide a less time consuming manner of dealing with evaluation of successful teachers. At the same time, the overall statute regarding teacher evaluation, which contained the short form option, was revised with the intent of making it more stringent and accountable.

Use of the short form option does save administrative time. This is supported by the fact that it is used more often with large teaching staffs. It is questionable

whether the short form option, when used by itself, is considered to be effective evaluation. This is especially interesting in light of the fact that the Legislature revised the entire section of statute with regard to teacher evaluation in order to make it more accountable and more stringent. Over 57% of reporting administrators report not using the option, and many of those who use the option spend additional time with short form teachers in formative evaluation processes.

Availability of the short form option for administrative use, while provided for by state policymakers, appears to be restricted locally by collective bargaining agreements and district policy and therefore is not available to many administrators in the state.

It is interesting to note that when the option is not used with eligible teachers, the decision is often based on informal data collection processes such as parent comments, observations of the teacher out of the classroom, student achievement, and other factors.

It should be noted that many of the administrators who responded do see evaluation of teachers as an important portion of their job. It should also be noted that many are spending more time with teacher evaluation than in the past, that many have changed practice in the past five years as a result of reading research or further study, and that many of those who use the short form option as a time saving way

of dealing with summative evaluation spend additional time with formative evaluation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations for Educational Practice

1. Utilize the short form option for summative evaluation.

For the majority of teachers (79.53%) who are eligible for evaluation utilizing the short form option, it is a viable option which will satisfy the needs of summative evaluation. When the short form option which provides for a 30 minute observation and a written summary is used, it provides for meeting all components of the state policy, when the written summary includes comments in all of the teacher evaluation criteria categories as provided for in RCW28A.67.065.

2. Increase the time spent with formative evaluation.

More options for providing for formative evaluation need to be developed and utilized for all teachers. Formative evaluation processes need to provide for personal contact between evaluator and teacher, need to provide for feedback in a broad range of areas, need to address individual goal-setting, and need to be based on well trained staff developers, who may or may not be principals. With larger staffs, it may be wise to look at utilizing a separate trained staff development person. Utilization of a separate individual would provide for more time for

principals to spend on other administrative duties, while at the same time providing teachers with additional feedback and assistance.

The area of formative evaluation needs to be directly addressed in statutes on teacher evaluation.

3. Provision of an "Excels" category for evaluation.

The current system, based strongly on summative evaluation only provides for two categories of summative evaluation: satisfactory or unsatisfactory. This means that a strong, experienced master teacher receives the same "satisfactory" evaluation as does a teacher who only meets the minimum competency requirements.

Recommendations for Further Study

1. Further study on administrative time use.

Since much of the original discussion in developing the short form as an option for teacher evaluation was based around the amount of administrative time, it would be logical to do a more detailed examination of exactly how administrators do in fact spend their time. This information would be useful in development of future changes in policy and regulation at both the state and local level. This would in effect look at the teacher evaluation role as a part of the entire range of duties which are required of school principals.

2. Further study on what teachers perceive as components of effective evaluation.

It is important that those being evaluated have in-put and understanding of the processes and procedures used in evaluating them. This study would help provide for that and at the same time examine the differences in expectations and perceptions between the two involved parties: teachers and administrators.

3. Examine which districts changed evaluation policy and procedures because of the changes in policy at the state level.

To fully understand the impact of the changes in policy, it would be useful to examine the types of changes in local evaluation requirements and policy that have taken place since the spring of 1985.

4. Examine the types of formative evaluation which are being conducted across the state. Other statutes and regulations have been implemented with regard to staff development. Staff development activities have been conducted by most districts, but with most districts doing so in their own manner. Many of these efforts have addressed staff development not as a part of the evaluation process, specifically formative evaluation. Research would indicate that to be most effective, summative and formative evaluation need to be coordinated.

CLOSING REMARKS

In once again looking at Townsend's (1987) conclusions, this researcher agrees that success in developing written policy is much more common than successfully "putting that policy into effective operation." The intent of the policy changes which provided for the short form of teacher evaluation in Washington state were strongly influenced by the in-put of the school principal's association call for more time. The impact on principal time has been minimal, partly due to the limited impact of the short form and partly due to principal choice.

The scope of the resulting policy changes were strongly based on a model of teacher evaluation directed primarily at summative evaluation only. Research indicates strongly that effective evaluation systems must address formative evaluation as well. At this point, it is addressed locally or in other statewide staff development programs and requirements. Research also indicates that there is a strong need to have summative and formative evaluation connected, which they are not in most parts of the state.

