

Portland State University

**PDXScholar**

---

Dissertations and Theses

Dissertations and Theses

---

1988

# The Effectiveness of a Teacher Evaluation Process as Perceived by Teachers and Building-level Administrators

David Stewart Halstead  
*Portland State University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open\\_access\\_etds](https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds)

**Let us know how access to this document benefits you.**

---

## Recommended Citation

Halstead, David Stewart, "The Effectiveness of a Teacher Evaluation Process as Perceived by Teachers and Building-level Administrators" (1988). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 1219.  
<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.1218>

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](mailto:pdxscholar@pdx.edu).

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF A TEACHER EVALUATION PROCESS AS  
PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS AND BUILDING-LEVEL ADMINISTRATORS

by

DAVID STEWART HALSTEAD

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

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION  
in  
PUBLIC SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION

Portland State University

©1988

TO THE OFFICE OF GRADUATE STUDIES:

The members of the Committee approve the dissertation  
of David S. Halstead presented August 2, 1988.

  
Ulrich H. Hardt, Chairperson

  
Loyde W. Hales

  
John F. Heflin

  
John D. Lind

  
Robert V. Brustad

APPROVED:

  
Robert B. Everhart, Dean, School of Education

  
Bernard Ross, Vice Provost for Graduate Studies

AN ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION OF David S. Halstead for  
the Doctor of Education in Public School Administration and  
Supervision presented August 2, 1988.

TITLE: The Effectiveness of a Teacher Evaluation Process  
as Perceived by Teachers and Building-level  
Administrators.

APPROVED BY MEMBERS OF THE DISSERTATION COMMITTEE:

[REDACTED]

Ulrich H. Hardt, Chairperson

[REDACTED]

Loyde W. Hales

[REDACTED]

John F. Heflin

[REDACTED]

John D. Lind

[REDACTED]

Robert L. Brustad

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions held by building administrators and teachers of the evaluation system being used in the Vancouver (Wash.) School District. Through the administration of separate questionnaires for building administrators and teachers,

research was conducted to determine if significant differences existed among groups of teachers, among groups of building-level administrators, and among building-level administrators and teachers.

The population of the study consisted of 235 randomly selected teachers from kindergarten through high school and 29 building-level administrators. Two different questionnaires were administered, one to teachers and one to building administrators, to determine the sample's perceptions of the current evaluation system being used in the Vancouver School District.

Results of the questionnaires were examined based upon the categories of evaluator quality; comfort with evaluator; frequency of classroom visitations; evaluation procedural points; and utilization of evaluation results.

Data within the building administrator group were examined through Chi Square, as also were comparative data between the building administrator and teacher groups. Data within the teacher group were examined both through Chi Square and through MANOVA and ANOVA statistical analysis.

The results of the study indicated that teacher grade level may have a significant impact upon a teacher's perception of the evaluation process, but gender, age and teaching experience may not significantly impact teacher perceptions. The data further showed that grade level may

not be significant in building administrator perceptions. In regards to comparing teacher and building administrator perceptions, it was found that these two groups may have different perceptions of a teacher evaluation system and process.

Recommendations for improvements in the evaluation system for the school district are included. These same recommendations may also be appropriate for other school districts as well. Other districts are encouraged to review their evaluation process in a similar manner to determine its perceived effectiveness by the practitioners that use it.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation is the culmination of a special area of interest of mine for the past fourteen years that I have been a school administrator. Were it not for the assistance, guidance and motivation of others, this document would not have been possible.

I wish to thank the Vancouver School District and its employees, both for permission to conduct the research with its staff, and for the cooperation of those who were selected to participate in the study. I wish to especially thank Mr. Allen Smith for his computer work and data analysis.

I would like to express appreciation to the members of my committee, Dr. John Lind, Dr. John Heflin, and Dr. Robert Brustad for their help and support. I would like to especially acknowledge the assistance of Dr. Ulrich Hardt, my advisor throughout my doctoral program, and Dr. Loyde Hales, for his assistance in the technical part of this study.

And, finally, I wish to thank my wife, Linda, and our two boys, Jeffrey and Michael. Throughout the many countless hours of work, your patience and encouragement have been appreciated. It is because of this, that I dedicate this dissertation to you.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .	iii
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	ix
 CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Definition of Effectiveness . . . . .	6
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	7
Purpose . . . . .	9
Operational Definition of Terms . . . . .	10
Teacher	
Teach	
Evaluation	
Building-level Administrators	
Principal	
Assistant Principal	
Significance of the Study . . . . .	11
II REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .	13
Definitions of Evaluation . . . . .	13
Purposes of Evaluation . . . . .	16
Historical Development of Evaluation . . . . .	20
Evaluation Methods . . . . .	27
Teachers and the Process . . . . .	31
Principals and the Process . . . . .	35
Processes and the System . . . . .	42
Forms and Procedures of Evaluation . . . . .	48

## CHAPTER

	Effective Program Characteristics . . . .	49
	Improving the System . . . . .	57
	Recent Research in Relationship to this Study . . . . .	64
	Summary of the Literature Review . . . .	68
	Current Evaluation Laws in Washington State . . . . .	72
	Current Evaluation Policies in the Vancouver School District . . . . .	75
III	METHODS AND PROCEDURES . . . . .	79
	Introduction . . . . .	79
	General Purpose of the Study . . . . .	79
	Research Questions . . . . .	80
	Sampling Methodology . . . . .	81
	Population Sampling Procedures Return Rate	
	Brief Overview . . . . .	84
	Questionnaire Design Field Testing of the Questionnaire Data Collection Procedures Data Analysis	
	Demographic Characteristics . . . . .	89
	Gender Age Education Job Category Undergraduate Major Total Teaching Experience Vancouver School District Teaching Experience	

## CHAPTER

Current Building Teaching Experience  
 Evaluation Form Used  
 Administrative Experience

IV	RESULTS OF THE STUDY . . . . .	99
	Introduction . . . . .	99
	Building-level Administrator Responses . . . . .	99
	Total Group Responses Comparison of Elementary and Secondary Administrators	
	Teacher Responses . . . . .	121
	Total Group Responses Demographic Group Responses	
	Comparison of Teachers and Building- level Administrators . . . . .	144
	Evaluator Quality Comfort with Evaluator Frequency of Classroom Visitations Evaluation Procedural Points Utilization of Evaluation Information and Overall View of the Evaluation Process	
	Review: Open-ended Comments . . . . .	157
	Orientation Process Pre-conference Observational Process Report Preparation Post-conference Goal Setting General Comments	
	Summary of Results . . . . .	163

## CHAPTER

V	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . .	168
	Introduction . . . . .	168
	Summary and Conclusions . . . . .	168
	Cluster 1: General Perceptions of the Evaluator's Skills	
	Cluster 2: Comfort with the Evaluator	
	Cluster 3: Frequency of Classroom Visits by Evaluator	
	Cluster 4: The Evaluation Process	
	Cluster 5: The Use of Evaluation Information and Overall View of the Evaluation Process	
	Limitations of the Study . . . . .	174
	Recommendations . . . . .	175
	Building Administrator Responsibili- ties	
	Goal Setting Process	
	Evaluation Process	
	Review of Effective Evaluation Programs	
	Recommendations for Further Study	
	BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	182
	APPENDICES . . . . .	193
	Appendix A: Professional Evaluation Interview Schedule	
	Appendix B: Report: Professional Preparation	
	Appendix C: Building Administrator Evaluation Perception Questionnaire	
	Appendix D: Teacher Evaluation Perception Questionnaire	
	Appendix E: Application for Review of Research Project for Human Subjects Committee	

CHAPTER

Appendix F: Invitation to Participate in the  
Study: Building Administrators

Appendix G: Invitation to Participate in the  
Study: Teachers

# LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I	Participant Breakdown and Return Rate for Teachers . . . . .	84
II	Participant Breakdown and Return Rate for Building Administrators . . . . .	84
III	Breakdown of Respondents by Gender . . . . .	90
IV	Breakdown of Respondents by Age . . . . .	91
V	Breakdown of Respondents by Education . . . . .	92
VI	Breakdown of Respondents by Job Category . . . . .	93
VII	Undergraduate Major. . . . .	94
VIII	Total Teaching Experience . . . . .	95
IX	Vancouver Teaching Experience. . . . .	96
X	Experience of Teachers in Current Building . . . . .	97
XI	Teacher Evaluation Form Used . . . . .	97
XII	Administrative Experience - Building Administrators . . . . .	98
XIII	Responses of Building Administrators to the Evaluator Quality Items on the Administrator Questionnaire. . . . .	101
XIV	Responses of Building Administrators to the Comfort with Evaluator Items on the Administrator Questionnaire . . . . .	102
XV	Responses of Building Administrators to the Frequency of Classroom Visitations Items on the Administrator Questionnaire . . . . .	105
XVI	Responses of Building Administrators to the Evaluation Procedural Points Items on the Administrator Questionnaire . . . . .	107

## TABLE

## PAGE

XVII	Responses of Building Administrators to the Utilization of Evaluation Results Items on the Administrator Questionnaire . . . . .	109
XVIII	Responses of Elementary and Secondary Building Administrators to the Evaluator Quality Items on the Administrator Questionnaire. .	112
XIX	Responses of Elementary and Secondary Building Administrators to the Comfort with Evaluator Items on the Administrator Questionnaire. .	113
XX	Responses of Elementary and Secondary Building Administrators to the Frequency of Classroom Visitation Items on the Administrator Questionnaire . . . . .	115
XXI	Responses of Elementary and Secondary Building Administrators to the Evaluation Procedural Points Items on the Administrator Questionnaire. . . . .	117
XXII	Responses of Elementary and Secondary Building Administrators to the Utilization of Evaluation Results Items on the Administrator Questionnaire. . . . .	119
XXIII	Percentage of Responses by Teachers in Cluster 1: General Perceptions of the Evaluator's Skills . . . . .	122
XXIV	Percentage of Responses by Teachers in Cluster 2: Comfort with the Evaluator . . . . .	124
XXV	Percentage of Responses by Teachers in Cluster 3: Frequency of Classroom Visits by the Evaluator . . . . .	125
XXVI	Percentage of Responses by Teachers in Cluster 4: Evaluation Process . . . . .	127
XXVII	Percentage of Responses by Teachers in Cluster 5: Use of Evaluation Information and Overall View of the Evaluation Process . .	129

TABLE	PAGE
XXVIII Means, Standard Deviations, and Reliability Coefficients for the Total Teacher Sample on the Clusters of the Teacher Evaluation Perception Questionnaire . . . . .	131
XXIX Results of MANOVA Using Teaching Level, Gender, Age, and Teaching Experience as Dependent Variables Using Wilks' Lambda Multivariate Test of Significance . . . . .	133
XXX Scale Means and Standard Deviation in Relationship to Gender . . . . .	134
XXXI Scale Means and Standard Deviation in Relationship to Teacher Age . . . . .	136
XXXII Scale Means and Standard Deviation in Relationship to Teaching Experience . . . . .	137
XXXIII Scale Means and Standard Deviation in Relationship to Teacher Level. . . . .	140
XXXIV Analysis of Variance Table for the Teaching Level Variable Using the Clusters as Dependent Variables. . . . .	141
XXXV Responses of Teachers and Building Administrators to the Evaluator Quality Items on the Administrator Questionnaire. . . . .	145
XXXVI Responses of Teachers and Building Administrators to the Comfort with the Evaluator Items on the Administrator Questionnaire . . . . .	147
XXXVII Responses of Teachers and Building Administrators to the Frequency of Classroom Visitation Items on the Administrator Questionnaire . . . . .	151
XXXVIII Responses of Teachers and Building Administrators to the Evaluation Procedural Points Items on the Administrator Questionnaire . . . . .	152

## TABLE

## PAGE

XXXIX	Responses of Teachers and Building Administrators to the Utilization of Evaluation Results Items on the Administrator Questionnaire . . . . .	155
-------	--	-----

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Today's building level administrators assume a variety of responsibilities as they manage public schools. One of the most important of these functions is that of evaluating teachers. In Washington State, and across America, principals, assistant principals, and other administrators spend hours observing and evaluating classroom teachers and making recommendations on how these teachers can improve their instructional skills. It is believed in educational circles that by making such observations and evaluations, and by making recommendations for improvement, the quality of instruction within the classroom will improve (Bolton, 1973; and Frels, Cooper & Reagan, 1984).

Researchers have identified various external forces that have prompted an increased interest in teacher evaluation. Knapp (1984) believes that three of these forces exist. First, with the decline of school enrollment over recent time, the need for public school teachers is not as great as it has been in the past. As a result, before teachers reach the point of being eligible for tenure or for a continuing contract, administrators are more

carefully scrutinizing teacher candidates. By moving to more formalized methods of evaluation, such as those promoted by Hunter (1976), Good (1984), and Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, and Bernstein (1984), administrators are better able to justify the results of selection criteria that are used to fill positions. Second, the public has recently voiced its dissatisfaction with perceived teacher incompetence. The public continually hears from the media that students in the public schools are performing poorly. Since it is the teacher who is in the classroom with students, the blame for this inferior performance falls on the teacher. Evaluation methods are seen by both the public and the educational community as an effective way of weeding out poor teachers. Although such uses of evaluation often create feelings of anxiety between the principal and the teacher and lessen the effectiveness of principals in working with staffs, it is commonly felt by educators that the advantages of such uses for evaluation far outweigh the disadvantages. Third, although dismissal cases rarely occur, evaluation methods used to implement "Reduction in Force" (RIF) policies have come into use when teaching staffs must be reduced due to enrollment declines. However, it should be remembered that union pressure, contract agreements, and state law limit the role of performance evaluation in reducing teacher personnel through RIF policies and procedures.

Darling-Hammond, Wise and Pease (1983) see the public's demands for higher student performance as the most significant reason for increased teacher evaluation. They state that the public has come to believe that the key to improving our schools lies in the upgrading of the quality of teachers rather than in changing school structure or curriculum. An important reason for this is that the upgrading of teachers is perceived by the public to be less expensive than the changing of curriculums or structures. Recent Gallup Polls support such beliefs as well. The 1979 Gallup Poll found that the most frequent response as to what schools could do to earn an "A" grade was the improvement of teacher quality (Darling-Hammond, et al., 1983). This can only occur if some method of monitoring teacher performance within the classroom is established.

To be qualified to observe and evaluate teachers effectively, building administrators in Washington must be well trained in the evaluation process. This training includes knowledge of Washington State statutory requirements for teacher evaluation; familiarity with local school district policies and regulations that govern teacher evaluation; knowledge of effective teaching strategies, instructional and learning theories; and expertise in utilizing the process of clinical supervision. Evaluators spend many hours in instruction and training in order to be well prepared to observe and recommend improvements in

classroom instruction. These hours are usually obtained through local colleges or universities that offer courses in the evaluation cycle conducting the evaluation process with teachers.

As is the case in most states, Washington law (Revised Code of Washington RCW 28A.67.065, p. 2, Common School Manual, 1987) requires each certificated teacher to be formally observed at least twice for no fewer than a total of sixty minutes in the teacher's classroom during each school year. Believing that instructional performance will improve if principals are spending time observing teachers, some school districts require their building administrators to spend more than the minimum amount of time for teacher observation. Washougal (Wash.) School District, for example, requires its building administrators to spend approximately 100 minutes per year observing each teacher. But, in most cases administrators will spend the state-required one hour minimum in observing each teacher. This is because principals have so many job responsibilities other than teacher evaluation that the time they spend on evaluating teachers becomes minimal.

By no means is one hour the extent of the time committed by building administrators to the evaluation process for each teacher. The observation must be reviewed, evaluated, and a post-conference must be prepared and conducted with the teacher, which can demand as much as two

additional hours for each classroom observation. Some school districts also require evaluators to conduct a conference prior to the classroom observation. This can take an additional hour. Depending upon district requirements, the entire process for each classroom observation may take the building administrator as much as three to four hours.

Even though building administrators must be well trained and qualified to evaluate teachers, and even though many hours are spent in meeting statutory requirements, many building administrators do not place enough emphasis upon the evaluation process to improve instruction. To them, the minimum required by statute and district policy becomes the maximum.

Some researchers suggest that many more hours should be spent on the evaluation process. Duke and Stiggins (1986) support the concept of one-third of the principal's time being spent on evaluation. Gorton and McIntyre (1978) report that, although principals place personnel (evaluation, advising, conferencing, and recruiting) as their highest priority on the job, school management actually takes the greatest amount of time. This results in principals spending less time on efforts to affect change in teacher performance and more time on the daily management of the building. Although the research of Drake and Wagner (1986) found that principals identified evaluation as their

highest job priority, actual time spent in this area was 9.55 percent, third in time spent behind attendance at meetings and student supervision. Even though principals perceive evaluation to be a very important part of their job, according to Drake and Wagner, principals do not devote the necessary time to this function in order to improve instruction in the classroom.

#### DEFINITION OF EFFECTIVENESS

For the purpose of this study, it is important to explain what is meant by the word effectiveness, which is found in the study's title. Effectiveness involves determining whether a system meets the needs for which the system was originally designed. In this case, the system is the teacher evaluation process. Its effectiveness is dependent upon its success in determining whether considered judgements concerning the professional accomplishments and competencies of certificated employees are being accomplished (National School Public Relations Association, 1974). In order for the evaluation system to be effective, it must be a process that improves and maintains the quality of the school district's educational program (Educational Research Service, 1978). To be effective, the evaluation process must focus upon education improvement through the upgrading of teacher skills (Darling-Hammond, et al., 1983). To the author of this study, effectiveness

refers to the ability of the current Vancouver School District evaluation process in upgrading teaching skills of the classroom teacher. This improvement can be determined through improved student academic performance and through trained evaluator judgements of the teacher's teaching skills.

#### STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In spite of the training given to building administrators and the time devoted to the evaluation process, one cannot help but wonder how much of this time is meaningful in relationship to improving the teacher's classroom instruction. Research has shown that principals often feel that their efforts in making recommendations for instructional improvement do little to change teacher behavior within the classroom. Some researchers (McCarty, Kaufman & Stafford, 1986; McLaughlin, 1984; and Mosher & Purpel, 1972) have found that teachers perceive current evaluation processes to be useless. Jones (Weisenstein, 1976) sees current methods of teacher evaluation as ". . . an ongoing tradition having little relationship to instructional improvement" (p. 2). Jones also states that neither the administrators conducting the evaluations nor the teachers being evaluated give much credence to current methods being used. It is his belief that current evaluation systems are

better designed to build evidence of poor teaching rather than to improve the teacher's instructional skills.

Often the principal is the one blamed for the evaluation system's failure. Researchers (Blumberg, 1980; DeRoche, 1981; McCarty, et al., 1986; and Mooney, 1984) have questioned the ability of principals to be effective in both managing and evaluating teachers under their supervision.

Dull (1981) believes that the key element in the success of supervisory visits depends upon good relations between the supervisor and the teacher. He believes that the principal's attitudes and procedures can make the evaluation program an enlightening, interesting, exciting venture or one that is frustrating, intimidating, and unmotivating by those involved. Gorton and McIntyre (1978) report that the problems most ineffectively handled by principals pertain to teacher performance. Cooper (1984) found that virtually no research suggests that the supervision of instruction makes an appreciable difference in the way teachers conduct their classes. Additionally, Berliner's research (1975) questions whether teaching behavior has any impact upon student performance.

If one agrees with the work of Cooper and Berliner, then it can be assumed that some questions exist as to the significance of evaluation to improve student performance. Nevertheless, principals and school districts continue

their current practices, effective or ineffective, in evaluating teachers in the classroom.

The work of Cooper and Berliner only leaves further questions in the minds of the practitioner. Do administrators at different grade levels possess different perceptions of the teacher evaluation system? Do teachers in different demographic groups possess different perceptions of the teacher evaluation system? Do teachers and principals perceive the teacher evaluation system differently?

#### PURPOSE

It is this authors's purpose to investigate the perceptions held by teachers and building administrators of the evaluation process being used in the Vancouver (Wash.) School District. Through the administration of separate questionnaires to teachers and building administrators, research will be conducted to find answers to the following research questions:

1. Is there a statistically significant difference between the perceptions of building-level elementary and secondary administrators regarding the effectiveness of the current teacher evaluation process?
2. Is there a statistically significant difference among the perceptions of teachers in various demographic groups (gender, age, teaching level,

teaching experience) regarding the effectiveness of the current Vancouver School District teacher evaluation process?

3. Is there a statistically significant difference between the perceptions of teachers and building-level administrators regarding the effectiveness of the current Vancouver School District teacher evaluation process?

#### OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS

Several educational terms are found throughout this study that require definitions for the benefit of the reader. This section will provide some specific definitions that relate directly to this study.

##### Teacher

A teacher is an individual who has completed a professional curriculum course of study, is certificated to teach and whose principle duties involve the directing of student learning experiences (Dejnozka & Leapel, 1982).

##### Teach

To teach is to engage in the instructing of curriculum to designated students (Hawes & Hawes, 1982).