In 1988, Torrens examined other components of RCW28A.67.065. I concur with her recommendation that the number of evaluatees per evaluator be limited by utilizing additional evaluators, at least in the area of formative evaluation.

The major issue addressed by the short form option was

that of administrative time. While the option may have provided a way in which evaluation could be accomplished in less time, it is questionable whether or not it is effective, at least in principals' eyes, teacher evaluation.

The bigger issue of administrative time concerns was not adequately addressed by the small concession of providing the short form option for evaluation.

The Legislature did hear the message from principals. Principals were concerned with increasing requirements and demands on their time while the amount of time at their disposal was not increasing. The problem may have been better addressed through increased staffing rather than by providing the short form option. The short form option has had limited impact on the real issue of time, partly because of principal choice not to use the option, and partly because of use limits imposed by local policy and collective bargaining agreements.

By reviewing the entire statutes on teacher evaluation, the Legislature did meet its intent of increasing accountability in that area.

Can you implement change in practice by making changes in policy? It appears that the policy at the state level can effect change in practice, but on a limited basis. While the policy did include specific requirements for observations, times, and criteria categories, these requirements have only served to set broad parameters which

have been interpreted and further restricted by local policy and collective bargaining agreement. It may well be that policy should not be more specific than that, or that to be more specific would infringe on local control issues.

The Legislature, if they wish to change practice might do well to look at the reasons that principals have given for having changed practices in the last five years. Reasons for changing practice have been based much more often on further training, reading effective schools research, reading research on how we should teach, and other comments rather than on changes in state policy. Training and research appear to have had more impact than policy, at either the state or local level. The final resolution might well be to look at funding for research based training rather than restrictive policy and statute.

REFERENCES

- Barber, L. W., & Klein, K. (1983, December) "Merit Pay and Teacher Evaluation" Phi Delta Kappan, 65(4), 247-251.
- Best, J. (1977). Research in Education, 3d ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Brandt, R. (1987, April). "On Teacher Evaluation: A Conversation with Tom McGreal" Educational Leadership, 44(7), 20-25.
- Buck, J. J., & Parsley, J. (Eds.). (1973). The way we see it: a survey of teacher evaluation policies and practices operant in the state of Washington. Seattle, WA: School Information and Research Service.
- Buttram, J. L., & Wilson, B. L. (1987, April). "Promising Trends in Teacher Evaluation" Educational Leadership, 44(7), 4-6.
- Carey, L. M. (1981). State-level teacher performance evaluation policies. Syracuse, NY: National Council of States on Inservice Education.
- Conley, D. T. (1987, April). "Critical Attributes of Effective Evaluation Systems" Educational Leadership, 44(7), 60-64.
- Conley, D. T. (1986). Certificated personnel evaluation in Colorado: a policy study of practices and perceptions at the time of the implementation of the certificated personnel performance evaluation act (H.B. 1338). (Doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, Boulder, 1986). Dissertation Abstracts International, 47, 3252.
- Dela-Dora, D. (1987, May). "Quality Supervision and Organization for Quality Teaching" Educational Leadership, 44(8), 35-38.

- Doyle, D. P., and Hartle, T. W. (1985, September). "Leadership in Education, Governors, Legislators, and Teachers" Phi Delta Kappan, 67(1), 21-27.
- Duckett, W., Strother, D., & Gephart, W. (Eds). "Evaluating the Evaluators" Practical Applications of Research Newsletter of Phi Delta Kappa's Center on Evaluation, Development, and Research, vol. 4 (3), 1982.
- Duke, D. L., & Stiggins, R. J. Teacher Evaluation, Five Keys to Growth. Washington D. C.: A Joint Publication of American Association of School Administrators, National Association of Elementary School Principals, National Association of Secondary School Principals, and the National Education Association, 1986.
- Duncan, A. N. (1986). An assessment of formal teacher evaluation practices in Alberta. Edmonton, Alberta: Alberta Department of Education.
- Eisner, E. W. (1984, March). "Can Educational Research Inform Educational Practice?" Phi Delta Kappan, 65(7), 447-452.
- Ellis, T. I. (1986). Teacher evaluation. Research Roundup. 2(2). 1-6.
- Evaluation of educational personnel. a report of the Massachusetts board of educational personnel. (1980). Boston, MA: Massachusetts State Department of Education.
- Florida Coalition for the Development of a Performance Measurement System. Florida performance Measurement System. Chipley, Fla.: Panhandle Area Educational Cooperative, 1983.
- Gibb, C. E. (1989). Perceptions of classroom teachers and supervisory principals relating to teacher evaluation policies and processes (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1989). Dissertation Abstracts International, 50, 1155.
- Glatthorn, A. A., & Holler, R. L. (1987, April). "Differentiated Teacher Evaluation" Educational Leadership, 44(7), 56-58.
- Glatthorn, A. A. (1984). Differentiated Supervision. Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

- Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1980, February). "Improving Inservice Training: The Messages of Research" Educational Leadership, 37(5). 379-385.
- Lamb, R. W., & Thomas, M. D. (1981, September). "The Art and Science of Teacher Evaluation" Principal, 44-47.
- Little, J., P. Glagaran, & R. O'Neal. (1984). Professional Development Roles and Relationships: Principles and Skills of "Advising." San Francisco: Far West Laboratory.
- McGreal, T. (1983). Successful Teacher Evaluation. Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Millman, J., (Ed.) (1981). Handbook of Teacher Evaluation. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Oldham, N. (1974). Evaluating teachers for professional growth. current trends in school policies and programs. Arlington, VA.: National School Public Relations Association.
- Soar, Robert S., Medley, D. M., & Coker, H. (1983, December). "Teacher Evaluation: A Critique of Currently Used Methods" Phi Delta Kappan, 65(4). 239-246.
- Stiggins, R. J. (1986, May). "Teacher Evaluation: Accountability and Growth Systems--Different Purposes" NAASP Bulletin, pp. 51-58.
- Stiggins, R. J. and Bridgeford, N. J. (1985). "Educational Performance Assessment for Teacher Development." Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 7, 85-87.
- Teacher evaluation: practices and procedures. (1989). Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.
- Torrens, S. E. (1988). A comparison of ideal teacher evaluation conditions to current teacher evaluation practices in Washington state and recommended polity changes pursuant to the "Common School Manual 1987" RCW 28A.67.225 (Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, 1988). Dissertation Abstracts International, 50, 49.

- Townsend, D. (1987). Teacher supervision and evaluation policies in selected Alberta school jurisdiction, 1983-1986; a summary of research, opinion and recent experience relative to implementation. Edmonton, Alberta: Alberta Department of Education.
- Weber, J. R. (1988). Teacher evaluation as a strategy for improving instruction. Elmhurst, IL: North Central Regional Educational Laboratory.
- Wise, A. E. (1988, January). "Legislated Learning Revisited" Phi Delta Kappan, 69(5), 328-332.
- Wise, A., Darlling-Hammond, L., McLaughlin, M., & Bernstein, H. (1984). Teacher Evaluation: A Study of Effective Practices. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.
- Wise, A. E. (1984). Teacher evaluation: a study of effective practices. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.
- Yudof, M. G. (1984, March). "Educational Policy Research and the New Consensus of the 1980's" Phi Delta Kappan, 65(7), 456-459.

APPENDIX A

PHONE INTERVIEWS TO DETERMINE LEGISLATIVE INTENT

Phase One:

Phone Interviews to Determine Legislative Intent.

AUDIENCE: Members of the Washington Education Association, members of the Washington Association of School Administrators, and members of the Legislature.

INTRODUCTION: In April of 1985, the 49th Legislature provided for changes in statute related to teacher evaluation. One of the changes provided for a shortened process for evaluation of successful teachers.

This study proposes to examine the original intent of that legislation and subsequent changes in administrative practice.

Testimony and/or support of this statute was provided by you as a member of (Legislature, WASA, WEA).

INTERVIEW CORD STRUCTURE:

All responses in this interview will be kept in private, and you as an individual will not be directly linked with your responses. You may also choose to omit any question(s) to which you do not want to respond.

Are you willing to take part in this study by participating in a phone interview?

Please help me identify a time when I can contact you by phone for this interview. I will be mailing you an Informed Consent Form for your signature and return prior to the phone interview.

Repeat introduction above.

QUESTION 1. As you look back at those changes, what do you remember as the significant issues surrounding that legislation, and especially the part of that legislation which established the shortened evaluation option?

QUESTION 2. What do you see as the intent of providing that option?

QUESTION 3. Do you remember specific desired changes in administrative practice which were issues in developing the legislation?