##### Evaluation

Evaluation is a program designed for the appraisal of a teacher's performance. Guidelines for carrying out such

programs are normally detailed in board of education policy statements. Evaluation involves the collection of information in relationship to the total school setting (Dejnozka & Leapel, 1982).

#### Building-level Administrators

Building-level administrators within the Vancouver School District consist of both principals and assistant principals assigned to the building level.

#### Principal

A principal is the chief administrator for a school (Hawes & Hawes, 1982). The principal is administratively responsible to the superintendent of schools or one of his/her assistants (Dejnozka & Leapel, 1982).

#### Assistant Principal

An assistant principal is a member of a building administrative team and is directly responsible to the principal. Within the Vancouver School District, specific job descriptions with general functions are assigned to each assistant principal.

### SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This study is significant in three ways. First, by obtaining information from certificated employees within the Vancouver School District about their perceptions of the current evaluation process, the District can critically

examine its current evaluation system's strengths and weaknesses. Second, if the results indicate dissatisfaction with the current evaluation model, the District may decide to revise the current model and develop a more effective system. Third, if the study results validate satisfaction with the process and perceived effectiveness in its ability to improve instruction, then the results support continued use of the current evaluation system by the school district.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Recent literature in the area of teacher evaluation provides some significant findings. This chapter provides a framework for definitions of evaluation, the purposes of evaluation, the historical development of evaluation, problems with current evaluation systems, examples of successful evaluation systems, recent research in relationship to this study, current evaluation laws in Washington State, and current evaluation policies in the Vancouver School District.

### DEFINITIONS OF EVALUATION

It is often difficult for educators to comprehend the meaning of the term "teacher evaluation." It has been used in many different ways to mean many different things. To some, it refers to the final written comments made about an educator's performance for the previous year's work. To others, it pertains to the dialogue that occurs between evaluator and evaluatee regarding an observed teaching experience. Still to others, it can be a combination of both short-term recommendations for a given observation and a long-term assessment of one's performance.

Abbott (Barber, 1983) suggests teacher evaluation to be a general assessment of one's personal performance. He sees this personal assessment as a basis for the evaluatee to use for personal and professional growth and for the improvement of performance. Lewis (1973) provides the following definition:

. . . the judgment by one or more educators, usually the immediate supervisor, on the manner in which another educator has been fulfilling his professional responsibilities to the school district over a specified period of time. (p. 23)

Many school districts include definitions within their evaluation policies to clarify terms and to address the concerns of all parties, including teacher unions. Such a definition is found in the Belmont (Calif.) School District Evaluation Plan (National School Public Relations Association, 1974):

Evaluation is the process of making considered judgments concerning the professional accomplishments and competencies of all certificated employees, based on a broad knowledge of the areas of performance involved, the characteristics of the situation of the individuals being evaluated, and the specific standards of performance pre-established for their positions. Evaluation should promote awareness of the strengths and weaknesses of all certificated personnel, provide for growth, and improvement and encourage beneficial change. It is much broader than any single assessment technique or instrument, and it is a necessary function in maintaining a viable profession. Evaluation of personnel should be directed to the total educational process in order that children are able to develop to the best of their abilities. It should be constructive, fair and

equitable. Communication between the evaluator and the evaluatee should be ongoing. (p. 5)

Another commonly accepted definition is "Evaluation is a cooperative and continuing process for the purpose of improving and maintaining the quality of educational programs in the school district," (Educational Research Service, 1978, p. 168).

Many educators confuse the words evaluation and supervision when discussing the two processes. In many cases, and in many educational circles, both words are used interchangeably. However, Embretson, Ferber, and Langager (1984) use differing definitions for the two terms. To them, supervision is a developmental process which fosters continuous growth and development in the art of teaching, while evaluation is a management function designed to maintain efficiency within the organization and to establish standards for personal performance.

One author (Borich, 1977) believes that the need for evaluation has evolved from the public's demand for greater accountability from our schools. If our schools are evaluated in some way, Borich believes that they become more accountable to the public and can justify better their programs and needs. Frels, Cooper and Reagan (1984) believe that an evaluation policy should generally contain a statement of its purpose, a repeal of any prior policies and procedures, and a statement of how the policy will be

applied. It should also identify who is to be assessed and who will be doing the assessing.

Knapp (1984) divides evaluation into two elements, formative and summative evaluation. Formative evaluation consists of the usual observational process used by supervisors in the schools. It is an ongoing method in which efforts are made to improve teacher effectiveness. Summative evaluation is that process that occurs at or near the conclusion of the school year. Included in a summative format is a value judgement of the teacher's efforts over the entire year. Prince (1984) defines formative evaluation as a supervisor making judgements about teacher performance and using observed data for the purpose of giving feedback to help teachers fit into the overall plan of the school district. Summative evaluation involves a determination of what the teacher has accomplished and permits the administrator to take some action that affects the teacher's job. This may be in the form of reward, transfer or termination. Prince further believes that the two are completely different and should not be confused.

#### PURPOSES OF EVALUATION

The primary purpose of evaluation is for professional improvement. In most cases, this professional improvement occurs through improving instruction in the classroom by evaluating one's performance. It is to help insure the

existence of a quality teaching staff so that educational quality may be maintained and enhanced (Frels, et al., 1984). It is seen as a process of judging the performance of an employee and is often based upon one's ability to fulfill a job description for the position. Both strengths and weaknesses are to be emphasized in the evaluation and communication between both parties is an integral part of the process.

Although the basic purpose of teacher evaluation is for professional improvement, other more specific functions of evaluation have also been identified. Bolton (1973) lists the following specific functions/purposes of teacher evaluation as a means of improving classroom instruction:

1. To improve teaching through the identification of ways to change teaching systems, teaching environments, or teaching behaviors.
2. To supply information that will lead to the modification of assignments, such as placement in other positions, promotions, and terminations.
3. To protect students from incompetence and teachers from unprofessional administrators.
4. To reward superior performance.
5. To validate the school system's teacher selection process.
6. To provide a basis for teachers' career planning and professional development. (p. vii)

Beach and Reinhartz (1984) find teacher evaluation to take many forms, but its use is basically to collect information about the teaching act and to codify the information

received in a systematic way so that decisions can be made about a teacher's level of instructional performance. Doyle (1983a) sees the purpose of the evaluation process for diagnosing and helping to improve teaching, aiding in administrative decisions regarding individual faculty, helping students choose courses and plan programs, and providing a criterion for research on teaching itself. Dull's comparative research (1981) into school district collective bargaining contracts shows that of the contracts reviewed, most school systems state that classroom visitations should be to improve instruction, improve teacher effectiveness, inspire professional growth, and to shape a teacher's successful career in education.

Wood and Pohland (1983) found that, based upon the responses from 363 school district superintendents, the four most frequently mentioned purposes of teacher evaluation are: 1) to help teachers improve their teaching performance (349 responses); 2) to decide on renewed appointment of probationary teachers (328 responses); 3) to recommend probationary teachers for tenure or continuing contract status (326 responses); and 4) to recommend dismissal of unsatisfactory tenured or continuing contract teachers (317 responses). One can see that the most frequently mentioned purpose of teacher evaluation in Wood and Pohland's work is considerably different from the other three mentioned purposes.

Drake and Roe (1986) see evaluation's purpose to help the educational process relate better to the needs of students. In better relating to student needs, evaluation becomes a continuous process which focuses upon improving the effectiveness of reaching the school's goals and objectives. In order for the process to be successful, the client's needs and the school's goals and objectives must work together in the teaching act.

Lewis (1973) finds the purpose of evaluation to be based upon the benefits that are realized by both the teacher and the administrator. Utilizing the teacher's current record of performance allows the administrator to make intelligent decisions concerning the teacher's current and future status within the organization. Teachers may better develop their abilities when they are knowledgeable of their professional strengths and weaknesses. Fredrich (1984) states that, although the expressed purpose of evaluation is to improve instructional quality, the actual purpose is to determine the professional future of teachers or to decide who is to receive tenure.

Ellis (1986) believes that teacher evaluation can become more successful within schools:

Teacher evaluation need not be what it too often becomes: an essentially meaningless formality regarded with suspicion and even contempt by teachers and as frustrating by supervisors. Moreover, it does not have to be a source of contention between teachers and administrators. If a teacher evaluation system is research-based,

designed to improve instruction, and approached with a cooperative attitude by all parties, it can be an effective and dynamic agent for educational renewal. (p. 1)

#### HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF EVALUATION

Little has been written about the evolving effectiveness that has developed over time in the evaluation process. In fact, not until about 1970 did evaluation become a recognized and necessary part of the expectations placed upon supervisors. This is primarily due to early educational philosophy of schooling in America. Horace Mann found in his early visits to schools that teachers spent most of their time organizing material and work for students. (Travers in Millman, 1981). He further emphasized the common belief of the time that all children were capable of learning if they would just apply themselves to their studies. The role of the teacher was that of an individual who would dispense knowledge to those students that wanted it. Major emphasis was placed upon the student's desire to use the classroom teacher as the purveyor of knowledge. Not until recent times have teachers been held accountable for student learning. And with this accountability has come the desire for evaluating teacher effectiveness to determine if student learning is a result of teacher performance within the classroom.

Davis' research (1964) found that early forms of teacher evaluation prior to and in the early 1900's in the

Milwaukee Schools consisted of unclassified traits and the assigning of numerical efficiency grades in larger school systems. In 1910, E.C. Elliott (Davis, 1964) released the "Provisional Plan for the Measure of Merit of Teachers." It consisted of a score card that has often been copied and is still found in some school districts. Included on the card were seven headings--physical efficiency, moral-native efficiency, administrative efficiency, dynamic efficiency, projected efficiency, achieved efficiency, and social efficiency. Under each of these headings were criteria appropriate for determining a teacher's efficiency and corresponding space for the evaluator to check one's level of competence.

By the year 1912 evaluation had become a common topic in educational circles. In that year, teacher evaluation became an item of discussion by the National Education Association (NEA) Department of Superintendents as organized teachers identified the measurement movement in the first report to the National Council of Education, which at that time was a part of NEA (Davis, 1964). During this time, most schools interpreted educational accountability through the process of administering and interpreting results of standardized tests given to students. If students scored well on these tests, it was believed that the school was effective in student learning and, likewise, effective in teaching in the classroom.

The first known teacher and course evaluation materials were published by a group of Harvard students in 1927 and were called the Confidential Guide to Courses, (Doyle, 1983b). These materials included not only methods and techniques to determine curricular effectiveness, but teacher effectiveness was addressed as well. Although the guide was designed to evaluate teachers and professors at Harvard, the format was adopted by public schools in an effort to evaluate their teachers by using some standardized methods.

Interest in teacher evaluation is found by Doyle (1983b) to be a cyclical process, with greater interest occurring during the early years of World War I, in the early 1920's, and in 1927, and declines in interest occurring between these times. This is primarily due to increased national interest and a feeling of greater need for education during certain times in our history. Since the end of World War II, interest has gradually increased, peaking in the mid-1970's and remaining stable through the past fifteen years. When it appears that schools need to improve upon their product, greater accountability is emphasized by the American public. This accountability is usually addressed through some methods of teacher evaluation.

Kimball Wiles (Mooney, 1984) developed a concept of supervision in the post World War II era which included

skill concepts in teaching, group processes, skill in evaluation, and skill in human relations. Emphasis was also placed upon the development of staff morale, motivation of teachers, shared leadership, cooperative decision-making, self-evaluation, and the development of staff leadership.

Hobar and Sullivan (1984) found that, although the systematic observation of instruction can be traced to the early 1900s, the methodology of teacher observation began to flourish and affect education between the 1940's and 1960's. The evaluation systems during this time primarily involved rating scales. When it was determined that the limitations of rating scales were dependent upon both the scale and the rater using the scale, new methods of evaluation were introduced. One of these was pioneered by D.G. Ryans in 1960 (Hobar & Sullivan, 1984). The Classroom Observation Record, developed by Ryans, trained observers in a six-step procedure that involved techniques in utilizing the rating scale, observations followed by conferences, and a reliability check to achieve agreement between the evaluator and evaluatee.

From the late 1960's to the early 1980's many classroom observational instruments were developed to answer the concerns expressed with the checklist methods being used (Hobar & Sullivan, 1984). Most of these methods relied upon increased reliability and validity in data collection and in refined processes in the recognition and coding of

observable behavior. This refining of classroom observational instruments was paralleled by increased sophistication in educational research within the classroom (Hobar & Sullivan, 1984; Medley, 1972; Medley, 1978; and Medley & Mitzel, 1958).

As time passed, the process and concept of teaching evolved from the original belief in the teacher as purveyor of knowledge to one in which the teacher was viewed as providing lessons and instruction to students. The most significant event that brought teacher evaluation into modern thought was the development of clinical supervision by Morris Cogan and a group of colleagues at Harvard University in the 1960's. Dull (1981) identifies the five parts of Cogan's clinical supervision model to be pre-observation conference, observation, analysis and strategy, supervisory conference, and post-conference analysis. Much of Cogan's work has been adopted in today's school evaluation processes by such highly respected educational researchers as Hunter (1984). Eventually, it became a common belief in education that the teacher and the learning conditions, not the pupil, were responsible for learning quantity and quality.

According to the National School Public Relations Association (1974), the pressure to evaluate teachers increased in the 1960's due to an increased cry from the public for greater accountability in the classroom.

Budgets became tight, which resulted in the evaluation process being utilized as a valid method of reducing staff when necessary or justifying the need for increased support for education. Travers (1981) states that research in the last decade has tended to move away from studying the teacher and toward studying the pupil. The goal of this effort has been to focus on what works in the classroom in order to improve student learning. Although such research is not new, emphasis upon its practical utilization in regards to student outcomes has received greater emphasis.

During the 1960's, little was written about the evaluation process. This was primarily due to the inability of educators to fully understand it themselves and the lack of research in this area. Suddenly, books which focused upon the topic of evaluation began to appear during the 1970's. Major works by Bolton (1973), Miller (1972, 1974), and Page (1974), all focused upon the process of teacher evaluation and emphasized various methods that the authors felt were effective in improving instruction.

Of particular interest is the research of Wood and Pohland (1983) in reviewing historical changes in evaluative criteria. Using the work of Boyce (1915), Davis (1964), Reavis and Cooper (1945), and Wood and Pohland (1978) to compare changes that have occurred in the selection of evaluative criteria over time, Wood and Pohland find that the importance originally placed upon the

evaluation of teacher personal characteristics has persisted and increased over time. Only in a single instrument analyzed by Wood and Pohland (1983) is the percent of items assessing the instructional role greater than that assessing personal characteristics. Wood and Pohland also found that the emphasis given to the instructional role of the teacher has remained relatively constant. In reviewing the total areas of evaluative criteria, the variables upon which teachers are evaluated seem to have remained largely constant over time with but minor variation and fluctuation in emphasis. From this review of data it becomes clear that those criteria established at the turn of the century have remained.

Of significance is a Rand Corporation study (Darling-Hammond, et al., 1983) which found increased interest when the subject of teacher evaluation became a part of collective bargaining agreements. McDonnel and Pascal (1979) found that the percentage of teacher evaluation provisions within contracts increased from 42 to 65 percent between 1970 and 1975. It becomes obvious that with greater emphasis upon the evaluation process for reasons of accountability, teacher unions would become more actively involved in the formulation of policy and adoption of various methods of evaluating teachers. Despite the fear that such evaluation methods are used for the purpose of teacher lay-off and nonrenewal, research by the American Association of

School Administrators (Lewis, 1982) found that few school districts actually used the evaluation methods for such purposes.

What does this indicate in relationship to the changes and advances that have occurred in education over the past 75 years? It appears that, despite what the research has found in regards to effective methods of teaching, the evaluation instruments used may not be keeping abreast with what has been identified as effective teaching techniques. Many sources believe that the current methods being used for evaluation are a waste of time and resources (McLaughlin, 1984). Darling-Hammond, et al. (1983) have found that, to most school districts, teacher evaluation is nothing more than a ritual that contributes little to school improvement but much to teacher anxiety and administrator burden. This is often true even in school districts that are practicing the latest methods as supported by research. Ellis (1986) claims that no completely objective approach to assessing teacher performance has ever been found, although researchers have made significant gains in recent years.

#### EVALUATION METHODS

The process of evaluating a teacher is more than just an administrator visiting the classroom and making some notes of what has been observed. Researchers (Soar, Medley

& Coker, 1983) have found the process to consist of three main methods: 1) teacher competency tests; 2) student achievement test performance; and 3) teacher performance ratings. Most evaluation systems will use one or more of these methods to evaluate teachers. Within these three methods, some examples can provide further understanding of their use by schools. First, in some states such as Texas, teachers have been evaluated based upon their abilities to perform on a test of competence. In this case, the National Teacher Examination is the device used most often for the establishment of such competence. Unfortunately, it is difficult to draw any conclusions about one's teaching abilities in relation to one's ability to perform satisfactorily on a standardized test. Secondly, teachers have been evaluated upon the ability of their students to perform on achievement tests. Millman's research (1981) found this to be a hotly debated topic in education, with local and national teacher unions being strongly opposed to such methods of accountability. Although such forms of evaluation are found in both formative and summative evaluations, the greatest opposition occurs with summative evaluation because more is at stake for the teacher. Summative evaluation has greater significance upon the continued employment of the teacher within the system. In most cases, student achievement test scores are used by the public rather than school districts. Unfortunately, the public that is

using such information for comparative reasons does not understand the many problems which can develop when one interprets standardized tests beyond the test's original intentions. The final and most commonly accepted method of evaluation is that of ratings of teacher performance within the classroom. Such methods may be used in several ways. In addition to having a supervisor or principal evaluate performance, approximately a third of all school systems require some formalized self-evaluation by teachers (Kowalski, 1978; and Carroll, 1981). According to Soar, et al. (1983), neither of these methods has proven to be totally successful. Despite this, school districts continue to utilize systems that include one or all of the above listed methods.

One other method of evaluation that has been practiced on a smaller scale with limited results is peer review (French-Lazovik, 1981). Since schools have experienced limited success with its use, the effectiveness of peer review has yet to be determined.

The research has shown a significant similarity between evaluation techniques used by schools. Haefele (1980) reviewed twelve common evaluative techniques that have been found in various school districts. In summary, these were:

1. Observations by supervisors, peers, or students that are informal and systematic.

2. Standardized testing of teacher knowledge or classroom skills.
3. The measurement of student achievement in relation to teacher performance.
4. The establishment of mutually determined goals by teachers and their supervisors.

Beach and Reinhartz (1984) have used the recent research of Manatt (1981), Rosenshine and Furst (1971), Walberg, Schiller, and Haertel (1979) to develop an evaluation system that utilizes a model for effective teaching. That model includes the following teaching skill areas:

1. Clarity of Instruction. Can evidence be shown that planning of organizational instruction has occurred? Has consideration been given for smooth transitions between lesson steps?
2. Enthusiasm during Instruction. Does the teacher demonstrate enjoyment and involvement in the act of teaching?
3. Task Orientation. Are the students actively and productively engaged in the act of learning?
4. Instructional Strategy. Is a variety of teaching methods demonstrated in the classroom?
5. Use of Interesting Questions. Does the teacher ask questions of significance? Are the questions structured so as to evoke deeper levels of thinking skills from students?
6. Interaction with Students. Does a positive climate exist in the classroom? Is the relationship between teachers and students businesslike, fair, open, and honest? (pp. 31-33)

All of these indicators, if present, can contribute to the elements of instruction that Beach and Reinhartz (1984) believe are found in effective classrooms.

#### TEACHERS AND THE PROCESS

Several researchers have proposed reasons for the inability of the evaluation process to be successful in the improvement of instruction. Schools have been seen as bureaucratic bodies, pyramidal in structure, and ill designed for policy and procedural change (Dreeben, 1970). According to Dreeben (1970), present within this structure is the absence of clear and standardized guidelines in which teacher performance can be judged and in which the quality of schools can be determined. Within the bureaucratic structure of schools, Scott (1966) identifies four areas of conflict that exist between the professionals within the organization and the bureaucratic organization itself:

1. Professionals are basically self-motivated individuals that tend to resist bureaucratic rules.
2. Professionals tend to see bureaucratic standards as self-serving of the organization and fight to reject them.
3. Professionals see bureaucratic supervision similar to Big Brother (a sense of distrust which tends to negate the concept of professionalism), which results in resistance to such supervision.
4. Professionals develop conditional or tentative loyalty to the bureaucracy. (pp. 38-9)

Dreeben (1970) also states that although the central point of agreement among professionals is that the role of the principal is one of supervision, most principals are limited to making short, fragmentary classroom observations that are seldom comprehensive enough to provide recommendations that are usable by the classroom teacher. Unfortunately, according to Dreeben, classroom teachers must rely upon their own experiences and perceptions in order to improve upon their performances.

Scott (1966) sees professionals as educators participating in two very distinct systems; the profession and the organization. The membership in both systems places important restrictions on the organization's attempt to deploy them in a rational manner with respect to its own goals. Scott also believes that the profession and the bureaucracy rest on fundamentally different principles of organization, and these divergent principles generate conflicts between professionals and their employees in certain specific areas such as evaluation.