QUESTION 4. What was the intent of the Legislature, as perceived by your association?

QUESTION 5. Did the final legislation address the

concerns/issues of you and/or your group? If not, what was not addressed?

QUESTION 6. If the change was to alter administrative practice, what specific changes do you think were intended to take place?

QUESTION 7. What changes in practice do think have come about as a result of this legislation?

QUESTION 8. Are there other individuals I should contact regarding the original intent of the short form evaluation option?

Thank you for your time and help with this survey.

APPENDIX B

PHONE INTERVIEWS WITH PRACTICING ADMINISTRATORS

Part Two:

Phone Interviews With Practicing Administrators.

AUDIENCE: Practicing school administrators

INTRODUCTION: In April of 1985, the 49th Legislature provided for changes in statute related to teacher evaluation. One of the changes provided for a shortened process for evaluation of successful teachers.

This study proposes to examine the original intent of that legislation and subsequent changes in administrative practice.

This statute provided for a shortened evaluation process option for administrators to use with successful teachers.

All responses in this interview will be kept in private, and you as an individual will not be directly linked with your responses. You may also choose to omit any question(s) to which you do not want to respond.

Are you willing to take part in this study by participating in a phone interview?

Please help me identify a time when I can contact you by phone for this interview. I will be mailing you an Informed Consent Form for your signature and return prior to the phone interview.

INTERVIEW CORD STRUCTURE:

Repeat introduction above.

QUESTION 1. Have you used the shortened evaluation option?

If not, why?

QUESTION 2. Think about those situations where you have used the short process in the last several years. Without revealing any individual teacher names or individual information, please describe why you chose to use the shortened process option.

QUESTION 3. Think about those situations where you did not use the shortened process option. Again, without revealing specific individual teacher names or information, please describe why you chose not to use the shortened process.

QUESTION 4. Has the shortened process option changed any of your practices with regard to evaluation? How?

QUESTION 5. Does the shortened process take less time than

the longer process?

QUESTION 6. Are you able to spend more time with weak teachers as a result of using the shortened process?

QUESTION 7. What current methods do you use to work with strong and weak teachers?

QUESTION 8. Do any of the methods available adequately work to evaluate strong and weak teachers? Which ones are most effective with strong teachers? With weak teachers?

QUESTION 9. How confident are you about using the short form evaluation? Is one thirty minute observation as accurate as the regular evaluation requirements in judging a teacher's success?

QUESTION 10. Is it possible to accurately judge a previously successful teacher's competence without any direct classroom observation?

QUESTION 11. The implied intent of the change was that it would not harm the system, has it in fact harmed the system, and how?

QUESTION 12. What do you see as being the key ingredients
in successful teacher evaluation?

Thank you for your help in completing this survey.

APPENDIX C

MAILED SURVEY OF PRACTICING ADMINISTRATORS

Dear Fellow Administrator,

I am studying current practices in teacher evaluation in Washington State as a part of my doctoral program. Your responses to this survey will be of great help.

In April of 1985, the 49th Legislature provided for changes in statute related to the definition of teacher evaluation standards and criteria.

One of the changes provided a short form evaluation option which could be used with teachers who had received satisfactory evaluations for four previous years. This short form of evaluation could be based on either

1. a thirty minute observation with a written summary
or
2. a final written evaluation based on the standard criteria and two observations totaling at least 60 minutes, but without a written summary of such observations being prepared.

This study will examine the use of this option in relation to the original legislative intent.

All replies will be kept confidential and neither your name or identity will be used for publication or public discussion purposes. You are free to withdraw from participation at any time without jeopardy, and you may choose not to answer any individual questions presented on this survey.

If you would like a copy of the results of this study, please furnish your mailing address at the bottom of the separate Informed Consent Form.

Please complete and return this survey in the enclosed stamped envelope by May 5, 1990.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE!