In relationship to the evaluation process, it is important to keep in mind the comments of Dreeben (1970):

The presence of managerial or supervisory personnel can immediately change the character of a classroom from a relatively private setting to a public one; it is well known that private and public conduct may change radically even when there is nothing to hide . . . . What the supervising principal sees is a distorted picture of classroom events, a perspective that may work to the long-run detriment of the teacher whose problems may be real and easily

remedied if the principal has a fair look at them and benefits the teacher through his undistorted observation. (p. 61)

McCarty, et al. (1986) conducted research which included teacher interviews regarding current evaluation processes in Wisconsin. Seventy-six teachers in 36 districts were asked their perceptions on how and when they were supervised or evaluated, how they learned how well they were doing in the classroom, and what direct or indirect effects supervision or evaluation had on their teaching activities. The results were dismal. Approximately 80 percent of the teachers pointed out that the typical supervisory practice was a single in-class visit once every two or three years, followed by a generalized formal rating. The teachers found such evaluation methods to be non-specific and totally useless in regards to teacher credibility and for improving instruction. Only twenty percent of those questioned responded that the clinical supervision model, made famous by Madeline Hunter (1976), was used in their evaluation process.

McLaughlin (1984) sees teachers as not being pleased with current teacher evaluation systems. In his research, teachers that had been identified by administrators as being strong complained that most current systems did not acknowledge excellence within the classroom, provided feedback that was too general to be useful, and failed to address the problem of teacher incompetence. Weak teachers

were also unhappy, because the diagnosis and assistance that they sought to improve their skills did not often occur. To teachers who see themselves as less than satisfactory, McLaughlin claims their satisfactory marks are meaningless. With grading systems using checklists for evaluation, Good (1981) finds teachers raise several items of concern:

1. Since the outcome of learning is cumulative, it is difficult to isolate one teacher's effect on student performance. This, of course, utilizes the product approach to evaluation.
2. Student performance is dependent upon both teacher behaviors and activities. These may be affected by socioeconomic status, school climate, pupil abilities, and previous instructional treatment. With such factors affecting student learning, teacher effectiveness is but a small portion of the entire learning process.
3. Good (1983) states that in regards to the practices that work for teachers in the classroom, teacher methods and techniques vary considerably. He states that no single teaching method works for all teachers. Each teacher is unique and what works for one may not work for another.

Research conducted by Neville (1966) and Jackson (1968) found that teachers perceive supervision as a threat. Mosher and Purpel (1972), reviewing recent research on supervision effectiveness, found that not a single study related the efforts of supervision to positive attitude and performance. In the research of McIntyre and Morris (1982), although most principals view evaluation as being primarily for instructional improvement, teachers' opinions are that evaluation is primarily used as a means of determining contract renewal.

Some research has supported the process of evaluation for improved teacher effectiveness. Through the research of Manatt, Palmer, and Hidlebaugh (1976), it was found that teachers' job performance improved when they knew they would be observed by a competent supervisor who is interested and capable of helping them to improve instructionally.

#### PRINCIPALS AND THE PROCESS

Weisenstein (1976) agrees with Jones' review of the literature (1972) which states that, "an average secondary student can do a better rating job than supervisors" (p. 8). Although most supervisors would take issue with such an opinion, the research does support that changes need to occur with the principal if evaluation is to become more effective in improving instruction.

Throughout the evolving process in the development of evaluation, it has always been recognized that the individual responsible for the evaluation of personnel has been the school principal (Davis, 1964). Frels, et al. (1984) state that until the civil rights movement in the 1950's and 1960's, the right of the principal to assess a teacher on any aspect of performance or activity was generally unquestioned. However, with the application of the first amendment to teachers, school administrators could no longer evaluate teachers for such activities as joining unions or engaging in protective speech activities. In fact, many current evaluation systems have often been stripped of everything except the barest essentials of the teacher's skills with students in the classroom.

Additionally, with the effective schools movement in the past ten years, principals have been seen as instructional leaders and are expected to participate more fully in the evaluation process (United States Department of Education, 1986). This is where the greatest problem with the system lies. For, even though principals have accepted additional duties with teacher evaluation, no previous responsibilities have been removed. The result is that principals do not have the time to evaluate staff in the ways the public currently expects.

Methods used for the evaluation process have included checklists, open-ended questionnaires, interval performance

recording, and rating scales (Lewis, 1973). However, it is important to remember that no system is foolproof when it involves the subjectivity of the evaluator.

Many writers have discussed what they believe is a conflict between the role of the principal as both evaluator and supervisor. Blumberg (1980) believes that the supervisor's conflict with role stems mainly from the demands that the organization places upon the role. DeRoche (1981) believes that, like it or not, the principal is saddled with the duality of responsibility which includes being supportive, analytic, and non-evaluative at times and pressed with improving instruction through other, more demanding roles at other times. Drake and Roe (1986) see the conflict in a similar way:

There are many problems associated with the evaluation of one human being by another human being. Indeed, this may be the crux of the problem, namely, that evaluation is perceived as deciding a person's worth; then his or her relative worthiness becomes a matter of official record. Often, the arguments are used that one cannot properly assess the teaching act, and that there is no proven relationship between many personal characteristics and good teaching. It would appear to be appropriate to reduce the emphasis upon the person by focusing upon the results of his or her work. (p. 292)

McCarty, et al. (1986) question whether it is possible to both evaluate and supervise teachers fairly and accurately. Such a question is further complicated by the interchangeable use of the words supervision and evaluation. McCarty, et al. (1986), using the work of Cogan

(1973) and Goldhammer (1969), define supervision as, "the developmental process of directing, guiding, and supporting the instructional behavior of teachers for the purpose of improving instruction" (p. 351). Evaluation is seen as "an administrative task that involves making a performance judgement about the effectiveness and quality of teaching" (p. 351). Supervision is, therefore, used to enhance the act of teaching within the classroom. It is not a value judgement of someone's individual worth. On the other hand, the process of evaluation is used to rank teachers in relationship to other teachers and in relationship to their relative worth within the organization. In order for teacher evaluation systems to work, well defined criteria and objectives must be established beforehand. The major problem that exists is that research demonstrates that school districts continue to develop evaluation systems that are not well articulated, inconsistently applied, and utilize the opinions of supervisors rather than any substantive method of measurement (Darling-Hammond, et al., 1983). McCarty's research (1986) also indicates that teachers seldom receive constructive suggestions from a principal that actually lead to a change in their teaching. Instead, teachers rely on their students to motivate them, or upon the suggestions of their colleagues. To support his research, McCarty states:

Unless teachers are viewed as individuals capable of diagnosing the learning needs of students and able to make judgements about appropriate learning strategies and tactics, their competence is not challenged. Some will mistakenly interpret this to mean that teachers should be left alone, which is almost impossible given the current emphasis on close supervision. Rather, teachers should be dignified with more respect, better supervision, more contact with their counterparts, and--not to be forgotten--praise when it is desired. (p. 353)

One common complaint and concern with principals in the evaluation process occurs when teachers receive low or unsatisfactory ratings. McLaughlin (1984) found that principals give more teachers ratings of "satisfactory" or "outstanding." Seldom does a teacher receive "needs improvement," or "unsatisfactory." Principals rationalize such ratings on the political and bureaucratic problems associated with teacher evaluations. McLaughlin claims that low ratings risk conflicts with teacher organizations; evaluators feel a lack of self-confidence in characterizing a teacher as being unsatisfactory without being able to offer recommendations for improvement; often building principals do not feel the support that they need from school district central offices; and time and resources do not permit one to respond satisfactorily to inadequate ratings.

Feiman-Nemser and Floden (1984) maintain that teachers seldom respect principals as being experts on practices within the classroom or as skilled observers of classroom activities. If a principal's credibility is

lacking, teachers question the legitimacy of the principal's comments on individual performance and often ignore the findings of such reports.

It is important to remember that in the role of the principal, such a person has a crucial part to play in providing the credible feedback essential to a teacher's sense of efficacy. Regularly conducted classroom observations, utilizing principal/evaluator classroom observation skills, can be critical in providing the review and diagnosis essential to teacher satisfaction, classroom effectiveness, and self-growth (McLaughlin, 1984). If conducted with the goal of instructional improvement as central to the process, teachers can view evaluation as professionally and personally rewarding. Teachers may come to value the evaluation process as an important source of information concerning their performance and an integral part of self-evaluation and goal setting for self-growth. A further advantage of using specific recommendations for improvement is that the evaluation process moves beyond the traditional global statements ("Keep up the good work" or "Classroom is well organized") to more specific statements that relate directly to the process of teaching in the classroom. Specific statements can be used by teachers more effectively when they strive to improve their classroom instructional techniques. McLaughlin (1984) states that such programs of teacher evaluation provide both the

language and the content of the communication associated with good teaching and improved practice.

Still another reason for problems with evaluation lies in the job responsibilities that accompany the principalship. Mooney (1984) states:

Traditionally, principals, overwhelmed with running the store and putting out fires, have lamented the lack of time. Sad but true, modern theories of supervision have made the time crunch worse for principals. They can no longer duck into a classroom, record a few notes, complete a form, and call it supervision. With the advent of clinical supervision there is a demand for more time for research, planning and conferences with the teacher before and after the classroom observation, thus compounding the demand for more supervisory time for busy principals. (p. 1)

Killian and Sexton's research (1979) shows that principals spend their management time in the following ways:

1. Maintenance (51%) - management of daily routines.
2. Critical/crisis (31.25%) - management of problems externally imposed.
3. Professional (16.3%) - management of self-imposed and directed decisions.

With such time commitments with the job, it is difficult to see how principals can spend more time than they currently do in evaluation. Time does not permit it to occur.

Unless school districts take a critical look at the role of the principal in relationship to duties and responsibilities, the likelihood of principals devoting more time to evaluation is impossible.

Unfortunately, there appears to be no real effort in education for the role to be changed. The only chance for such change to occur is for principals and teachers to no longer accept the situation as it currently exists and to push for changes that will improve current practices.

#### PROCESSES AND THE SYSTEM

Weisenstein (1976) quotes Jones' (1972) opinion on the current state of evaluation as ". . . an ongoing tradition having little relationship to instructional improvement" (p. 2). Weisenstein goes on to say:

Neither the administrators who are doing the evaluating nor the teachers who are being evaluated give much credence to the current system of evaluation which Jones claims is suited only to build evidence of poor teaching and is not used as an instrument to improve instruction. (p. 2)

Wise, et al. (1984) maintain that the criteria, the process for the collection of data, and evaluator's competence contribute to the validity of the evaluation process. They have found through their research that the process must suit the purpose if the results are to be judged as valid.

Medley, et al. (1983) identified four minimum steps that are essential in the development of a valid method of evaluation of teacher performance. Those steps are: (1) defining a task to be performed by the teacher in instructional or behavioral terms; (2) documenting a record of the

teacher's behavior while the task is being performed; (3) developing some method of scoring the record of the teacher's performance; and (4) based upon predetermined standards, comparing the score against other scores by other teachers. Unfortunately, when developing evaluation policies and procedures, many school districts do not utilize the recommendations of Medley, et al. Research shows that not only does the need exist for such systems to be adopted by school districts, but the need for such adoption is urgent.

Many professionals and researchers are not happy with current evaluation processes. Medley, et al. (1984) believe that current methods of evaluation have proven their ineffectiveness, as witnessed by the number of poor teachers within our schools that continue to teach until retirement. They further state that successful teacher evaluation systems must utilize research that has identified effective teaching as the criteria for evaluation. The National School Public Relations Association (Cummings & Schwab, 1978) claims that the problem is in making valid judgements about something as complex and personal as a teacher's abilities. Unless schools can identify what causal relationships occur between teaching and learning, the teacher's abilities are merely subjective judgements. McGreal (1984) believes that successful evaluation systems must possess a realistic attitude about the purpose of

evaluation. Goal setting must be the major focus of the system. It is the only logical alternative to the kinds of systems that contain rating scales and standardized criteria. The goal-setting process is a cooperative activity between the supervisor and the teacher that results in a mutually agreeable focus. Despite this, school districts tend to adopt nearly identical evaluation systems and processes that have little likelihood of success.

Similarity in the evaluation forms used by school districts has been substantiated through research. Review of a recent Rand study (Tracy & MacNaughton, 1986), found that thirty-two school districts used similar criteria or categories for evaluating teacher competency. These criteria fell into the following five common themes: teaching procedures, classroom management, knowledge of subject matter, personal characteristics, and professional responsibility. Tracy and MacNaughton refer to these as the traditional supervisory categories, those which judge teacher performance on the presence or absence of certain characteristics.

Wood and Pohland's (1983) earlier mentioned work, which found the Educational Research Service review of school district responses to the question of the purpose of evaluation, indicated that 349 of 363 school districts identified the purpose of teacher evaluation to be that of helping teachers to improve. However, in reviewing the

evaluation instruments used by the districts, it was found by Wood and Pohland that the evaluative criteria did not focus upon improving teaching skills. In fact, only 28.22% of the items in the rating scale instruments related directly to the act of teaching within the classroom. Even personal characteristics of the teacher received a higher percentage of rating criteria (30.03%) than teaching skills. Most significantly, all non-instructional criteria totaled 70.02 percent of the total evaluation criteria. More emphasis was given to organizational maintenance (consisting of personal characteristics, student outcomes, organizational/membership roles, professional role, social role and administrator/manager role) within the classroom than to the instructional strategy used by teachers.

Wood and Pohland's work provides an interesting narrative that demands the consideration and review by school district policy-makers. If school districts do support the premise that teacher evaluation is primarily for the purpose of improving classroom teaching skills, then those items within the evaluative criteria should primarily focus upon classroom teaching, and fewer criteria should address those other areas of the teacher's responsibilities.

McLaughlin (1984) states that teacher evaluation which utilize a system of describing and diagnosing the act of teaching in specific and concrete terms can be the most effective and legitimate means of quality control within

schools. This is because such a system appeals to the basic principals of professionalism and the improvement of one's skills within the classroom. However, such a system forces consistency in observing teaching style and teacher behavior. Stodolsky (1984) claims that such systems do not do justice to the wide range of teaching styles, behaviors, and skills found within the classroom. Her research, primarily conducted in elementary schools, supports flexibility in teaching styles and behaviors. She concludes that evaluators should examine teaching within an overall context rather than simply identify the presence or absence of a list of desirable teaching behaviors. Such research conflicts with most of that which has supported consistent evaluation criteria and methods.

One problem identified by Berliner (1975) with current evaluation systems is that educators are committed to competency training and evaluation without the existence of empirical evidence linking teacher behavior to student outcomes in classroom settings. Berliner says:

Such works as the Coleman Report and its offshoots have minimized the role of the teacher in accounting for educational outcomes. If what they say is true, that teachers have only a minimal impact upon student performance, then the question remains of whether programs to improve teacher effectiveness have any direct impact upon students. (page 32)

A number of school districts have adopted evaluative methods which include the strengthening of the principal's

supervisory, diagnostic and prescriptive skills, (McLaughlin, 1984). Such districts have moved away from the formerly popular deterministic, process-product model of evaluation. In such systems, principals are trained to observe the classroom, assess teacher solutions to classroom problems, gauge the quality of teacher-student interactions, and analyze the instructional practices that are occurring in the classroom. The process-product approach to evaluation supports the formal authority of the principal as the evaluator with functional authority based in technical knowledge, evaluation skills and shared language.

Many school districts that have selected the process of clinical supervision within their evaluation cycle find the greatest satisfaction in the consistency of language used by principal/evaluators in the post-conference phase of evaluations (McLaughlin, 1984). Training like this permits principals to speak clearly, precisely, and very specifically to teachers about their performance, to interpret classroom activities, and to analyze teaching practices.

#### FORMS AND PROCEDURES OF EVALUATION

Upon examining 127 evaluation forms that are used in Indiana and Tennessee, Carfield and Walter (1984) concluded that many current evaluation forms are poorly constructed

and are too vague and subjective. Many of the forms reviewed in the study were found to be cumbersome and demanded far too much administrative time to complete. Often, both faculties and administrators felt uncomfortable with the instruments. This was attributed to the fact that building administrators who are charged with the role of using the forms frequently are not involved in the development of them.

The research of McCarty, et al. (1986) on teacher perceptions toward evaluations in Wisconsin states that the concern most often expressed by teachers deals with the forms used by school districts. Almost universally, teachers in the study expressed disdain with rating systems attached to evaluations. Although resistance was primarily psychological in nature, since salaries were not attached to such evaluation methods, teachers expressed a general feeling that the rating process is fraught with subjectivity that cannot be substantiated on the number of times that observations by administrators occur. Of interest was the response given by teachers which stated that the evaluation process provided little or no impact upon the teacher's performance in the classroom. The impression left from the research was that, although principals have a right and are required by law to observe and evaluate teachers, most teachers in the study questioned principals competence in the ability to successfully fulfill their responsibility as

evaluators. Although teachers expressed these feelings they also expressed a desire to be observed and supervised more efficiently. Very few teachers commented that they would like to be left alone.

Good (1984) believes that a major problem with current evaluation systems is the small number of times that a teacher is observed. Principals cannot hope to improve instruction when they drop into a classroom only once or twice per year. Good strongly supports methods in which evaluators spend several consecutive days with each teacher to obtain a true picture of the teacher's skills and strengths.

#### EFFECTIVE PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

Many entities have proposed new programs in an effort to improve upon the effectiveness of teacher evaluation. Some proponents of teacher evaluation recommend the utilization of new methods of evaluation, one of which is the concept of performance appraisal. According to Lewis (1973), this method involves a process of joint problem-solving with commonly agreed upon goal setting for individual growth. Both the principal and teacher work together in the establishment of goals, discussion of progress toward meeting the goals, and follow-up, which includes the establishment of further goals for further personal and professional growth. The administrator is seen more as a

coach than as one who criticizes the teacher's work. Together, the principal and teacher work for the improvement and growth of the teacher within the classroom. The Redfern model (Redfern, 1980) is nearly identical to that proposed by Lewis.

A very critical element necessary in successful evaluation programs is support from both administrators and teachers. Those individuals who are to be evaluated need to be involved in both the developmental process of the evaluative criteria and in the documents to be used. In the Penn-Harris-Madison Schools evaluation program (Speicher and Schurter, 1981), it was determined that, in order for a successful school evaluation program to be accepted, it was necessary to formulate a committee consisting of teachers and principals from all organizational levels as well as key central office staff members. It was further found that teachers and supervisors must work together collaboratively to increase teaching effectiveness and enhance the opportunities for student learning through a formative process of instructional improvement.

French-Lazovik (1981) identifies eighteen benchmarks of a successful teacher evaluation system. Among them are:

1. The evaluation procedures and policies must have the support of top academic administrators.
2. Faculty must have participated, through committees and through general meetings, in the

planning of the system, and they must be aware of their impact on the policies developed.

3. Teaching should be evaluated separately from other academic responsibilities.
4. Only explicitly stated and performance-related criteria should be considered.
5. Methods of data collection and policies that govern them should be appropriate to the evaluation purpose for which they are used.
6. The evaluation instruments and procedures used should provide data that are reliable, valid and comparable within academic units if the results are considered in decisions.
7. Help for an individual faculty member trying to improve his or her teaching must be available.
8. Academic rewards should be tied to evaluation in an equitable way.

Many evaluators hope to improve instruction and meet the minimum legal requirements for evaluation at the same time. Educators have found that successful evaluation programs are not just a single, annual process but are a process that is on-going throughout the school year. Harris (1986) proposes eight steps in a successful evaluation program.

1. Specifying the criteria under which the teacher is to be evaluated.

2. Selecting, designing and adapting an evaluative instrument that addresses the criteria upon which one is to be evaluated.
3. Gathering the data through observation of the teaching act and through a variety of methods.
4. Analyzing the data.
5. Interpreting the data.
6. Valuing the data in relationship to research, theory, and professional standards.
7. Decision making, based upon the data, its interpretation and the value that is determined.
8. Developing an action plan, which includes goals for future professional growth.

Research conducted by Genck (1983) identifies successful evaluation systems to include:

1. A well documented plan for evaluation that is designed to be fair and constructive.
2. Separating evaluation for dismissal from evaluation for development.
3. Separating program evaluation from teacher and administrator evaluation.
4. Participation by teachers in defining and operating evaluation.
5. Multiple views to offset the risks of personality, style and opinion.
6. Recognition and reward for good performance.

Most recent teacher evaluation systems recommend a variety of methods that have been shown through research to improve teacher effectiveness as based upon student performance gains. In most of these models, the supervisor utilizes techniques associated with the growing effective schools research. The work of Madeline Hunter (1976) requires evaluators to look for certain methods that have been identified by research to be effective in increasing student learning.

Speicher and Schurter (1981) support an evaluation system whose first major component involves the mutually established process of goal setting. Through this process, the teacher and evaluator cooperatively select and set one goal that relates directly to the area of teacher planning, one for classroom climate, and one for the act of teaching or classroom management. These goals are built upon research-based teacher effectiveness criteria. Through formal evaluation, the teacher's effectiveness is assessed. Student evaluations, though optional for permanent teacher and required of non-permanent teacher use, are also used by the teacher and administrator and are included in the teacher's annual appraisal report.