James C. Leffler
Asst. Principal
Burton Elementary School

1. Sex ☐ male
 ☐ female
2. Age _____
3. Current title ☐ principal
 ☐ associate or assistant principal
4. Educational level ☐ BA plus graduate work
 ☐ MA or MS
 ☐ MA or MS plus graduate work
 ☐ Ed. Specialist
 ☐ PhD or EdD
5. Experience ☐ years in education
 ☐ years administrative experience
 ☐ years in current location
6. Present grade level ☐ elementary
 ☐ intermediate or middle school
 ☐ junior high
 ☐ senior high
 ☐ other (specify) _____
-

7. Total certificated staff you evaluate ____
8. Total certificated staff you, evaluate, with 4 or more
years satisfactory evaluations ____
9. Total certificated staff you evaluated using the short
form option during the 1988-1989 ____
10. Do you use either short form option? (check one)
- ____ yes (go to question 11)
- ____ no (go to question 15)
11. Which short form of evaluation do you use? (check one)
- ____ use 30 minute observation with written
summary
- ____ use 2 observations of 60 minutes total with
no written summary
- ____ use both short form evaluation methods
- ____ do not use either short form option
12. Does the use of the short form evaluation give you more
time to work with weak teachers? (check one)
- ____ yes
- ____ no
13. Think about those teachers where you have used the

short form of evaluation. Rate each item below from
1 - 4 as to its importance in choosing the short form
option.

(4= Very Significant 3= Significant
2= Minor Significance 1= No Significance)

- _____ previous experience with the teacher
- _____ I saw the short form as a reward to the
teacher
- _____ I wanted to save time
- _____ frequency of discipline referrals to
office
- _____ parent comments
- _____ observations out of classroom setting
- _____ student achievement
- _____ student comments
- _____ other (specify) _____

14. Think about those teachers who could have been evaluated with the short form of evaluation but were not. Rate each item below from 1-4 as to its importance in not choosing the short form option.

(4= Very Significant 3= Significant

2=Minor Significance 1= No Significance)

_____ Short form had been used 2 previous
years with this teacher

_____ I felt the teacher needed the
additional feedback

_____ frequency of discipline referrals to
office

_____ parent comments

_____ observations out of classroom setting

_____ student achievement

_____ student comments

_____ other (specify) _____

(go to question 16)

15. Reason for not using either shortened option:

(check one)

_____ not in use in our district

_____ do not believe it is effective for
teacher evaluation

_____ was not aware of short form option

_____ other (please explain) _____

16. What has been the effect of having the short form of evaluation option: (check one)

- ☐ the system is more stringent
- ☐ the system is weakened
- ☐ the option has had little or no effect
- ☐ don't know

17. Have you changed your practices in teacher evaluation since spring 1985? (check one)

- ☐ yes (please go to question 18)
- ☐ no (please go to question 20)
- ☐ was not evaluating teachers in 1985
(please go to question 22)

18. How have you changed your practice in teacher evaluation since 1985? In each pair of statements below, check the one that most accurately describes your situation.

☐ I now spend less time on evaluation than in 1985.

☐ I now spend more time on evaluation than in 1985.

☐ The evaluation system I use is now more stringent.

☐ The evaluation system I use is now less stringent.

☐ I now use a different type of evaluation system than in 1985.

☐ I use the same type of evaluation system as in 1985.

19. Why did you change practice? Check any statements below which are reasons for your having changed practice since 1985.

- ☐ The evaluation system in my district changed.
- ☐ I have had additional training.
- ☐ My district is in a restructuring process.
- ☐ I have read new research on how we should teach.
- ☐ I have read effective schools research.
- ☐ The state policy has changed.
- ☐ other (specify) _____

20. Compared to 5 years ago, how much time do you spend with evaluation of strong teachers? (check one)

- ☐ same amount of time
- ☐ more time
- ☐ less time

21. Compared to 5 years ago, how much time do you spend with evaluation of weak teachers? (check one)

☐ same amount of time
☐ more time
☐ less time

22. How well does your current teacher evaluation system provide for formative evaluation (improvement of instruction) with strong teachers? (check one)

☐ very effectively
☐ satisfactorily
☐ less than satisfactorily
☐ poorly

23. Look at the statements below. Rate each from 1 to 4 as to their importance as components of effective teacher evaluation?