Tracy and MacNaughton (1986) coined the term, "neo-traditional" to refer to newer methods of evaluation. This refers to the process in which school districts utilize supervision which continues to focus upon teaching

characteristics, as the traditional methods do, but to also incorporate those characteristics from the effective teaching research. Although the philosophy for evaluation and the individuals involved in the process are the same, the use of new research in what has been found to be effective becomes the center of focus upon which one is observed and evaluated. Some basic changes in such a system are:

1. The neo-traditional approach focuses upon the instructional act rather than an unweighted range of teacher traits as in the traditional form.
2. The neo-traditional approach utilizes what research has shown to be effective in producing higher student learning. The work of individuals such as Hunter (1984) and Minton (1979) are usually identified with the neo-traditional approach. Hunter identifies seven elements of an effective lesson, which include an anticipatory set, objectives and purposes, input, modeling, checking for understanding, guided practice, and independent practice. Minton (1979) has developed a detailed process for using these teaching elements in the supervision of instruction. Although Hunter's work has been criticized by some researchers for its methods of developing similarity in instructional methods across the

curriculum (Glatthorn, 1984) and for its emphasis upon direct instruction, its effectiveness in increasing student learning has been supported (Hunter, 1984).

3. The neo-traditional approach requires additional and extensive training for those responsible for the supervision and evaluation of those who utilize the principles.
4. Since post-conferences are an integral part of the neo-traditional approach, a closer supervisor-teacher relationship is essential. This conflicts with current practices in some school districts that develop an adversarial relationship between the evaluator and evaluatee.

Duke and Stiggins (1986) show that an important element within improving teacher performance is that of administrator credibility. They state:

It is difficult to imagine a teacher taking evaluation seriously when the evaluator is perceived to have little valuable knowledge of direct relevance to the teacher, the content area(s), the grade level, or the particular group of students. Credibility is a function of many things, including knowledge of technical aspects of teaching, knowledge of subject area, years of classroom teaching experience, years of experience in the school and school district, recency of teaching experience, and familiarity with the teacher's classroom and students. (p. 22)

Duke and Stiggins go on to say that many individuals in the role as evaluators have not had direct teaching experience

for years. This can result in teachers questioning as to the relevance of advice received. Additionally, in order to establish proper levels of credibility with those to be observed, supervisors must be able to persuade teachers to alter their actions by providing clear and convincing reasons for change, demonstrate patience in finding the time necessary to do an effective job in evaluating, and develop trust between the evaluatee and the evaluator.

Two evaluation systems that have been adopted by a number of school districts are Manatt's "Mutual Benefit Evaluation" (Manatt, Palmer & Hidlebaugh, 1976) and Redfern's "Management of Objectives Evaluation" (Redfern, 1980). Both models are characterized by goal-setting, teacher involvement in the evaluation process and a group of centralized teaching standards and criteria. The major difference between the two models is at which point the teacher becomes a part of the evaluation process.

It appears that many questions remain unanswered with respect to the teacher evaluation process and its effectiveness in improving instruction in the classroom. One cannot just accept the fact that evaluation is at a point where it can now be seen as the cure to the maladies that affect poor teaching. However, it may be the best medicine we have in addressing the symptoms that have been diagnosed as an educational system in need of a cure.

### IMPROVING THE SYSTEM

Unfortunately, no simple formula for effectively evaluating teachers exists, nor have any new methods been designed which guarantee improvement in the quality of instruction (Ellis, 1984).

However, in order to establish an evaluation system that measures the competency of teachers, the system must reflect some common agreement as to what is meant by competency. In Ellis (1984), Allen Pearson (1980) proposed that a teacher meet three questions to be considered as competent:

1. What are the standards that are established in order for a teacher to teach satisfactorily instead of just adequately?
2. In order for a teacher to perform at a satisfactory level, what skills are needed?
3. Does the teacher possess these skills? (p. 2)

Although the first of these is the most controversial, all three involve the use of subjective systems of determining whether teachers possess these qualities. Furthermore, answers to such questions include the use of one's value base as a determining factor of judgement.

As to the improvement of the evaluation system, McLaughlin (1984) proposes the necessity of substantial and on-going principal training. Attendance at a weekend workshop is not the answer. Not only does initial training

need to occur, but continual in-service to update and refine principal skills is necessary. Since principals have the responsibility for evaluation, but do not have the authority or the resources to act on their findings, school districts need to recognize this problem and make the necessary adjustments.

Wise, et al. (1984) state that to improve a teacher's performance, the teacher's cooperation must be enlisted by the school district. Also, the district must motivate the teacher and provide some system in which the teacher is guided through a series of steps for improvement.

Mooney (1984) proposes seven essential elements in successful teacher supervisory models:

1. Know the school district's goals and objectives.
2. Each evaluator must know his/her own strengths and weaknesses.
3. The learning environment must be known.
4. Each evaluator must know each teacher as a person and professional.
5. Know the skill levels, strengths and weaknesses of the school's students.
6. Plan the logistics of each evaluation.
7. Plan the supervisory sequence for all teachers.  
(p. 1)

McLaughlin (1984) also supports the need for a district commitment to the evaluation system that is adopted. Such a commitment should include the allocation of

resources for principal training and in-service, and for teacher remediation.

Ellis (1984) mentions the framework established in the Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study (BCTS) of California (Gudridge, 1980), in identifying five interrelated skills essential to successful teaching. These essential elements are: 1) diagnosis, which consists of subject-matter knowledge and the awareness of student differences; 2) prescription, or clarifying the learning objectives; 3) presentation of material in a way that students can understand; 4) monitoring student performance in relationship to the prescription; and 5) feedback, or receiving information from the students in some visible way that allows one to determine whether the material has been understood and learned.

Recent research by the Rand Corporation (Wise, et al., 1984) identified four school districts that possessed common elements supported by research to be effective in evaluation. The four school districts found to have effective evaluation programs were Salt Lake City; Lake Washington, Wash.; Greenwich, Conn.; and Toledo, Ohio. All four make evaluation a central mission of the school district. This is shown through a commitment of time, money, and central office administrative support. All four districts collaborate with their local teachers association or union to design and carry out the evaluation process. All of the districts tailor their evaluation system and

criteria to fit the school system's instructional objectives. Most importantly, Rand found that the individuals charged with the process of administering the evaluation system know what they are doing. Each school district is committed to both time and money in providing the training necessary to make the evaluators experts in the evaluation process. Often, after initial evaluations uncover teacher weaknesses, these districts will assign "experts" to work with individual teachers to improve upon previously determined weaknesses. Such a system eliminates the difficulty that often exists when the supervisor and evaluator are the same person.

Wise, et al. (1984) formulate the following conclusions from their work:

1. To succeed, a teacher evaluation system must suit the educational goals, management style, conception of teaching, and community values of the school district.
2. Top level commitment to and resources for evaluation outweigh checklists and procedures.
3. The school district should decide the main purpose of its teacher evaluation system and then match the process to the purpose.
4. To sustain resource commitments and political support, teacher evaluation must be seen to have utility. Utility depends on the efficient use of

resources to achieve reliability, validity, and cost effectiveness.

5. Teacher evaluation and responsibility improve the quality of teacher evaluation.

Based upon these conclusions, Wise, et al. (1984) make the following recommendations for an evaluation system to be successful:

1. School districts should adopt a teacher evaluation system that aligns itself with the school district educational goals, management style, conception of teaching, and community values. Evaluation systems should not be adopted simply because they work in another school district.
2. States should not impose highly prescriptive teacher evaluation requirements.
3. Sufficient time should be given for administrators to evaluate teachers.
4. The quality of evaluations should be regularly assessed with feedback provided to the evaluators. This should also be followed by continual evaluator training of the evaluation process.
5. Evaluators should be trained in observation and evaluation techniques, including the reporting, diagnosing, and clinical supervision skills necessary for the evaluation system.

6. School districts should continually self-examine their current evaluation system to determine whether it still meets the original purposes.
7. Evaluators should be trained in observation and evaluation techniques, including the reporting, diagnosing, and clinical supervision skills necessary for the evaluation system.
8. School districts should decide whether they can afford to use more than just one evaluation system to meet district goals and purposes.
9. The number of teachers to be evaluated and the importance and visibility of evaluation outcomes must be determining factors in the allocation of resources.
10. School districts should use expert teachers in the supervision and assistance of peers, particularly with beginning teachers.
11. The design and oversight of evaluation systems should be developed by school districts with the support and assistance of teacher organizations to ensure legitimacy, fairness, and effectiveness.
12. Teachers should be held accountable to standards of practice that require them to make appropriate

instructional decisions on behalf of their students.

In regards to the improvement of evaluations at the central office level, Ellis quotes Joki (1982) in stating that school boards can help improve the process of teacher evaluation by writing strong, clear policies on administrator accountability; teacher recruitment; supervision, and evaluation; on an instructional model keyed to specific instructional objectives; and on inservice training for administrators and teachers.

After reviewing articles which focused upon evaluation over the past ten years, Chirnside (1984) offers ten commandments that can make for successful teacher evaluation. If followed, it is reasoned, school districts will not find themselves faced with many of the problems that some districts have found as to legal challenges and questions of accountability.

1. The purpose of evaluation must be the improvement of instruction.
2. An atmosphere of trust must be maintained between the evaluator and the evaluatee.
3. Goal setting must be an integral part of the evaluation process.
4. Fairness and consistency must be ensured to all evaluatees.
5. Those being evaluated must clearly understand the criteria by which they are to be evaluated.
6. Respect for the staff's professionalism must be conveyed to them.

7. Following evaluation, immediate and direct feedback must be provided.
8. Supervisors must be trained evaluators.
9. Evaluators must make a strong time and energy commitment to the process of evaluation.
10. The focus of evaluation must shift from the end of the year, final evaluation to an ongoing cycle of evaluations for continuous growth. (pp. 42-43)

In the recent booklet, What Works -- Research About Teaching and Learning (U.S. Dept. of Education, 1986), the following comment was made regarding the supervision of teachers:

When supervisors comment constructively on teachers' specific skills, they help teachers become more effective and improve teacher morale. Yet, typically, a supervisor visits a teacher's classroom only once a year and makes only general comments about the teacher's performance. This relative lack of specific supervision contributes to low morale, teacher absenteeism, and high faculty turnover. (p. 52)

If this is the case, then it is more important than ever for school districts to take a serious look at their current evaluation system in order to guarantee that they are following all the prescriptions and recommendations being made by researchers.

#### RECENT RESEARCH IN RELATIONSHIP TO THIS STUDY

The work of several researchers has been used to develop this study's framework. It is through these

studies that the research questions and design have been developed.

In 1974, the National School Public Relations Association reviewed 59 school district evaluation policies and found that effective evaluation systems should possess the following: (1) the system should be continuous; (2) it should utilize a variety of methods and techniques; (3) in-service training in the use of the evaluation instrument should be provided for teachers; and (4) evaluators should be well trained in the use of the instrument. If a district were to accept such a philosophy for evaluation, it would be seen as a continuous and on-going process for professional growth of all school employees.

In comparing the Vancouver School District evaluation system to the NSPRA recommendations, all four of the ingredients necessary for an effective evaluation system are present to some degree in Vancouver. Although the Vancouver system is a continuous process, the question exists as to whether teachers and building administrators perceive this process to occur often enough and effectively enough. The Vancouver evaluation system uses a variety of methods and techniques, but these are limited and based upon the amount of training and the skills that have been acquired by the evaluators. In-service training for teachers in the use of the evaluation system is required of all principals at each year's first faculty meeting. In this in-service

training, administrators are required to inform their teaching staffs of the purpose of the evaluation process, the methods of evaluation that will be used within the building, and the name of the person who will be the primary evaluator for each teacher.

In relationship to the proper training of the evaluator, Washington State law requires all evaluators to be trained in evaluation techniques and to be a certified and qualified evaluator. Building administrators within the Vancouver School District have received considerable training in Clinical Supervision (Hunter, 1976), have been required to demonstrate skill in using this training, and have been certified as being qualified evaluators.

The work of Wise, et al. (1984) for the Rand Corporation involved the review of 32 school district evaluation systems to identify effective evaluation systems. It was found that school authorities do not agree on the best practices regarding instrumentation, evaluative frequency, teacher role in the process, or how the information can best be utilized by the district. They did find similarity among school districts regarding the lack of sufficient principal resolve and competence in accurate evaluation. Other areas of similarity were teacher apathy and resistance, the lack of consistency and uniformity within a school system, the lack of adequate training for evaluators, and problems in the evaluation of secondary school

staffs and specialists. Respondents also consistently reported two positive results of teacher evaluation: improved communication between teachers and administrators and an increase in awareness by teachers of instructional goals and classroom practices.

Much of what was found by Wise, et al. was used in designing the questionnaires for this study. Through teacher and building administrator input, perceptions of the practices being used in the district in relationship to the use of instrumentation, evaluation frequency, and the utilization of the information to affect improved instruction were received. Also, both teachers and building-level administrators were asked their opinions regarding evaluator training, and the communication between evaluators and evaluatees.

The findings of McGreal (1984) and French-Lazovik (1982) are also instrumental in the development of this research. McGreal believes that in order for a school district to have a successful evaluation program it must provide all the members of the school with appropriate training and guided practice in the skills and knowledge necessary to implement and effectively maintain the system. He found in his research that many school districts fall short of developing such a program. Principals are not trained well enough in the system's process, which results in a lack of commitment and time in making teacher evaluation

something of value to all. French-Lazovik's work states that effective teacher evaluation systems use data that is reliable, valid and comparable and that help is provided for faculty members to improve teaching skills. McGreal and French-Lazovik's work, like that of Wise mentioned previously, provided framework for this study in the area of evaluator training and whether evaluatees saw this training to be useful in relationship to providing recommendations for improving instruction.

The work of the NSPRA, Wise, et al., and McGreal support the current Vancouver evaluation system. This study was designed to use this research to explore the perceived effectiveness of the evaluation system in the Vancouver School District, and to determine whether certain demographic subgroups of teachers and building level administrators possessed similar views of the system.

#### SUMMARY OF THE LITERATURE REVIEW

Teacher evaluation has often been perceived as a solution for improving instruction within the classroom. Unfortunately, this solution is not as simple as selecting a previously developed evaluation system and implementing it within any given school district. Before a school district can decide upon what evaluation process is to be used, the district must establish its mission statement and educational goals. Following the establishment of a

mission statement and the development of goals, and with the cooperation and assistance of both those who are to be evaluated and those who will be doing the evaluating, the criteria for evaluation and the process of evaluating should be mutually developed and approved. Without the support of those most closely involved with the evaluation process, its chance of success is diminished.

Although the research identifies various purposes in the need for evaluation to occur, a common thread appears to be that the primary purpose of evaluation is for the professional improvement of those being evaluated. Primary reasons for teacher evaluation can be attributed to enrollment declines with reductions in force, public dissatisfaction with student academic performance, and the desire of school districts to improve the skills of the teachers that they employ.

Historically, interest in teacher evaluation has varied with the greatest interest occurring in the past thirty years. With increased research in the identification of effective teaching techniques, even greater interest has recently occurred with evaluation processes. As further research identifies more effective methods of evaluation, interest will continue to be high.

Despite the fact that several methods of accountability have been tried in relationship to evaluating teacher performance, the most popular and most widely used

is that of observation of performance, followed by formative and summative evaluation reports. Such reports usually try to identify the teacher's effectiveness in a variety of ways that directly impact learning in the classroom.

Researchers have identified several problems with the current evaluation system. These problems stem from the principal or evaluator, the teacher, the process, or school district-selected forms and procedures.

Although the research of Frels, Bolton, Abbott, Beach and Reinhartz, and others have identified the primary purpose of teacher evaluation to be for the improvement of instruction, it has been found that traditional forms of evaluation have resulted in little or no improvement in teacher performance. McCarty's work (1986) showed teachers to be very unsatisfied with evaluations due to the non-specificity of recommendations from evaluators. McLaughlin (1984) found that the feedback given to teachers was too general and did not acknowledge excellence. The work of Neville (1966) and Jackson (1968) identified the evaluation process to be a threat to teachers. However, the work of Manatt, et al. (1976) did show that teacher performance can improve when teachers know that they will be observed by competent evaluators.

In relationship to the evaluator, changes need to occur in order for evaluation to become more meaningful for

teachers. Blumberg (1980) stated that the role of the evaluator needs to be more clearly delineated from the role of the supervisor. Feiman-Nemser and Floden (1984) found that teachers seldom respected principals as being experts on practices within the classroom. As a result, building administrators may need to develop confidence within their evaluatees about their skills as evaluators. McLaughlin (1984) encouraged regularly conducted classroom observations followed by review and diagnosis in order for teacher skills to improve. But Mooney's comments and research (1984) may be the most significant in relationship to the evaluation process. In his work, he described the overwhelming job responsibilities that are part of the principalship which make it next to impossible to complete all tasks and still be an effective evaluator. This difficulty in being able to complete tasks may be the single most critical item in the improvement of the evaluation process.

School districts that have developed successful teacher evaluation systems appear to the researchers to have several common criteria. First, their evaluation system is continuous and on-going. Second, the system has the support of the school district's central office. Third, evaluators receive continual training in the evaluation process and are continually updating their skills. Fourth, both those being evaluated and those doing the evaluation are involved in the development and

implementation of the system. And finally, the system is perceived as one with the primary purpose of improving one's professional skills.

#### CURRENT EVALUATION LAWS IN WASHINGTON STATE

Through the Washington State Legislature, the teacher evaluation process has progressed to one in which purposes and criteria have been developed through statute. In 1985, the legislature established the following guidelines for school districts in developing their individual evaluation policies:

1. An evaluation system must be meaningful, helpful and objective;
2. An evaluation system must encourage improvements in teaching skills, techniques and abilities by identifying areas needing improvement.
3. An evaluation system must provide a mechanism to acknowledge, recognize, and encourage superior teaching performance; and
4. An evaluation system must encourage respect in the evaluation process by the persons subject to the evaluations through recognizing the importance of objective standards and minimizing subjectivity. (RCW 28A.67.205)

The authority to evaluate the certificated staff within the Washington State Public Schools is found in the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 28A.67.065, which provides for the Superintendent of Public Instruction for the state to adopt the minimum criteria established for the evaluation of employees by local school districts. This is

further restated within the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 392-191-001. The categories in which the minimum criteria are listed are instructional skill, classroom management, professional preparation and scholarship, effort toward improvement when needed, the handling of student discipline and attendant problems, interest in teaching pupils, and knowledge of subject matter (RCW 28A.67.065).

The minimum evaluative criteria established through administrative code are as follows:

1. Instructional skill. The certificated classroom teacher demonstrates, in his or her performance, a competent level of knowledge and skill in designing and conducting an instructional experience.
2. Classroom management. The certificated classroom teacher demonstrates, in his or her performance, a competent level of knowledge and skill in organizing the physical and human elements in the educational setting.
3. Professional preparation and scholarship. The certificated classroom teacher demonstrates, in his or her performance, evidence of having a theoretical background and knowledge of the principles and methods of teaching, and a commitment to education as a profession.
4. Effort toward improvement when needed. The certificated classroom teacher demonstrates an awareness of his or her limitations and strengths, and demonstrates continued professional growth.
5. The handling of student discipline and attendant problems. The certificated classroom teacher demonstrates the ability to manage the non-instructional, human dynamics in the educational setting.

6. Interest in teaching pupils. The certificated classroom teacher demonstrates an understanding of and a commitment to each pupil, taking into account each individual's unique background and characteristics. The certificated classroom teacher demonstrates enthusiasm for or enjoyment in working with pupils.
7. Knowledge of subject matter. The teacher demonstrates a depth and breadth of knowledge of theory and content in general education and subject matter specialization(s) appropriate to the elementary and/or secondary level(s). (WAC 392-191-010)

Aside from those requirements listed above as minimum criteria for evaluation, WAC 180-44 speaks to general teacher responsibilities. Often these appear within teacher evaluations. Among these requirements are that (1) teachers follow a prescribed course of study, enforce the state and school district rules and regulations, and maintain appropriate records and reports; (2) teachers direct and control the studies of their pupils, taking into consideration individual differences among students; (3) teachers evaluate individual growth of pupils, and make periodic reports to parents of this growth; and (4) teachers daily prepare for their duties, attend teacher meetings and other meetings as required by the principal (WAC 180-44-010). Additional requirements of teachers include the responsibility of disciplining pupils (WAC 180-44-020) and maintaining a healthful classroom atmosphere (WAC 180-44-040).

RCW 28A.67.065 also provides for local school districts, through their school boards, to establish both evaluative criteria and procedures for the evaluation of all certificated employees. The principal, or the principal's designee, is responsible for the evaluation of all teachers within the principal's supervision. During the school year, each teacher and certificated employee is required by law to be observed at least twice for a total of no less than sixty minutes. After each observation or series of observations, the principal is to document the results of the observation in writing and provide for the teacher a copy of the report within three days after its preparation. Within the first ninety calendar days of the school year, newly employed teachers are to have been observed for at least thirty minutes.