4= Very Important 3= Important

2= Little Importance 1=Not Important

- ___ District developed evaluation criteria
- ___ District places a priority on evaluation
- ___ State developed evaluation criteria
- ___ State places a priority on evaluation
- ___ Staff development program in the district
- ___ Administrative training in evaluation techniques
- ___ Evaluation system reflects current research
- ___ Sufficient administrative time for evaluation
- ___ Use of teachers and mentors to help with evaluation
- ___ Frequent classroom observations
- ___ Frequent feedback to teachers
- ___ Modeling practices by principal
- ___ Reinforcement of teachers
- ___ Correction of weaknesses
- ___ Personal contact between principal and teacher
- ___ Other (specify) _____

24. How well does your current teacher evaluation system provide for summative evaluation (annual rating of satisfactory or unsatisfactory) with strong teachers? (check one)

☐ very effectively
☐ satisfactorily
☐ less than satisfactorily
☐ poorly

25. How well does your current teacher evaluation system provide for formative evaluation (improvement of instruction) with weak teachers? (check one)

☐ very effectively
☐ satisfactorily
☐ less than satisfactorily
☐ poorly

26. How well does your current teacher evaluation system provide for summative evaluation (annual rating of satisfactory or unsatisfactory) with weak teachers?
(check one)

☐ very effectively
☐ satisfactorily
☐ less than satisfactorily
☐ poorly

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP AND ASSISTANCE. PLEASE RETURN THIS SURVEY, ALONG WITH THE SEPARATE INFORMED CONSENT FORM IN THE ENCLOSED POSTAGE PAID ENVELOPE.

APPENDIX D

COMMENTS FROM MAILED SURVEY

QUESTION 13. Think about those teachers where you have used the short form of evaluation. Rate each item below from 1-4 as to its importance in choosing the short form option.

- o Coupled with goal setting to go beyond meeting the minimum standards.
- o 4 plus years of experience
- o I don't use, all teachers deserve the fullest attention.
- o Annual evaluation became repetitious.
- o Limit on how many can be placed on this each year.
- o Those with 4 years of satisfactory get to choose method of observation, I have nothing to do with it.
- o This first year, I put everyone on it to prevent problems.
- o Negotiated agreement.
- o Rotation, every other year.
- o Teacher's own efforts toward improvement .

QUESTION 14. Think about those teachers who could have been evaluated with the short form of evaluation but were not. Rate each item below from 1-4 as to its importance in not choosing the short form option.

- o Four years of satisfactory ratings.
- o Length of time teaching.

- o I need to be in classrooms ... try to break staff into groups with differing supervision.
- o Other staff member concerns.
- o One third per year, 3 year rotation.
- o Contractual agreement.
- o Encouraged to use long form since I did not have over 30 in building to evaluate.
- o Great teachers want specific feedback to help them grow.
- o Teacher comments.

QUESTION 15. Reason for not using either shortened option:

- o New to Washington state.
- o Felt long form more valuable, as new administrator I like to write more
- o New to building, don't know teachers instructional skills well enough.
- o Teacher needs feedback.
- o Our school district requires a two year period of evaluation by a principal before short form use.

QUESTION 16. What has been the effect of having the short form of evaluation option?

- o Collective bargaining has not agreed yet.
- o More time for formative evaluations.

QUESTION 19. Why did you change practice? Check any statement below which are reasons for your having changed practice since 1985.

- ☐ Negotiated agreement.
- ☐ I wasn't doing a good job of evaluation so I changed systems and data collection.
- ☐ Attended workshop in use of five by five.
- ☐ Increased staff size.
- ☐ Moved to new district.
- ☐ Personal growth in working with people.
- ☐ Greater responsibility, more to evaluate.
- ☐ The building is so large (over 800 students) I don't have the time to be the instructional leader I want to be.

QUESTION 23. Look at the statements below. Rate each from 1 to 4 as to their importance as components of effective teacher evaluation.

- ☐ Goal setting with teachers.
- ☐ Goal setting in September.
- ☐ Administrative time with district priority.
- ☐ Supervision for growth is the key.
- ☐ Experts in field for modeling.
- ☐ Teachers with teachers.

- o In-service which is available.
- o Video taping every 3 years as part of reinforcement.
- o Survey of students by teachers in at least 2 classes every year to set goals for improvement.
- o Strong interpersonal relationship skills for principal or evaluator.

OTHER COMMENTS:

- o Need to have "excels" category for strong teachers.
- o It is not necessary to impose the evaluation system on a master teacher year after year.
- o A problem with the current evaluation process in the state of Washington is that observation /evaluations comments are similar to unsolicited advice. We often reject unsolicited advice. If a teacher cannot satisfactorily "perform" for a 30 minute observation then he/she ought not to be teaching. The entire process is artificial. During an observation, not only do the teacher perform, but so do the students. However, teachers, students, parents and administrators can separately rank order the teachers from best to worst and the results will be nearly identical. We all know the effective and ineffective

teachers, because of tenure, getting the ineffective teacher to change is difficult.