The significance of the evaluation of teachers is underscored in this same RCW. Principals who do not follow the guidelines as stated in the law are subject to non-renewal of their contract.

#### CURRENT EVALUATION POLICIES IN THE VANCOUVER SCHOOL DISTRICT

Like most school districts in Washington State, the Vancouver School District includes its evaluation policy within the Comprehensive Professional Agreement between the Vancouver School District and the Vancouver Education

Association (1986-89). The policy defines evaluation as "a comprehensive conclusion based on a series of events and activities" (p. 62). The agreement consists of the following purposes in order of priority:

1. To improve the professional performance of the employee.
2. To let the employee know how he/she is getting along on a regular basis.
3. To specifically inform the employee of ways in which he/she can improve.
4. To identify specific training needs of an employee.
5. To establish a basis for contract renewal or nonrenewal, dismissal, or any other disciplinary action against an employee whenever such action may become necessary. (p. 60)

The evaluation is based upon recorded observations in the classroom or other instructional setting (such as in a media center, shop, or gymnasium), and any of the number of incidents, reports, and meetings which occur during the year. In the policy, it states that the primary responsibility of evaluating teachers belongs to the building principal or assistant principals. If a noted deficiency is documented on a teacher's evaluation, the principal may use the services of other certificated employees to assist in programs of remediation.

The Vancouver School District sees the evaluation cycle to be a year-long process, with the final report due to the central office by May 25. In accordance with state

law, new employees must be evaluated at least once within ninety days of the beginning date of employment. That evaluation must be for at least thirty minutes in duration.

Two different forms are used in the evaluation process. One of them, the Professional Evaluation Interview Schedule, (See Appendix A) is used following either a single or series of classroom observation. This form is used no less than twice each year for a total of no less than sixty classroom minutes of observation. The other form, Report: Professional Performance, (See Appendix B) is a summary evaluation that is completed at the end of the initial ninety days for new employees and at the end of the year for all other employees.

A new law passed by the Washington State Legislature in 1986 (RCW 28A.67.065) provides for a shortened process and form of evaluation for employees after they have demonstrated four years of successful evaluations. This process results in the employee being observed only once each year for no less than thirty minutes. A final evaluation is compiled as is done for teachers on the other, long form of evaluation. Each three years, employees on the short form evaluation must be evaluated, as previously mentioned, at least twice for not less than sixty minutes.

The evaluative criteria within the school district consists of eight categories. Seven of these are directly

related to the requirements for state law and are previously mentioned (i.e., instructional skills, classroom management, professional preparation and scholarship, effort toward improvement when needed, the handling of student discipline and attendant problems, interest in teaching pupils, and knowledge of subject matter). An additional area not included in state statutes, but a part of the district evaluative criteria, is responsibility in general school service (Comprehensive Professional Agreement, 1986-89).

## CHAPTER III

### METHODS AND PROCEDURES

#### INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides an examination of the methods and procedures utilized in this study to investigate the perceptions held by teachers and building-level administrators of the Vancouver School District evaluation system. Areas of discussion include: (1) General Purpose of the Study; (2) Research Questions; (3) Sampling Methodology; (4) Brief Overview; and (5) Demographic Characteristics.

#### GENERAL PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The general purpose of this descriptive study was to determine teacher and building-level administrator perceptions of the current teacher evaluation system and process in the Vancouver School District. It was an assumption of this study that participants' perceptions of an evaluation process can be used to determine that process's effectiveness in improving instruction.

Both teachers and building-level administrators demonstrated, through completion of the Evaluation Perception Questionnaires, their perception of the effectiveness

of the currently used process and system in the school district. Through their responses on the questionnaires, the areas of disagreement and concern in regards to the evaluation of instruction were further noted. Additionally, both groups expressed their views regarding whether they believed the current process should be changed or improved.

### RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The results from the questionnaires provided two sets of data for comparative purposes. One set, drawn from responses of current school district teachers, provided perceptions of the evaluation process as seen by teachers. The other set of data was based upon the responses received from the building-level administrators that evaluate teachers.

Three research questions gave direction to this study. The data from both the Teacher and Building-level Administrator Evaluation Perception questionnaires were analyzed to determine the following:

1. Is there a statistically significant difference between the perceptions of building-level elementary and secondary administrators regarding the effectiveness of the current teacher evaluation process?
2. Is there a statistically significant difference among the perceptions of teachers in various

demographic groups (gender, age, teaching level, teaching experience) regarding the effectiveness of the current Vancouver School District teacher evaluation process?

3. Is there a statistically significant difference between the perceptions of teachers and building-level administrators regarding the effectiveness of the current Vancouver School District teacher evaluation process?

#### SAMPLING METHODOLOGY

This section will explain the methods used in determining the sample population, procedures for selection, and the return rate from the sample population.

##### Population

The Vancouver School District is an urban-suburban school district located in Southwest Washington State, just north of the Interstate Bridge, which joins the states of Washington and Oregon. The school district consists of 15,000 students and approximately 1,000 employees, of which approximately 700 are certificated teachers, administrators and support personnel. The school district consists of the city of Vancouver (population of approximately 40,000) and outlying areas both to the north and to the east of the city. This unincorporated area includes a population of

approximately 50,000. There are 25 elementary schools, four middle schools, three high schools, and one alternative school in the district. The current elementary and middle school grade configurations consist of kindergarten through grade six in the elementary schools, and grades seven and eight in the middle schools. The three high schools account for grades nine through twelve. Pan Terra, the alternative secondary school, consists of students in grades seven through twelve.

#### Sampling Procedures

Since the purpose of the study was to determine the perceptions of both teachers and building administrators in regards to the Vancouver teacher evaluation process, it was necessary to select a sample of individuals within the district that was knowledgeable of the district's evaluation system. To do this, and to guarantee a high confidence level, a random sample of 235 of the district's 727 teachers was selected to receive the questionnaire. Since the total number of building administrators was only 42, all building administrators were asked to participate in the study.

To determine participants within the teacher sample, each teacher was assigned a number for a computerized random number selection program. Part of this selection process included previously selected numbers being

withdrawn from the computer's list of available numbers so as not to have previously selected numbers reappear.

#### Return Rate

Table I shows that, of the 235 teachers who were asked to participate, 193 returned completed or partially completed questionnaires; this provided an 82 percent rate of return from the teachers. The highest percentage of return was from middle school teachers (93.3%), while the lowest return rate was from the high school teachers (66.3%). In relationship to the total teacher sample, 51.8 percent of the respondents were from the elementary schools (grades kindergarten through six), and 42.0 percent were from the middle and high schools (grades seven through twelve). The remaining 6.2 percent were at more than one level.

The return rate from the building administrators, as shown in Table II, was not as high as that of the teachers. Of the 42 district building-level administrators, 29 responses were received; this provided 69 percent of the total possible responses. In relationship to grade level supervision, 48.3 percent of the respondents were from the elementary schools and 51.8 percent of the respondents were from middle and high schools.

TABLE I  
PARTICIPANT BREAKDOWN AND RETURN  
RATE FOR TEACHERS

Grade Level	<u>Questionnaires</u>		Return Rate	Percent of Sample
	Sent	Returned		
Elem. School Teacher	125	100	80.0	51.8
Middle School Teacher	30	28	93.3	14.5
High School Teachers	80	53	66.3	27.5
Multiple Levels		12		6.2
Total	235	193	82.1	100.0

TABLE II  
PARTICIPANT BREAKDOWN AND RETURN RATE FOR  
BUILDING ADMINISTRATORS

Grade Level	<u>Questionnaires</u>		Return Rate	Percent of Sample
	Sent	Returned		
Elem. School Principals	21	14	66.6	48.3
Middle School Assist. Prin.	4	2	50.0	6.9
Middle School Prin.	4	3	75.0	10.3
High School Assist. Prin.	9	7	77.7	24.2
High School Principals	4	3	75.0	10.3
Total	42	29	69.0	100.0

#### BRIEF OVERVIEW

This section will provide an overview of the process used in the study. Included in this section are the questionnaire design, field testing of the questionnaire, data collection procedures, and data analysis.

### Questionnaire Design

Two questionnaires were designed by the author. An example of the Building Administrator Evaluation Perception Questionnaire is found in Appendix C, while an example of the Teacher Evaluation Perception Questionnaire is found in Appendix D. Although both consisted of the same questions, each was designed to obtain perceptions from the viewpoint of the respondent, that being either a teacher or a building administrator.

The questionnaires consisted of both structured and open-ended questions. The first portion was structured and consisted of 33 questions that required the interviewee to select one of five categories for each question. These five categories, with corresponding point values, were as follows: 1. Strongly Agree; 2. Agree; 3. Undecided; 4. Disagree; and 5. Strongly Disagree.

Following the 33 structured questions in both questionnaires, evaluatees were given the opportunity for dialogue by answering six open-ended questions. These questions were designed to allow the respondent to recommend ways the current evaluation process could be improved in the areas of the orientation process, pre-conference, observational process, report preparation, post-conference, and goal setting. An additional opportunity was provided

at the questionnaire's conclusion for any additional comments that the respondent wished to make.

#### Field Testing of the Questionnaire

The purpose of field testing a questionnaire is to determine the ease of completing the survey, determining the questionnaire's appropriateness in relationship to the researcher's intent, and to determine the general reaction to the survey (Dillman, 1978). Prior to the administration of the questionnaire to the selected participants, it was piloted in five randomly selected schools within the district: two elementary, one middle, one alternative, and one high school. Those individuals asked to participate in the field study were individuals that had been previously selected at random for the study. A total of approximately fifty teachers and nine administrators participated in the field study. Based upon the results, it was determined that no major changes needed to occur, so the questionnaires were then distributed to the remainder of the randomly selected school district participants. The responses received from those participants in the field study were added to those collected in the main study.

#### Data Collection Procedures

Prior to the distribution of the questionnaires to the subjects in the school district, an application for permission was submitted to the Vancouver School District

Research Review Committee. Following the review and discussion of the research to be completed, approval was given by the committee for the research to begin.

Permission for the research was also obtained from the Portland State University Human Subjects Research Review Committee (HSRRC) (See Appendix E), with the recommendation that the privacy of the subjects be guaranteed by providing an envelope for each subject's questionnaire.

After the sample was selected, packets for the teachers and all building-level administrators were packaged. Included within each packet was a personal letter for each selected participant, both teacher (See Appendix F) and building administrator (See Appendix G), a copy of the questionnaire with specific instructions for its completion, an envelope in which to return the questionnaire, and a Scan-tron sheet on which the responses were to be placed. Listed on the outside of the packages were the names of the individuals that had been selected to participate.

The author met individually with each building principal and provided him/her with the objectives of the questionnaire prior to its distribution to teachers and explained the importance of receiving responses from the selected teachers. Those teachers that were randomly selected were identified by building and each questionnaire was given to the building principal to explain to the

subjects, distribute and collect the questionnaires, and to return the materials to the author. Since the person collecting the questionnaires was also the person about whom some of the questionnaire was addressed, the teachers were encouraged to place the completed questionnaire in the sealed envelope for return to the researcher. Follow-up phone calls were also made to those principals whose schools were late in returning completed questionnaires.

### Data Analysis

The data from the two questionnaires were coded for computer analysis. The teacher responses were analyzed in relationship to the subgroups of gender, age, teaching experience and teacher level. In order to determine the reliability of responses, a multivariate analysis of variance (Cronbach, 1951) was conducted for determination of reliability. To do this, the 33 questions were clustered into the following five categories for statistical analysis: 1. General Perceptions of the Evaluator's Skills (questions 1-3 and 7); 2. Comfort with the Evaluator (questions 8, 10, 11, and 15); 3. Frequency of Classroom Visits by Evaluator (questions 9, 12, 16-19); 4. Evaluation Process (questions 4, and 21-27); and 5. Use of Evaluation Information and Overall View of the Evaluation Process (questions 5, 14, and 28-33). Significant differences at  $p < .05$  in content area were identified through

ANOVA technique. Scheffe values (1959) were also computed to identify the specific areas in which group differences occurred. Chi Square was used to further examine the teacher responses on each individual question.

Since the building administrator group was so small, no clustering of questions occurred other than the original grouping found on the questionnaire and only the subgroups of elementary and secondary building administrator were examined. Chi Square was used to examine the results of the building administrator responses. As in the teacher group, the Alpha level for administrators was set at .05.

In comparing the total responses of teachers and building administrators, Chi Square was used, with the Alpha level again set at .05.

The questionnaires were checked to determine whether all questions were answered by the participants and were then read by a Scan-tron reader into the Vancouver School District's Digital Equipment Corporation VAX-VMS computer which utilized the Statistics Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), Version 4.5 for statistical review of the results.

#### DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Part of the research of this study was to determine whether demographics played a role in one's perceptions of the current evaluation process. To determine this,

respondents were asked to complete questions that provided personal history in the following areas: gender, age, educational experience, teaching category, undergraduate teaching major, teaching experience in the Vancouver School District, total experience, experience in the building in which one was currently assigned, and whether the teacher was on the regular or short evaluation form. This section will discuss the demographic characteristics of the study's participants. In some cases, responses were omitted due to inaccuracy in completing the questionnaire. In those cases, the percentages that are reported reflect the valid percent of respondents.

### Gender

Respondents were identified as male or female as reflected in Table III. The majority of building administrator respondents were male (64.3%), while the majority of teacher respondents were female (63.7%).

TABLE III  
BREAKDOWN OF RESPONDENTS BY GENDER

Gender	Building Administrators		Teachers*	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
Male	18	64.3	70	36.3
Female	10	35.7	123	63.7
Total	28	100.0	193	100.0

\*Eight questionnaires lacked this information. Percentage of respondents reflects the valid percent of participants.

Age

Table IV shows that the chronological breakdown for teacher respondents was from 21 to over 60 years of age and for building-level administrators from 31 to 60 years of age. Age groupings were broken down into ten-year intervals. Only 6.3 percent of the teacher respondents were under 31 years of age and only one percent was over 60 years of age. The largest number of teacher respondents (43.5%) was in the 41-50 age group, while the largest number of building-level respondents (42.9%) was in the 51-60 age category.

TABLE IV  
BREAKDOWN OF TEACHER RESPONDENTS BY AGE

Age*	Building Administrators		Teachers*	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
21 - 30 Years Old	0	0.0	12	6.3
31 - 40 Years Old	7	25.0	64	33.5
41 - 50 Years Old	9	32.1	83	43.5
51 - 60 Years Old	12	42.9	30	15.7
Over 60 Years Old	0	0.0	2	1.0
Total	28	100.0	191	100.0

\*Ten responses lacked this information.

Education

Educational background for respondents, as shown in Table V, began at the level of a Bachelor's degree and

continued by 45 credit hour increments to the EdD or PhD level. The breakdown of groups on this question was identical to the breakdown used by the school district for the certificated employee salary schedule. All of the building administrators and 68.2 percent of the teacher respondents had earned a Master's degree. The next largest percentage of teacher respondents (14.1%) had earned a Bachelor's degree plus 90 quarter hours.

TABLE V  
BREAKDOWN OF RESPONDENTS BY EDUCATION

Position	<u>Building Administrators</u>		<u>Teachers*</u>	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
Bachelor's Degree	0	0.0	16	8.3
BA - 45 Qtr Hours	0	0.0	15	7.8
BA + 90 Qtr Hours	0	0.0	27	14.1
Master's Degree	29	100.0	131	68.2
EdD or PhD	0	0.0	3	1.6
Total	29	100.0	192	100.0

\*Nine responses lacked this information.

### Job Category

The job categories in Table VI were divided into four increments of primary, intermediate, middle, and high school. These increments were not evenly divided by grades, but followed the current Vancouver School District structural division of curricular programs. There was an even distribution of building administrators between elementary and secondary levels, with 48.3 percent of the

TABLE VI  
BREAKDOWN OF RESPONDENTS BY JOB CATEGORY

Respondents	N	Percent
<b>Building Administrators</b>		
Elementary Principal	14	48.3
Middle School Principal	3	10.3
Middle School Assistant Principal	2	6.9
High School Principal	3	10.3
High School Assistant Principal	7	24.2
<b>Total Building Administrators</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Teachers*</b>		
Primary Teacher (Grades K-3)	54	29.8
Intermediate Teacher (Grades 4-6)	46	25.4
Middle Level Teacher (Grades 7-8)	28	15.5
High School Teacher (Grades 9-12)	53	29.3
<b>Total Teachers</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>100.0</b>

\*Twenty responses lacked this information.

respondents being from elementary schools and the other 51.7 percent coming from secondary schools (middle and high schools). A fairly even distribution of teacher respondents also occurred. Over half of the teachers (55.2%) were from the primary and intermediate grades, while 44.8 percent of the respondents were from middle and high school classrooms.

#### Undergraduate Major

Fifteen major fields of study were listed and are shown in Table VII, with a sixteenth space provided for

TABLE VII  
UNDERGRADUATE MAJOR

Category	<u>Building Admin.</u>	<u>Teachers</u>
	N	N
Elementary Education	13	77
Secondary Education	3	44
Art	0	4
Health	0	4
English/Lang. Arts./Reading	1	12
Music	1	10
Social Studies/Social Science	11	44
Science	1	15
Physical Education	5	20
Industrial Arts	2	4
Vocational Education	1	4
Speech/Drama	1	5
Other	2	22

NOTE: Participants may have identified more than one undergraduate major.

respondents to identify other categories that were not previously listed. The results of this information were inconclusive because teachers often listed more than one major field of study on the questionnaire. The same was also true of the building administrator responses.

#### Total Teaching Experience

This category, shown in Table VIII, was divided by five-year intervals, beginning with zero experience and concluding with 30 or more years. As with the age breakdown, the majority of building administrators and teachers can be found in the middle of the table, between five and nineteen years of total teaching experience. The teachers

TABLE VIII  
TOTAL TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Experience	Building Admin.		Teachers	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
0 - 4 Years	1	3.6	16	8.5
5 - 9 Years	7	25.0	27	14.4
10 - 14 Years	11	39.3	28	14.9
15 - 19 Years	6	21.4	54	28.7
20 - 24 Years	2	7.1	34	18.1
25 - 29 Years	1	3.6	22	11.7
30 Plus Years	0	0.0	7	3.7
TOTAL	28	100.0	188	100.0

\*Thirteen responses lacked this information.

appeared to demonstrate a more even breakdown of years teaching experience than did the building administrators.

#### Vancouver School District Teaching Experience

This category is shown in Table IX and was designed to determine the responses of teachers who have taught within the district. It could also be used for comparative purposes with those who had taught outside of the school district. Divisions for this question were identical to total teaching experience. The data indicated that building administrator respondents have relatively fewer years of teaching experience in Vancouver than they have in total teaching experience. The same can also be said of the teachers in the Vancouver Schools.

TABLE IX  
VANCOUVER TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Experience	<u>Building Admin.*</u>		<u>Teachers**</u>	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
0 - 4 Years	4	14.8	36	20.6
5 - 9 Years	8	29.6	19	10.9
10 - 14 Years	13	48.1	30	17.1
15 - 19 Years	2	7.5	47	26.8
20 - 24 Years	0	0.0	34	19.4
25 - 29 Years	0	0.0	9	5.1
30 Plus Years	0	0.0	1	0.1
TOTAL	27	100.0	176	100.0

\*One response lacked this information.

\*\*Twenty-five respondents lacked this information.

#### Current Building Teaching Experience

The breakdown of this category, shown in Table X, was also identical to the experience breakdown on the two previous tables, but it was only completed by teacher respondents. Over 50 percent of the teacher respondents have been in their current building for less than five years.

#### Evaluation Form Used

The school district uses two different forms and methods in the evaluation process. One of them is a regular form on which a teacher is observed and evaluated twice during each year. The other form, the short form, involves the formal observation and evaluation of the teacher only once each year, with the teacher going through

TABLE X  
EXPERIENCE OF TEACHERS IN CURRENT BUILDING

Experience	N	Percent
0 - 4 Years	95	50.8
5 - 9 Years	33	17.6
10 - 14 Years	20	10.7
15 - 19 Years	22	11.8
20 - 24 Years	17	9.1
Total	187	100.0

\*Fourteen responses lacked this information.

the regular evaluation process every third year. Table XI shows that the teacher respondents within the two groups were nearly identical, with 49.2 percent of the respondents on the short form evaluation and 50.2 percent on the long evaluation form.

TABLE XI  
TEACHER EVALUATION FORM USED

Form	N	Percent
Short Form	91	49.2
Regular Form	94	50.8
Total	185	100.0

\*Sixteen responses lacked this information.

#### Administrative Experience

Additional demographic information was obtained from the Building Administrator Evaluation Perception

Questionnaire respondents in relationship to administrative experience. These responses are shown in Table XII. That information showed almost identical number of years experience from the respondents in both school district experience and total administrative experience.

Chapter IV will discuss the results of the research. This will be followed by Chapter V, which will include the recommendations and conclusions of the study.

TABLE XII  
ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE - BUILDING ADMINISTRATORS

Experience	VSD Experience		Total Experience*	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
0 - 4 Years	1	3.6	1	3.9
5 - 9 Years	9	32.1	9	34.6
10 - 14 Years	7	25.0	7	26.9
15 - 19 Years	8	28.6	7	26.9
20 - 24 Years	2	7.1	2	7.7
25 - 29 Years	1	3.6	0	0.0
Total	28	100.0	26	100.0

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS OF STUDY

#### INTRODUCTION

This chapter reports the results of the comparative analysis applied to the questions in the Evaluation Perception Questionnaires that were completed by both teachers and building-level administrators.

The following sections are included in this chapter: (1) Building-level Administrator Responses; (2) Teacher Responses; (3) Comparison of Teachers and Building-level Administrators; (4) Review: Open-ended Questions; and (5) Summary of Results.

#### BUILDING-LEVEL ADMINISTRATOR RESPONSES

This section will discuss the results from the analysis of responses received by the building-level administrators. Included in this discussion will be the report of total group responses and the report of comparisons of responses between the elementary- and secondary-level building administrators.

##### Total Group Responses

One purpose of the administration of the Building-level Administrator Evaluation Perception Questionnaire was

to determine building-level administrator perceptions of the effectiveness of the teacher evaluation process and whether these perceptions differed by administrative assignment.

This section will describe the results received from the building-level administrators on questions within the five subdivisions of the building administrator questionnaire. The five sub-divisions are: (1) Evaluator Quality; (2) Comfort with Evaluator; (3) Frequency of Classroom Visitations; (4) Evaluation Procedural Points; and (5) Utilization of Evaluation Results. Corresponding tables will show the responses given by building administrators to the questions within each subdivision.

Evaluator Quality. Based upon results of the research, and as shown in Table XIII, the building administrators perceive themselves to be well qualified and effective in the task of evaluating teachers. All of the administrators that returned the surveys either agreed or strongly agreed that they possess the skills and training needed to evaluate the performance of teachers (Question 1). Additionally, 89.3 percent of the respondents said that their evaluatees perceive them to be effective in analyzing observed lessons accurately (Question 3), while 92.8 percent believe that their evaluatees feel that they receive fair evaluations from them (Question 2).

TABLE XIII

RESPONSES OF BUILDING ADMINISTRATORS TO THE EVALUATOR  
QUALITY ITEMS ON THE ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Question	N	Percentage				
		SA (1)	A (2)	U (3)	D (4)	SD (5)
1. I possess the skills and training to evaluate the performance of my teachers.	28	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2. My evaluatees feel I give them fair evaluations.	28	28.6	64.2	3.6	3.6	0.0
3. My evaluatees see me as being effective in analyzing observed lesson accurately.	27	17.9	71.4	3.6	7.1	0.0
4. After being in my evaluatees' classroom, they receive feedback on what was observed.	28	64.3	35.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. My evaluatees see me as using the previous evaluation to assist them in setting future goals for instructional improvement.	28	17.9	50.0	21.4	10.7	0.0

Not only do building administrators perceive themselves as providing feedback to teachers following a classroom observation (Question 4 - 100%), but they also believe that their evaluatees perceive them as using this information for establishing future goals for teachers (Questions 5 - 67.9%).

Comfort with Evaluator. Table XIV shows the results of the building administrator responses in relationship to self-perceptions of teacher comfort with evaluators. Building administrators perceived themselves to be relatively effective in developing comfort with their

TABLE XIV

RESPONSES OF BUILDING ADMINISTRATORS TO THE COMFORT WITH EVALUATOR ITEMS ON THE ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Question	N	Percentage				
		SA (1)	A (2)	U (3)	D (4)	SD (5)
6. My evaluatees feel that I respect them as educators.	27	55.6	44.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
7. My evaluatees know what I think of their teaching skills.	28	32.1	64.3	3.6	0.0	0.0
8. A level of trust exists between my evaluatees and me.	28	32.1	60.8	7.1	0.0	0.0
9. My evaluatees are satisfied with the amount of time I spend in their classrooms.	29	3.6	39.3	32.1	21.4	3.6
10. Teachers feel uneasy and unsure of themselves when I enter a classroom to evaluate.	28	7.4	11.1	11.1	55.6	14.8
11. Teachers feel threatened by me when I enter their room to evaluate.	28	7.1	7.1	3.6	53.6	28.6

TABLE XIV (Continued)

Question	N	Percentage				
		SA (1)	A (2)	U (3)	D (4)	SD (5)
12. My evaluatees agree that I observe in their room for a period of time that gives me a fair picture of activities that were observed.	28	14.3	64.3	17.8	3.6	0.0
13. If my evaluatees know when they are going to be observed, they would do a better job in preparation for the observation.	28	21.4	46.4	14.3	14.3	3.6
14. The post-conference is a mutual sharing of both my evaluatee's perceptions of what happened, and my perceptions of what was seen during the observation.	28	32.1	67.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
15. My evaluatees feel comfortable in the post-conference with me.	28	32.1	64.3	3.6	0.0	0.0

evaluatees. All or nearly all respondents stated that their evaluatees feel that they are respected by them (Question 6 - 100%), know what they think of their teaching skills (Question 7 - 96.4%), and have developed a level of trust between themselves and their evaluatees (Question 8 -

92.9%). Furthermore, building administrators generally believed that teachers do not feel uneasy and unsure of themselves (Question 10), nor do they feel threatened when evaluators walk into their room (Question 11). To these two negatively stated questions, 70.4 percent and 82.2 percent, respectively, of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed.

The results of Question 9 in this survey support the belief that administrators have varying opinions on whether teachers are satisfied with the amount of time spent by administrators in classrooms. Approximately 43 percent of the respondents (42.9%) believe that their evaluatees are satisfied with the amount of time they spend in classroom, while 25 percent do not feel that their evaluatees are satisfied and 32.1 percent were undecided.

Building administrators responded in Question 13 (67.8%) that they believe teachers would do a better job in preparation for an observation if they knew when they were going to be observed.

Results of questions which addressed the perceived levels of comfort of evaluatees in the post-conference phase of the evaluation process indicated that building administrators felt that a mutual sharing of perceptions of what was observed occurs during this phase of the process (Question 14 - 100%) and that teachers were comfortable during the post-conference (Question 15 - 96.4%).

Frequency of Classroom Visitation. Although building-level administrators are in classrooms more than just to conduct formal observations, the frequency of such visits is limited (See Table XV). Questions 16 and 17

TABLE XV

RESPONSES OF BUILDING ADMINISTRATORS TO THE FREQUENCY  
OF CLASSROOM VISITATION ITEMS ON THE  
ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Question	Percentage					
	N	SA (1)	A (2)	U (3)	D (4)	SD (5)
16. I drop into my evaluatees' class- rooms to see how they are doing at least once/week.	27	14.8	22.2	0.0	37.1	25.9
17. I drop into my evaluatees' class to observe students and curriculum at least once/week.	28	14.3	17.9	3.6	39.2	25.0
18. The only time I am in classrooms is for a formal evaluation.	28	7.1	10.7	0.0	28.6	53.6
19. I am too busy to visit my evaluatees' classrooms any more than currently occurs.	28	14.3	32.1	14.3	25.0	14.3
20. I wish that I could visit my evaluatees' classrooms more often.	28	53.6	35.7	3.6	7.1	0.0

dealt directly with whether the administrator was in the classroom to see how the teacher was doing on a weekly basis, or whether drop-ins occur on a weekly basis to observe students and curriculum. In each case, over 63 percent of the respondents stated that they did not drop in to classrooms on a weekly basis. However, 46.4 of all building administrators felt they were too busy to visit more often than was currently occurring (Question 19). Among groups of administrators, 89.3 percent stated that they wished they could visit classrooms more often (Question 20).

Evaluation Procedural Points. Table XVI reports the results of responses by building-level administrators in the area of evaluation procedural points. In relationship to the principal's perceptions of the procedures used in the evaluation process, the results showed that half of all evaluators do not schedule the date and time for the observation (Question 21) and do not conduct pre-conferences prior to the observation (Questions 22 - 79.3%). It was also found that most evaluators do not know the teacher's class objective (Question 23 - 67.9%), nor does the teacher know what areas the evaluator will focus upon during the observation (Question 24 - 55.2%). According to Questions 25 and 26 (89.6% and 93.2%, respectively), the building-level administrators perceive themselves to be quite

TABLE XVI  
RESPONSES OF BUILDING ADMINISTRATORS TO THE EVALUATION  
PROCEDURAL POINTS ITEMS ON THE  
ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Question	N	Percentage				
		SA (1)	A (2)	U (3)	D (4)	SD (5)
21. Before each evaluation, I schedule the date and time for the observation.	28	25.0	21.4	3.6	39.3	10.7
22. I always conduct a pre-conference with my evaluatees to discuss the lesson to be observed prior to a classroom observation.	28	6.9	10.3	3.5	62.1	17.2
23. Before each evaluation, I know my evaluatees' objective for the lesson to be observed.	28	7.1	17.9	7.1	57.2	10.7
24. Before each evaluation, the evaluatee knows the areas in which the evaluation will focus for observational purposes.	28	10.3	24.2	10.3	44.9	10.3
25. During the observation, I take accurate verbatim notes on what is observed.	28	51.7	37.9	3.5	6.9	0.0
26. I accurately record what happens in the classroom during an evaluation.	28	48.4	44.8	3.4	0.0	3.4

accurate in documenting what happens within the classroom during the observation period.

Utilization of Evaluation Results. Table XVII reports results of building-level administrator perceptions on the utilization of evaluation results. As can be seen, administrators are split on their feelings regarding the success of the current evaluation process being used by the school district. Although 42.9 percent of the respondents believe that the current evaluation system enables the evaluatees to be evaluated fairly and accurately (Question 28), 32.1 percent of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with this assertion.

Consistency existed in the administrator's perceptions of their accuracy in recording data within the observation period. Building administrators see themselves as being prompt in completing the evaluation report and setting a time for a post-conference to occur (Question 27 - 89.3%).

Questions 29 through 31 addressed the utilization by teachers of recommendations for improvement. In Questions 29 (82.8%) and 30 (79.4%), building-level administrators felt that teachers receive recommendations from classroom observations that they can implement in their classroom and use to set personal goals. As to the improvement of instruction (Question 31), 51.9 percent of evaluators felt the current process had improved their evaluatees'

TABLE XVII

RESPONSES OF BUILDING ADMINISTRATORS TO THE UTILIZATION  
OF EVALUATION RESULTS ITEMS ON THE  
ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Question	N	Percentage				
		SA (1)	A (2)	U (3)	D (4)	SD (5)
27. I am prompt in completing the evaluation report and setting a time to post-conference.	28	39.3	50.0	10.7	0.0	0.0
28. The current evaluation system enables my evaluatees to be evaluated fairly and accurately.	28	10.7	32.2	25.0	25.0	7.1
29. My evaluatees are provided with recommendations that they seriously try to implement in their classrooms.	28	10.3	72.5	6.9	6.9	3.4
30. The current evaluation system provides my evaluatees with information that they can use to set personal goals for instructional growth.	28	10.3	69.1	10.3	6.9	3.4
31. The current evaluation process has improved my evaluatees' teaching.	28	0.0	51.9	29.6	11.1	7.4
32. The teacher evaluation system can and should be improved.	28	42.9	42.9	10.6	3.6	0.0
33. I am very satisfied with the evaluation process.	28	0.0	18.5	18.5	44.5	18.5

teaching, while 18.5 percent did not believe that the current process improved the evaluatees' teaching skills, and approximately 30 percent were undecided.

Questions 32 and 33 asked the respondents whether the current system could be improved and whether they were satisfied with the current evaluation process. Results indicated that 85.8 percent of the respondents believe the system can be improved and 63 percent of the evaluators are not satisfied with the current system.

#### Comparison of Elementary and Secondary Administrators

Another purpose of the administration of the Building-level Administrator Evaluation Perception Questionnaire was to determine whether building-level administrator perceptions of the effectiveness of the teacher evaluation process varied between elementary and secondary building administrators. The elementary and secondary administrators were divided into two groups: elementary (grades K through 6) and secondary (grades 7 through 12). Using the Chi Square method, an item-by-item analysis of the results of each question by the two demographic groups was done. The response distribution for the two administrative groups is discussed only for those questions in which significant differences were found. Tables within this section will report group responses and Chi Square results.

This section will describe the results received when comparing the two groups of building-level administrators on the questions within the five subdivisions of the building administrator questionnaire. As discussed previously, the five subdivisions are: (1) Evaluator Quality; (2) Comfort with Evaluator; (3) Frequency of Classroom Visitation; (4) Evaluation Procedural Points; and (5) Utilization of Evaluation Results.

Evaluator Quality. Table XVIII presents the results of responses of elementary and secondary building administrators within the area of evaluator quality. In reviewing the Chi Square tests of independence, no significant difference ( $p > .05$ ) was found to exist between the responses of elementary and secondary administrators regarding evaluator quality.

Comfort with Evaluator. Table XIX presents the responses of elementary and secondary building administrators to the questions within the area of comfort with the evaluator. The Chi Square tests of independence found no significant difference ( $p > .05$ ) in this category.

Frequency of Classroom Visitations. The Chi Square tests of independence found no significant difference between elementary and secondary building administrators in this category ( $p > .05$ ). Table XX reports the responses the subgroups of elementary and secondary building administrators gave within this category.

TABLE XVIII

RESPONSES OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY BUILDING ADMINISTRATORS TO THE  
EVALUATOR QUALITY ITEMS ON THE ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Question	Admin. Level*	N	Percentage					$\chi^2$	D.F.	Prob.	Comments
			SA (1)	A (2)	U (3)	D (4)	SD (5)				
1. I possess the skills and training to evaluate the performance of my teachers.	E:	14	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0				No Interpretation Possible
	S:	14	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0				
2. My evaluatees feel that I give them fair evaluations.	E:	14	28.6	64.3	7.1	0.0	0.0				No Interpretation Possible
	S:	14	28.6	64.3	0.0	7.1	0.0				
3. My evaluatees see me as being effective in analyzing observed lessons accurately.	E:	13	7.7	92.3	0.0	0.0	0.0				No Interpretation Possible
	S:	14	28.6	50.0	7.1	14.3	0.0				
4. After being in my evaluatees' classroom, they receive feedback on what was observed.	E:	14	57.1	42.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.156	1	0.693	Exclude (U) (D) (SD)
	S:	14	71.4	28.6	0.0	0.0	0.0				
5. My evaluatees see me as using the previous evaluation to assist them in setting future goals for instructional improvement.	E:	14	7.1	57.1	21.4	14.3	0.0				No Interpretation Possible
	S:	14	28.6	42.9	21.4	7.1	0.0				

\* E = Elementary building-level administrators; S = Secondary building-level administrators.

TABLE XIX

RESPONSES OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY BUILDING ADMINISTRATORS TO THE COMFORT WITH  
EVALUATOR QUALITY ITEMS ON THE ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Question	Admin. Level*	N	Percentage					$\chi^2$	D.F.	Prob.	Comments
			SA (1)	A (2)	U (3)	D (4)	SD (5)				
6. Evaluatees feel that I respect them as educators.	E:	13	53.8	46.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.000	1	1.000	Exclude (U) (D) (SD)
	S:	14	57.1	42.9	0.0	0.0	0.0				
7. My evaluatees know what I think of their teaching skills.	E:	14	28.6	71.4	0.0	0.0	0.0				No Interpretation Possible
	S:	14	35.7	57.1	7.1	0.0	0.0				
8. A level of trust exists between my evaluatees and me.	E:	14	28.6	64.3	7.1	0.0	0.0				No Interpretation Possible
	S:	14	35.7	57.1	7.1	0.0	0.0				
9. My evaluatees are satisfied with the amount of time I spend in their classrooms.	E:	14	0.0	42.9	28.6	28.6	0.0	0.000	1	1.000	Combine (SA) (A) (U) (D) (SD)
	S:	14	7.1	35.7	35.7	14.3	7.1				
10. Teachers feel uneasy and unsure of themselves when I enter a classroom to evaluate.	E:	13	7.7	15.4	7.7	61.5	7.7				No Interpretation Possible
	S:	14	7.1	7.1	14.3	50.0	21.4				
11. Teachers feel threatened by me when I enter their room to evaluate.	E:	14	7.1	0.0	0.0	64.3	28.6				No Interpretation Possible
	S:	14	7.1	14.3	7.1	42.9	28.6				

TABLE XIX (Continued)

Question	Admin.	N	Percentage					$\chi^2$	D.F.	Prob.	Comments
			SA (1)	A (2)	U (3)	D (4)	SD (5)				
12. My evaluatees agree that I observe in their room for a period of time that gives me a fair picture of activities that were observed.	E:	14	7.1	92.9	0.0	0.0	0.0				No Interpretation Possible
	S:	14	21.4	35.7	35.7	7.1	0.0				
13. If my evaluatees knew when they were going to be observed, they would do a better job in preparation for the observation.	E:	14	14.3	64.3	0.0	14.3	7.1				No Interpretation Possible
	S:	14	29.6	29.5	29.6	14.2	0.0				
14. The post-conference is a mutual sharing of both my evaluatee's perceptions of what happened, and my perceptions of what was seen during the observation.	E:	14	35.7	64.3	0.0	0.0	0.0				No Interpretation Possible
	S:	14	29.6	71.4	0.0	0.0	0.0				
15. My evaluatees feel comfortable in the post-conference with me.	E:	14	21.4	79.6	0.0	0.0	0.0				No Interpretation Possible
	S:	14	42.9	50.0	7.1	0.0	0.0				

\* E = Elementary building-level administrators; S = Secondary building-level administrators.

TABLE XX

RESPONSES OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY BUILDING ADMINISTRATORS TO THE FREQUENCY OF  
CLASSROOM VISITATION ITEMS ON THE ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Question	Admin. Level*	N	Percentage					$\chi^2$	D.F.	Prob.	Comments
			SA (1)	A (2)	U (3)	D (4)	SD (5)				
16. I drop into my evaluatees' classrooms to see how they are doing at least once/week.	E:	13	30.8	23.1	0.0	46.1	0.0				No Interpretation Possible
	S:	14	0.0	21.4	0.0	28.6	50.0				
17. I drop into my evaluatees' class to observe students and curriculum at least once/week.	E:	14	21.4	28.6	7.1	42.9	0.0				No Interpretation Possible
	S:	14	7.1	7.1	0.0	35.7	50.0				
18. The only time I am in classrooms is for a formal evaluation.	E:	14	0.0	0.0	0.0	35.7	64.3	0.876	1	0.349	Exclude (U) Combine (SA) (A) (D) (SD)
	S:	14	14.3	21.4	0.0	21.4	42.9				
19. I am too busy to visit my evaluatees' classrooms any more than currently occurs.	E:	14	0.0	35.7	21.4	21.4	21.4	0.876	1	0.349	Combine (SA) (A) (U) (D) (SD)
	S:	14	28.6	28.6	7.1	28.6	7.1				
20. I wish that I could visit my evaluatees' classrooms more often.	E:	14	57.1	28.6	7.1	7.1	0.0	0.037	1	0.848	Exclude (SD) Combine (A) (U) (D)
	S:	14	50.0	42.9	0.0	7.1	0.0				

\* E = Elementary building-level administrators; S = Secondary building-level administrators.

Evaluation Procedural Points. The results of Questions 21 through 26 are reported in Table XXI. The data showed that, with the exception of Question 25, no significant difference ( $p > .05$ ) was found in this category. In Question 25, one hundred percent of elementary administrators saw themselves as taking accurate verbatim notes during an observation, while 78.6 percent of the secondary administrators perceived themselves to be accurate note takers. Additionally, 14.3 percent of secondary building administrators did not see themselves as taking accurate verbatim notes.

Utilization of evaluation results. The subgroup responses in the utilization of evaluation results and overall satisfaction with current evaluation methods within the district are shown in Table XXII. The Chi Square tests of independence found no significant difference between elementary and secondary building administrators in this category ( $p > .05$ ).

TABLE XXI

RESPONSES OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY BUILDING ADMINISTRATORS TO THE EVALUATION  
PROCEDURAL POINTS ITEMS ON THE ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Question	Admin. Level*	N	Percentage					$\chi^2$	D.F.	Prob.	Comments
			SA (1)	A (2)	U (3)	D (4)	SD (5)				
21. Before each evaluation, I schedule the date and time for the observation.	E	14	28.6	21.4	7.1	41.9	0.0	0.304	1	0.581	Combine (SA) (A) (U) (D) (SD)
	S:	14	21.4	21.4	0.0	35.7	21.4				
22. I always conduct a pre-conference with my evaluatees to discuss the lesson to be observed prior to a classroom observation.	E:	14	7.1	14.3	0.0	64.3	14.3				No Interpretation Possible
	S:	14	7.1	7.1	7.1	57.3	21.4				
23. Before each evaluation, I know my evaluatees' objective for the lesson to be observed.	E:	14	7.1	21.4	7.1	64.3	0.0				No Interpretation Possible
	S:	14	7.1	14.3	7.1	50.0	21.4				
24. Before each evaluation, the evaluatee knows the areas in which the evaluation will focus for observational purposes.	E:	14	14.3	28.6	7.1	50.0	0.0	0.028	1	0.867	Combine (SA) (A) (U) (D) (SD)
	S:	14	7.1	21.4	14.3	35.7	21.4				

TABLE XXI (Continued)

Question	Admin. Level*	N	Percentage					$\chi^2$	D.F.	Prob.	Comments
			SA (1)	A (2)	U (3)	D (4)	SD (5)				
25. During the observation, I take accurate verbatim notes on what is observed.	E:	14	95.7	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.030	1	0.002	Exclude (SD)
	S:	14	14.3	64.3	7.1	14.3	0.0				Combine (A) (U) (D)
26. I accurately record what happens in the classroom during an evaluation.	E:	14	57.1	35.7	0.0	0.0	7.1	0.304	1	0.581	Exclude (D)
	S:	14	35.7	57.1	7.1	0.0	0.0				Combine (A) (U) (SD)

\* E = Elementary building-level administrators; S = Secondary building-level administrators.

TABLE XXII

RESPONSES OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY BUILDING ADMINISTRATORS TO THE UTILIZATION OF  
EVALUATION RESULTS ITEMS ON THE ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Question	Admin. Level*	N	Percentage					$\chi^2$	D.F.	Prob.	Comments
			SA (1)	A (2)	U (3)	D (4)	SD (5)				
27. I am prompt in completing the evaluation report and setting a time to post-conference.	S:	14	28.6	64.3	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.952	1	0.329	Exclude (D) (SD) Combine (A) (U)
	E:	14	50.0	35.7	14.3	0.0	0.0				
28. The current evaluation system enables my evaluatees to be evaluated fairly and accurately.	E:	14	7.1	35.7	28.6	21.4	7.1	0.000	1	1.000	Combine (SA) (A) (U) (D) (SD)
	S:	14	14.3	28.6	21.4	28.6	7.1				
29. My evaluatees are provided with recommendations that they seriously try to implement in their classrooms.	E:	14	0.0	85.7	7.1	0.0	7.1				No Interpretation Possible
	S:	14	21.4	57.1	7.1	14.3	0.0				
30. The current evaluation system provides my evaluatees with information that they can use to set personal goals for instructional growth.	E:	14	7.1	78.6	7.1	0.0	7.1				No Interpretation Possible
	S:	14	14.3	64.3	7.1	14.3	0.0				
31. The current evaluation process has improved my evaluatee's teaching.	E:	14	0.0	46.2	38.5	7.7	7.7	0.124	1	0.724	Exclude (SA) Combine (U) (D) (SD)
	S:	14	0.0	57.1	21.4	14.3	7.1				

TABLE XXII Continued

Question	Admin. Level*	N	Percentage					$\chi^2$	D.F.	Prob.	Comments
			SA (1)	A (2)	U (3)	D (4)	SD (5)				
32. The teacher evaluation system can and should be improved.	E:	14	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.284	1	0.594	Exclude (SD) Combine (A) (U) (D)
	S:	14	35.7	35.7	21.4	7.1	0.0				
33. I am very satisfied with the evaluation process.	E:	14	0.0	14.3	14.3	64.3	7.1	0.599	1	0.439	Combine (A) (U) (D) (SD)
	S:	14	0.0	23.1	23.1	23.1	30.8				

\*E: Elementary building-level administrators; S = Secondary building-level administrators.

## TEACHER RESPONSES

In this section, the responses to the Teacher Evaluation Perception Questionnaire will be examined for the total teacher sample and by selected teacher characteristics.

### Total Group Responses

One purpose of the administration of the Teacher Evaluation Perception Questionnaire was to determine teacher perceptions of the effectiveness of the teacher evaluation process. This section will discuss the results obtained from the questionnaires completed by the randomly selected teachers.

The 33 questions were reviewed to determine whether a common theme existed within a group of the questions. From this review, five clusters were identified into which the questions were grouped. These five clusters were categorized by the experimenter as follows: General Perceptions of the Evaluator's Skills (Questions 1-3 and 7); Comfort with the Evaluator (Questions 8, 10, 11, and 15); Frequency of Classroom Visits by Evaluator (Questions 9, 12, 16-19); Evaluation Process (Questions 4, and 21-27); and Use of Evaluation Information and Overall View of the Evaluation Process (Questions 5, 14, and 28-33). This section will discuss the responses received by the total group of

teachers within the study and will conclude with a discussion of the scale characteristics of the clusters.

General Perceptions of the Evaluator's Skills. Table XXIII shows the total teacher group responses in relationship to the general perceptions of the evaluator's skills. Teachers generally perceived their evaluators quite positively in relationship to their skills as evaluators. Over 89 percent of teacher respondents viewed their evaluators

TABLE XXIII

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES BY TEACHERS IN CLUSTER 1:  
GENERAL PERCEPTIONS OF THE EVALUATOR'S SKILLS

Question	N	Percentage				
		SA (1)	A (2)	U (3)	D (4)	SD (5)
1. My evaluator possesses the necessary skills and training to evaluate my teaching performance.	199	44.2	45.2	3.5	5.5	1.5
2. My evaluator is fair in his/her evaluations.	198	51.0	43.4	3.5	1.0	1.0
3. My evaluator is effective in being able to analyze observed lessons accurately.	200	35.5	51.0	8.5	5.0	0.0
7. I know what my evaluator thinks of my teaching skills.	198	47.0	40.9	8.1	3.5	0.5

to possess the necessary skills and training to evaluate (Question 1). Teachers also saw their evaluators to be fair in their evaluations (Question 2), as 94.4 percent of the teachers responded favorably in viewing their evaluator as being fair. Teachers also gave high marks to their evaluators in relationship to evaluator effectiveness in accurately analyzing lessons (Question 3 - 86.5%), and in knowing what their evaluator thinks of their teaching (Question 7 - 87.9%).

Comfort with the Evaluator. Table XXIV records the responses by teachers toward their perceived comfort with the evaluator. Teachers stated that they felt comfortable with their evaluator. Trust was present between the evaluator and evaluatee (Question 8 - 87%); teachers did not feel uneasy or unsure of themselves when the evaluator was present in the classroom (Question 10 - 83.9%), nor did they feel threatened by their evaluator's presence in the room (Question 11 - 91%). A strong feeling existed among teachers that their evaluator made them feel comfortable during post-conferences (Question 15 - 91.9%).

Frequency of Classroom Visits by Evaluator. Teacher responses shown in Table XXV demonstrate that teachers were generally satisfied with the frequency with which evaluators were in their classrooms (Question 9) and with the length of classroom visitations (Question 12). Over 73 percent of teachers were satisfied with the frequency and

TABLE XXIV  
 PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES BY TEACHERS IN CLUSTER 2:  
 COMFORT WITH THE EVALUATOR

Question	N	Percentage				
		SA (1)	A (2)	U (3)	D (4)	SD (5)
8. A level of trust exists between my evaluator and me.	200	49.0	38.0	7.0	3.0	3.0
10. I feel uneasy and unsure of myself when my evaluator comes into my room.	199	4.1	6.0	6.0	47.7	36.2
11. I feel threatened when my evaluator is in my room to evaluate me.	200	2.5	3.0	3.5	48.0	43.0
15. My evaluator makes me feel comfortable in the post-conference.	198	43.9	48.0	4.6	3.0	0.5

length of current visitations, while 16 percent were not satisfied and 9 percent were undecided. Such visits were not on a weekly basis, however. In Questions 16 and 17, which focused upon whether evaluators were in classrooms for observational purposes on a weekly basis, over 64 percent of teachers did not agree that they were visited in their classrooms on a weekly basis. Twenty-six percent of the respondents stated that the only time their evaluator was in their classroom was for evaluation purposes (Question 18); however, 70.5% stated that their evaluator was in

TABLE XXV

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES BY TEACHERS IN CLUSTER 3:  
FREQUENCY OF CLASSROOM VISITS BY THE EVALUATOR

Question	Percentage					
	N	SA (1)	A (2)	U (3)	D (4)	SD (5)
9. I am satisfied with the amount of time my evaluator spends in my classrooms.	199	38.2	37.2	9.0	11.6	4.0
12. My evaluator makes observations for a period of time that I believe gives a fair picture of the activities that were observed.	200	26.0	47.5	11.5	10.0	5.0
16. My evaluator will drop into my class to see how I am doing at least once/week.	199	11.1	19.1	5.0	35.7	29.1
17. My evaluator will drop into my class to observe students and curriculum at least once/week.	198	9.0	15.1	5.7	40.9	29.3
18. The only time my evaluator is in my room is for a formal evaluation.	200	7.5	18.5	3.5	38.5	32.0
19. My evaluator is too busy to visit my classroom any more than currently occurs.	199	17.1	31.6	17.6	18.6	15.1

their classroom for more than just evaluation purposes.

Nearly 50 percent of the teachers felt that their evaluator was too busy to visit more often (Question 19).

Evaluation Process. Teachers had varying opinions regarding the effectiveness of the evaluation process, as shown in Table XXVI. Although they praised the evaluator for the feedback that they received (Question 4 - 73.9%), fewer than half of the teachers stated that the evaluator scheduled observations (Question 21 - 49%), and a large majority felt that pre-conferences did not occur prior to the observation (Question 22 - 76.5%). Neither did teachers feel that the evaluator knew the observed lesson's objectives (Questions 23 - 62.7%) or that teachers were aware of what areas the evaluator would focus during the observation (Question 24 - 54.3%). Teachers did see their evaluators as being accurate in recording what was observed (Question 25 - 76.4% and Question 26 - 85%) and in completing the observation report promptly (Question 27 - 87.8%).

Use of Evaluation Information and Overall View of the Evaluation Process. Results of this cluster are shown in Table XXVII. Teachers gave mixed responses on whether their evaluator uses previous evaluations to assist the teacher in setting future goals (Question 5). Although 54 percent of the respondents affirmed the question, 19.9 percent were undecided and 26.1 percent did not believe that their evaluator used previous evaluations to assist them in establishing future goals. In relationship to teacher perceptions of the use of evaluation information, teachers felt that the post-conference was a mutual sharing of the

TABLE XXVI  
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES BY TEACHERS  
IN CLUSTER 4: EVALUATION PROCESS

Question	N	Percentage				
		SA (1)	A (2)	U (3)	D (4)	SD (5)
4. After my evaluator has been in my classroom for an observation, I receive valuable information on what was observed.	199	33.7	40.2	11.1	13.5	1.5
21. Before each evaluation, my evaluator schedules the date and time for the observation with me.	200	17.0	32.0	9.5	32.0	9.5
22. My evaluator conducts a pre-conference with me to discuss the lesson to be observed prior to a classroom observation.	200	3.5	11.5	8.5	53.0	23.5
23. Before each evaluation, my evaluator knows my objective for the lesson to be observed.	198	8.6	20.1	8.6	47.5	15.2
24. Before each evaluation, I am aware of the areas in which my evaluator will be focusing for observational purposes.	197	9.6	27.4	8.6	41.6	12.7
25. During the observation, my evaluator takes what I believe are accurate verbatim notes of what occurred in the classroom.	199	30.7	45.7	13.6	7.5	2.5

TABLE XXVI (Continued)

Question	N	Percentage				
		SA (1)	A (2)	U (3)	D (4)	SD (5)
26. My evaluator accurately records what happens in my classroom during an evaluation.	200	33.5	51.5	12.0	2.0	1.0
27. My evaluator is prompt in completing the evaluation report and setting a time to post-conference.	197	40.6	47.2	5.6	6.6	0.0

observation (Question 14 - 86.8%) and that evaluators provided teachers with recommendations for teachers to implement in the classroom (Question 29 - 69.6%).

Teachers also displayed mixed feelings on whether the current evaluation system enabled their evaluator to evaluate their performance fairly and accurately (Question 28). Although 57.5 percent of the respondents felt that they received fair and accurate evaluations, 18.5 percent were undecided and 24 percent did not feel that they received fair and accurate evaluations.

Teachers were not definite in their response regarding whether the current evaluation system had improved their teaching (Question 31). Although 44.7 percent felt that their teaching had improved because of the evaluation process, 32.6 percent did not feel that the process had

TABLE XXVII  
 PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES BY TEACHERS IN CLUSTER 5:  
 USE OF EVALUATION INFORMATION AND OVERALL VIEW  
 OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS

Question	N	Percentage				
		SA (1)	A (2)	U (3)	D (4)	SD (5)
5. My evaluator uses the previous evaluation to assist me in setting future goals for instructional improvement.	196	17.3	36.7	19.9	23.0	3.1
14. The post-conference is a mutual sharing of both my perceptions and the evaluator's perceptions of what was seen during the observation.	197	32.5	54.3	5.6	6.1	1.5
28. The current evaluation system enables my evaluator to evaluate my performance fairly and accurately.	200	17.5	40.0	18.5	21.0	3.0
29. My evaluator provides me with recommendations that I seriously try to implement in my classroom.	197	18.8	50.8	15.2	13.2	2.0
30. The current evaluation system provides me with information that I can use to set personal goals for instructional growth.	199	12.1	45.2	17.1	21.6	4.0
31. The current evaluation system has improved my teaching.	199	6.0	38.7	22.6	26.1	6.5

TABLE XXVII (Continued)

Question	N	Percentage				
		SA (1)	A (2)	U (3)	D (4)	SD (5)
32. The teacher evaluation system should be improved.	199	13.6	31.2	26.1	24.6	4.5
33. I am very satisfied with the evaluation process.	198	12.6	32.8	21.2	25.3	8.1

improved their teaching, and 22.6 percent were undecided whether teacher improvement could be attributed to the evaluation process. Over 44 percent expressed the need for improvement in the current system (Question 32), while 29.1 percent disagreed and 26.1 percent were undecided as to whether the system should be improved. As to satisfaction with the current system (Question 33), 45.4 percent expressed satisfaction, while 33.4 percent were dissatisfied and 21.2 percent were undecided as to how they felt about the current evaluation system.

Scale Characteristics of the Clusters. Questions 10, 11, 18, 19, and 32 on the Teacher Evaluation Perception Questionnaire were written in such a way as to result in necessitating reverse scoring. Reverse scoring was only done in the computation of the cluster scores used in calculating means, standard deviations and coefficients of

reliability. The reported results of these questions have not been reversed and are as they were completed by the respondents. The means, standard deviations, and scale reliabilities of the clusters are shown in Table XXVIII. As can be seen, scale reliabilities ranged from .783 in Comfort with the Evaluator (Cluster 2) to .905 in the Use of Evaluation Information and Overall View of the Evaluation Process (Cluster 5). The means ranged from 1.71 for General Perceptions of the Evaluator's Skills (Cluster 1) to 2.81 for Frequency of Classroom Visits by Evaluator (Cluster 3). The standard deviations ranged from 0.660 for General Perceptions of the Evaluator's Skills (Cluster 1)

TABLE XXVIII  
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND RELIABILITY  
COEFFICIENTS FOR THE TOTAL TEACHER SAMPLE  
ON THE CLUSTERS OF THE TEACHER EVALUATION  
PERCEPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Scale (Cluster)	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficients Alpha
1. Evaluator's Skills	1.710	0.660	.8417
2. Comfort with Evaluator	1.761	0.700	.7828
3. Frequency of Class Visits	2.806	0.897	.8313
4. Evaluation Process	2.605	0.667	.7876
5. Overall View of Process	2.614	0.828	.9051

to 0.897 for Frequency of Classroom Visits by Evaluator (Cluster 3). The clusters were created in order to avoid performing and discussing 33 x 4 Chi Squares and to control for experimentive-error rate entailed by numerous comparisons.

### Demographic Group Responses

Another purpose of the administration of the Teacher Evaluation Perception Questionnaire was to determine whether teachers differ in their perceptions of the effectiveness of the teacher evaluation process according to the dependent variables of gender, age, teaching level, or teaching experience. A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed separately for each independent variable (gender, age, teaching level, and teaching experience). The five clusters (scales) of the Teacher Evaluation Perception Questionnaire provided the dependent variables. For each test, a .05 level of confidence was used. The decision was made to follow rejection of a multivariate statistical hypothesis with analysis of variance on each dependent variable. Table XXIX provides the results of MANOVA with the independent variables of gender, age, teaching level and teaching experience.

The remainder of this section will describe the results received from the four independent variables. Corresponding tables will demonstrate the results.

TABLE XXIX  
RESULTS OF MANOVA USING TEACHING LEVEL, GENDER, AGE,  
AND TEACHING EXPERIENCE AS DEPENDENT VARIABLES  
USING WILKS' LAMBDA MULTIVARIATE  
TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Value	Approx. F	Hypoth DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Gender	.04015	1.37208	5.00	164.00	.237
Age	.09995	.83033	20.00	648.00	.688
Teaching Exper.	.15566	.84613	30.00	790.00	.699
Teacher Level	.32470	3.78674	15.00	468.00	.000

Gender Differences. Table XXX reports the scale means and standard deviations for gender, on which the total means ranged from 1.725 to 2.833.

A multivariate analysis of variance was performed, using gender of the teacher as the independent variable and the five clusters of the Teacher Evaluation Perception Questionnaire as the dependent variables. With 5 and 164 degrees of freedom, the Wilks' Lambda value ( $F = 1.372$ ) was not significant at the .05 level of confidence ( $p = .237$ ). (See Table XXIX). No statistically significant differences were thus detected.

TABLE XXX  
SCALE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATION  
IN RELATIONSHIP TO GENDER

Cluster	Male			Female			Total		
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD
1. Evaluator Skills	69	1.696	.663	119	1.742	.669	188	1.725	.665
2. Comfort with Evaluator	70	1.689	.631	120	1.792	.698	190	1.754	.674
3. Freq. of Class Visits	68	2.978	.895	121	2.751	.925	189	2.833	.918
4. Evaluation Process	68	2.649	.597	118	2.598	.737	186	2.616	.688
5. Overall View of Process	69	2.623	.817	111	2.591	.838	180	2.604	.828

Teacher age differences. The scale means and standard deviations for teacher age are found in Table XXXI. In the category of teacher age, total scale means ranged from 1.722 to 2.827.

Using age of the teacher as the independent variable and the five clusters of the Teacher Evaluation Perception Questionnaire as the dependent variables, a multivariate analysis of variance was performed. With 20 and 648 degrees of freedom, the Wilks' Lambda value ( $F = .8303$ ) was not significant at the .05 level of confidence ( $p = .688$ ). (See Table XXIX, p. 132). No statistically significant differences were thus directed.

Teaching experience differences. The total scale means, which ranged from 1.724 to 2.841 in the category of Teaching Experience, and standard deviations are reported in Table XXXII.

A multivariate analysis of variance was performed, using years of experience as a teacher as the independent variable and the five clusters of the Teacher Evaluation Perception Questionnaire as the dependent variables. With 30 and 790 degrees of freedom, the Wilks' Lambda value ( $F = .846$ ) was not significant at the .05 level of confidence ( $p = .699$ ). (See Table XXIX, p. 132). No statistically significant differences were thus detected.

TABLE XXXI  
SCALE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATION  
IN RELATIONSHIP TO TEACHER AGE

Cluster	<u>21 - 30 Yrs.</u>			<u>31 - 40 Yrs.</u>			<u>41 - 50 Yrs.</u>			<u>51 - 60 Yrs.</u>			<u>Over 60 Yrs.</u>			<u>Total</u>		
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD
1. Evaluator Skills	12	1.792	.602	62	1.811	.662	80	1.703	.704	30	1.571	.554	2	1.500	.707	186	1.722	.660
2. Comfort with Evaluator	12	2.104	.914	63	1.806	.726	81	1.701	.587	30	1.633	.601	2	1.625	.884	188	1.750	.666
3. Freq. of Class Visits	10	3.100	.605	63	2.984	.961	83	2.749	.958	29	2.678	.774	2	1.917	.354	187	2.827	.921
4. Evaluation Process	11	2.886	.710	62	2.666	.787	81	2.593	.661	28	2.500	.487	2	1.937	.796	184	2.614	.690
5. Overall View of Process	10	2.475	.291	60	2.769	.779	77	2.570	.858	29	2.405	.716	2	2.188	1.326	178	2.600	.823

TABLE XXXII  
SCALE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATION IN RELATIONSHIP  
TO TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Cluster	0 - 4 Yrs.			5 - 9 Yrs.			10 - 14 Yrs.			15 - 19 Yrs.		
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD
1. Evaluator Skills	16	1.656	.658	26	1.808	.668	27	1.870	.783	52	1.760	.602
2. Comfort with Evaluator	15	1.850	.431	27	1.982	.766	27	1.982	.766	54	1.722	.700
3. Freq. of Class Visits	14	2.607	.854	27	2.753	.683	27	3.056	.939	54	2.948	.973
4. Evaluation Process	14	2.518	.684	25	2.425	.697	27	2.672	.745	54	2.750	.789
5. Overall View of Process	14	2.446	.807	25	2.550	.824	25	2.780	.866	52	2.678	.831

TABLE XXXII (Continued)

Cluster	<u>20 - 24 Yrs.</u>			<u>25 - 29 Yrs.</u>			<u>30 Plus Yrs.</u>			<u>Totals</u>		
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD
1. Evaluator Skills	33	1.553	.595	22	1.773	.631	7	1.393	.453	183	1.724	.672
2. Comfort with Evaluator	33	1.606	.556	22	1.830	.818	7	1.286	.509	185	1.760	.695
3. Freq. of Class Visits	34	2.730	1.054	22	2.803	.824	6	2.611	.564	184	2.841	.908
4. Evaluation Process	32	2.559	.599	22	2.676	.431	7	2.536	.572	181	2.624	.685
5. Overall View of Process	31	2.504	.748	21	2.702	.895	7	2.179	.854	175	2.608	.825

Teaching Level Differences. Total scale means, ranging from 1.730 to 2.827, and standard deviations for teaching level are found in Table XXXIII.

Using the teaching level of primary, intermediate, middle, and high school as the independent variable and the five clusters of the Teacher Evaluation Perception Questionnaire as the dependent variable, a multivariate analysis of variance was performed. With 15 and 468 degrees of freedom, the Wilks' Lambda value ( $F = 3.787$ ) was significant at the .05 level of confidence ( $p = .000$ ). (See Table XXIX, p. 132). Therefore, the statistical hypothesis for the multivariate test was rejected.

Following the rejection of the multivariate statistical hypothesis, univariate analyses of variance were performed on the five scales, using a .05 level of significance for each analysis. (See Table XXXIV). The statistical hypothesis for Comfort with the Evaluator (Cluster 2) was not significant;  $F(3, 158), = .966, p > .05$ .

Significant differences among teaching levels were found for Cluster 1: General Perceptions of the Evaluator's Skills, ( $F(3, 158) = 5.53, p < .01$ ); Cluster 3: the Frequency of Classroom Visits, ( $F(3, 158) = 11.962, p < .001$ ); Cluster 4: The Evaluation Process ( $F(3, 171) = 10.84, p < .001$ ); and Cluster 5: The Use of Evaluation Information and Overall View of the Evaluation Process, ( $F(3, 158), = 5.14, p < .01$ ). The ANOVA statistical

TABLE XXXIII  
SCALE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATION  
IN RELATIONSHIP TO TEACHING LEVEL

Cluster	Primary			Intermediate			Middle			High			Total		
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD
1. Evaluator Skills	53	1.543	.575	44	1.597	.636	26	2.000	.834	53	1.896	.607	176	1.730	.664
2. Comfort with Evaluator	53	1.708	.843	45	1.661	.672	28	1.857	.815	52	1.851	.728	178	1.761	.696
3. Freq. of Class Visits	53	2.428	.808	44	2.591	.910	28	2.976	.702	53	3.346	.774	178	2.827	.888
4. Evaluation Process	53	2.274	.624	45	2.542	.624	27	2.958	.607	50	2.860	.628	175	2.616	.673
5. Overall View of Process	49	2.334	.716	43	2.454	.764	28	2.728	.816	51	2.895	.856	171	2.596	.815

TABLE XXXIV  
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE FOR THE TEACHING LEVEL VARIABLE  
USING THE CLUSTERS AS DEPENDENT VARIABLES

Variable	Hy SS	Error SS	Hy MS	Error MS	F*	Sig. of F
1. Evaluator Skills	6.664	63.450	2.221	.402	5.531	.001
2. Comfort with Evaluator	1.419	77.374	.473	.490	.966	.410
3. Freq. of Class Visits	23.961	105.497	7.986	.668	11.962	.000
4. Evaluation Process	11.390	60.295	3.797	.382	9.950	.000
5. Overall View of Process	9.819	100.538	3.273	.636	5.143	.002

\*df = 3, 158

hypothesis that the means of the perceptions of teachers regarding evaluator quality do not differ according to teaching level was rejected;  $F(3, 158) = 4.48, p < .01$ ).

Following the rejection of these hypotheses, Scheffe's test (1959) was performed for each pair-wise mean comparison, to determine whether significant differences ( $p < .05$ ) existed among the four teaching levels.

Scheffe's test for pair-wise mean comparisons was therefore performed on Cluster 1: General Perceptions of the Evaluator's Skills. The minimum difference needed between two means in order to be significant at the .05 level for Cluster 1 was 0.4038. A significant difference ( $p < .05$ ) was found between primary and middle school teachers, with primary teachers ( $M = 1.543$ ) tending to have higher regard in the skills of their evaluators than middle school teachers ( $M = 2.000$ ). None of the other pair-wise mean comparisons was significant.

Scheffe's test for pair-wise mean comparison was performed for Cluster 3: Frequency of Classroom Visits by the Evaluator. The minimum difference needed between two means in order to be significant at the .05 level for Cluster 3 was .5007. Significant differences ( $p < .05$ ) were found between primary ( $M = 2.428$ ) and middle ( $M = 2.976$ )/high school teachers ( $M = 3.346$ ) and between intermediate ( $M = 2.591$ ) and high school teachers. In reviewing teacher level means within this cluster, it was found that the mean

values increased from a low of 2.428 (primary teachers) to a higher of 3.346 (high school teachers). As may be seen from this data, the frequency of classroom visitations on the part of evaluators decreases as one moves within the system from primary to high school.

Scheffe's test for pair-wise mean comparisons was performed for Cluster 4: Evaluation Process. The minimum between two means needed for significance at the .05 level for Cluster 4 was .3890. Scheffe's test, when performed on each pair-wise mean comparison within Cluster 4, found significant differences ( $p < .05$ ) between primary ( $M = 2.274$ ) and middle school teachers ( $M = 2.958$ ), between primary and high school teachers ( $M = 2.860$ ) and between intermediate ( $M = 2.542$ ) and high school teachers. It may be said that, in relationship to the evaluation process cluster, primary teachers demonstrate the highest satisfaction among the teaching levels, with middle school teachers demonstrating the least amount of satisfaction.

Scheffe's test for pair-wise mean comparisons was performed for Cluster 5: Use of the Evaluation Information and Overall View of the Evaluation Process. The minimum difference between two means needed for significance at the .05 level for Cluster 5 was .4948. Significant differences ( $p < .05$ ) were found between primary ( $M = 2.334$ ) and high school teachers ( $M = 2.895$ ). In relationship to overall perceptions of the evaluation process, primary teachers

demonstrated a greater amount of satisfaction with the evaluation process than did high school teachers.

#### COMPARISON OF TEACHERS AND BUILDING-LEVEL ADMINISTRATORS

This section will discuss the results from the analysis of responses received by both the teacher and building-level administrators on the two questionnaires. Although the questions were somewhat parallel, building administrators and teachers responded to different questionnaires. The questions that are listed in the tables are from the Building Administrator Evaluation Perception Questionnaire.

Included in this discussion will be the report of comparison of responses between the teachers and the building administrators. The section will be subdivided in the same format as the previously discussed building administrator's section, using the following five categories: (1) Evaluator Quality; (2) Comfort with Evaluator; (3) Frequency of Classroom Visitations; (4) Evaluation Procedural Points, and (5) Utilization of Evaluation Information and Overall View of the Evaluation Process. Corresponding tables will show the responses given by teachers and building administrators to the questions within each subdivision.

##### Evaluator Quality

Table XXXV reports the responses of building administrators and teachers in the category of Evaluator Quality.

TABLE XXXV

RESPONSES OF TEACHERS AND BUILDING ADMINISTRATORS TO THE EVALUATOR  
QUALITY ITEMS ON THE ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Question	Job Title*	N	Percentage					$\chi^2$	D.F.	Prob.	Comments
			SA (1)	A (2)	U (3)	D (4)	SD (5)				
1. I possess the skills and training to evaluate the performance of my teachers.	A:	28	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.385	2	0.184	Combine (U) (D) (SD)
	T:	199	44.2	45.2	3.5	5.5	1.5				
2. My evaluatees feel that I give them fair evaluations.	A:	28	28.6	64.2	3.6	3.6	0.0	5.637	2	0.060	Combine (U) (D) (SD)
	T:	198	51.0	43.4	3.5	1.0	1.0				
3. My evaluatees see me as being effective in analyzing observed lessons accurately.	A:	27	17.9	71.4	3.6	7.1	0.0	4.354	2	0.113	Exclude (SD) Combine (U) (D)
	T:	200	35.5	51.0	8.5	5.0	0.0				
4. After being in my evaluatees' classroom, they receive feedback on what was observed.	A:	28	64.3	35.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.087	2	0.001	Combine (U) (D) (SD)
	T:	199	33.7	40.2	11.1	13.5	1.5				
5. My evaluatees see me as using the previous evaluation to assist them in setting future goals for instructional improvement.	A:	28	17.9	50.0	21.4	10.7	0.0	4.248	2	0.374	
	T:	196	17.3	36.7	19.9	13.0	3.1				

NOTE: Although the questions were somewhat parallel, building administrators and teachers responded to different questionnaires. \*A = Building-level administrator responses; T = Teacher responses.

A significant difference ( $p < .05$ ) was recorded on Question 4, which stated that following an observation, teachers receive feedback on what was actually observed. The response to this question showed that 100 percent of building administrators believed that feedback occurred. Teachers, on the other hand, were not entirely in agreement with the perceptions of administrators. Although nearly 74 percent (73.9%) of teachers believed that they received feedback, 15 percent of teachers did not believe that they received feedback after their evaluator was in their room. Eleven percent of the teachers were undecided as to whether they received feedback on what was observed.

#### Comfort with Evaluator

Table XXXVI reports the responses of building administrators and teachers in the category of Comfort with the Evaluator. Questions 9 ( $p < .01$ ), 10 ( $p < .05$ ), and 13 ( $p < .05$ ) were the questions within this category that recorded significant differences between teachers and building administrators.

Question 9, which asked whether building administrators perceived their evaluatees to be satisfied with the amount of time that building administrators are in classrooms, reported that only 42.9 percent of building administrators felt that teachers were satisfied with the frequency of classroom visitations by evaluators, while 25.0

TABLE XXXVI

RESPONSES OF TEACHERS AND BUILDING ADMINISTRATORS TO THE COMFORT WITH  
EVALUATOR ITEMS ON THE ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Question	Job Title*	N	Percentage					$\chi^2$	D.F.	Prob.	Comments
			SA (1)	A (2)	U (3)	D (4)	SD (5)				
6. My evaluatees feel that I respect them as educators.	A:	27	55.6	44.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.200	2	0.123	Combine (U) (D) (SD)
	T:	199	63.8	28.1	5.6	2.0	0.5				
7. My evaluatees know what I think of their teaching skills.	A:	28	32.1	64.3	3.6	0.0	0.0	5.194	2	0.075	Combine (U) (D) (SD)
	T:	198	47.0	40.9	8.1	3.5	0.5				
8. A level of trust exists between my evaluatees and me.	A:	28	32.1	60.8	7.1	0.0	0.0	4.555	2	0.103	Combine (U) (D) (SD)
	T:	200	49.0	38.0	5.8	3.6	3.6				
9. My evaluatees are satisfied with the amount of time I spend in their classrooms.	A:	29	3.6	39.3	32.1	21.4	3.6	10.140	1	0.002	Combine (SA) (A) (D) (SD)
	T:	199	38.2	37.2	9.0	11.6	4.0				
10. Teachers feel uneasy and unsure of themselves when I enter a classroom to evaluate.	A:	28	7.4	11.1	11.1	55.6	14.8	6.132	2	0.047	Combine (SA) (A)
	T:	199	4.1	6.0	6.0	47.7	36.2				
11. Teachers feel threatened by me when I enter their room to evaluate.	A:	28	7.1	7.1	3.6	53.6	28.6	2.659	2	0.265	Combine (SA) (A) (U)
	T:	200	2.5	3.0	3.5	48.0	43.0				

TABLE XXXVI (Continued)

Question	Job Title*	N	Percentage					$\chi^2$	D.F.	Prob.	Comments
			SA (1)	A (2)	U (3)	D (4)	SD (5)				
12. My evaluatees agree that I observe in their room for a period of time that gives me a fair picture of the activities that were observed.	A:	28	14.3	64.3	17.8	3.6	0.0	0.002	1	0.965	Combine (SA) (A) (U) (D) (SD)
	T:	200	26.0	47.5	11.5	10.0	5.0				
13. If my evaluatees knew when they were going to be observed, they would do a better job in preparation for the observation.	A:	28	21.4	46.4	14.3	14.3	3.6	7.366	2	0.025	Combine (SA) (A) (D) (SD)
	T:	199	8.5	31.7	14.6	33.7	11.6				
14. The post-conference is a mutual sharing of both my evaluatee's perceptions of what happened, and my perceptions of what was seen during the observation.	A:	28	32.1	67.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.810	2	0.090	Combine (U) (D) (SD)
	T:	197	32.5	54.3	5.6	6.1	1.5				
15. My evaluatees feel comfortable in the post-conference with me.	A:	28	32.1	64.3	3.6	0.0	0.0	3.270	2	0.195	Combine (U) (D) (SD)
	T:	198	43.9	48.0	4.6	3.0	0.5				

NOTE: Although the questions were somewhat parallel, building administrators and teachers responded to different questionnaires. \*A = Building-level administrator responses; T = Teacher responses.

teachers were satisfied with the frequency of visitations. A rather large number of building administrators was undecided (32.1%). On the other hand, 75.4 percent of the teachers indicated satisfaction with the number of visitations that were made by their evaluator. Only 15.6 percent of the teachers indicated dissatisfaction with the number of times building administrators were in classrooms.

Question 10 asked whether the administrator perceived teachers to feel uneasy or unsure of themselves when the building administrators entered their classroom to evaluate. Building administrators tended to feel that teachers felt more uneasy (18.5%) than did teachers (10.1%). Greater disagreement was received from teachers (83.9%) than from building administrators (70.4%) on this question. These results indicate that building administrators believe that their presence in the classroom creates more anxiety in teachers than teachers are willing to admit.

Question 13 asked the respondents whether they believed that teachers would perform better if they knew when they were to be observed. Over 67 percent of building administrators felt that teachers would perform better if they knew when they would be observed, while 17.9 percent did not think that such knowledge would change the teacher's performance. Teachers, on the other hand, have mixed feelings on whether their performance would improve

if told when they would be observed. Although 40.2 percent of teachers felt that they would do a better job, 45.3 percent said they would not do a better job, and 14.6 percent were undecided.

#### Frequency of Classroom Visitations

Table XXXVII reports the responses of building administrators and teachers on the category of Frequency of Classroom Visitations. Only Question 20 within this category recorded significant difference ( $p < .01$ ) between teachers and building administrators. A large percentage (89.3%) of building administrators stated that they wished that they could visit classes more often, while only 37.7 percent of teachers stated that they wished that building administrators would visit their classrooms more often. In relationship to not wanting more visitations to occur, 7.1 percent of building administrators and 35.1 percent of teachers did not want an increase in classroom visitations.

#### Evaluation Procedural Points

Table XXXVIII reports the results of the responses of teachers and building administrators in the category of Evaluation Procedural Points. As can be seen, no significant difference ( $p > .05$ ) was recorded between the two groups in this category.

TABLE XXXVII

RESPONSES OF TEACHERS AND BUILDING ADMINISTRATORS TO THE FREQUENCY OF  
CLASSROOM VISITATION ITEMS ON THE ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Question	Job Title*	N	Percentage					$\chi^2$	D.F.	Prob.	Comments
			SA (1)	A (2)	U (3)	D (4)	SD (5)				
16. I drop into my evaluatees' classrooms to see how they are doing at least once/week.	A:	27	14.8	22.2	0.0	37.1	25.9	1.702	4	0.790	
	T:	199	11.1	19.1	5.0	35.7	29.1				
17. I drop into my evaluatees' class to observe students and curriculum at least once/week.	A:	28	14.3	17.9	3.6	39.2	25.0	0.757	2	0.6849	
	T:	198	9.0	15.1	5.7	40.9	29.3				
18. The only time I am in classrooms is for a formal evaluation.	A:	28	7.1	10.7	0.0	28.6	53.6	5.224	4	0.265	
	T:	200	7.5	18.5	3.5	38.5	32.0				
19. I am too busy to visit my evaluatees' classrooms any more than currently occurs.	A:	28	14.3	32.1	14.3	25.0	14.3	0.349	2	0.840	Combine (SA) (A) (D) (SD)
	T:	199	17.1	31.6	17.6	18.6	15.1				
20. I wish that I could visit my evaluatees' classrooms more often.	A:	28	53.6	35.7	3.6	7.1	0.0	34.017	4	0.000	
	T:	199	12.6	25.1	27.2	27.6	7.5				

NOTE: Although the questions were somewhat parallel, building administrators and teachers responded to different questionnaires.

\*A = Building-level administrator responses; T = Teacher responses.

TABLE XXXVIII

RESPONSES OF TEACHERS AND BUILDING ADMINISTRATORS TO THE EVALUATION  
PROCEDURAL POINTS ITEMS ON THE ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Question	Job Title*	N	Percentage					$\chi^2$	D.F.	Prob.	Comments
			SA (1)	A (2)	U (3)	D (4)	SD (5)				
21. Before each evaluation, I schedule the date and time for the observation.	A:	28	25.0	21.4	3.6	39.3	10.7	3.533	4	0.473	
	T:	200	17.0	32.0	9.5	32.0	9.5				
22. I always conduct a pre-conference with my evaluatees to discuss the lesson to be observed prior to a classroom observation.	A:	28	6.9	10.3	3.5	62.1	17.2	0.908	2	0.635	Combine (SA) (A) (U)
	T:	200	3.5	11.5	8.5	53.0	23.5				
23. Before each evaluation, I know my evaluatees' objective for the lesson to be observed.	A:	28	7.1	17.9	7.1	57.2	10.7	0.440	2	0.802	Combine (SA) (A) (D) (SD)
	T:	198	8.6	20.1	8.6	47.5	15.2				
24. Before each evaluation, the evaluatee knows the areas in which the evaluation will focus for observational purposes.	A:	28	10.3	24.2	10.3	44.9	10.3	0.133	2	0.936	Combine (SA) (A) (D) (SD)
	T:	197	9.6	27.4	8.6	41.6	12.7				

TABLE XXXVIII (Continued)

Question	Job Title*	N	Percentage					$\chi^2$	D.F.	Prob.	Comments
			SA (1)	A (2)	U (3)	D (4)	SD (5)				
25. During the observation, I take accurate verbatim notes on what is observed.	A:	28	51.7	37.9	3.5	6.9	0.0	5.749	2	0.056	Combine (U) (D) (SD)
	T:	199	30.7	45.7	13.6	7.5	2.5				
26. I accurately record what happens in the classroom during an evaluation.	A:	28	48.4	44.8	3.4	0.0	3.4	2.976	2	0.225	Combine (U) (D) (SD)
	T:	200	33.5	51.5	12.0	2.0	1.0				

NOTE: Although the questions were somewhat parallel, building administrators and teachers responded to different questionnaires.

\*A = Building-level administrator responses; T = Teacher responses.

Utilization of Evaluation Information and Overall View of the Evaluation Process

Table XXXIX demonstrates the responses of both the building administrators and teachers in this final category. Significant difference were found on Question 32 ( $p < .01$ ) and 33 ( $p < .05$ ). Question 32 asked the respondents whether they perceived the current evaluation system to be in need of improvement. The building administrators overwhelmingly (85.5%) felt that the evaluation system can and should be improved. Teachers, on the other hand, did not share such strong feelings. Although 44.8 percent of the teachers felt that the system can and should be improved, 29.1 percent did not support change, and 26.1 percent were undecided as to whether change should occur.

In Question 33, the respondents were asked whether they were satisfied with the current evaluation system. Only 18.5 percent of the building administrators agreed that they were satisfied with the current system, while 63 percent expressed dissatisfaction, and 18.5 percent were undecided. Although teachers did not demonstrate as great a degree of dissatisfaction (33.4%), only 45.4 percent of teachers stated that they were satisfied with the current system. Over twenty percent (21.2%) of the teachers were undecided as to their satisfaction with the current evaluation system.

TABLE XXXIX

RESPONSES OF TEACHERS AND BUILDING ADMINISTRATORS TO THE UTILIZATION  
OF EVALUATION RESULTS ITEMS ON THE ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Question	Job Title*	N	Percentage					$\chi^2$	D.F.	Prob.	Comments
			SA (1)	A (2)	U (3)	D (4)	SD (5)				
27. I am prompt in completing the evaluation report and setting a time to post-conference.	A:	28	39.3	50.0	10.7	0.0	0.0	0.081	2	0.960	Exclude (SD) Combine (U) (D)
	T:	197	40.6	47.2	5.6	6.6	0.0				
28. The current evaluation system enables my evaluatees to be evaluated fairly and accurately.	A:	28	10.7	32.2	25.0	25.0	7.1	2.614	4	0.624	
	T:	200	17.5	40.0	18.5	21.0	3.0				
29. My evaluatees are provided with recommendations that they seriously try to implement in their classrooms.	A:	28	10.3	72.5	6.9	6.9	3.4	4.765	2	0.092	Combine (U) (D) (SD)
	T:	197	18.8	50.8	15.2	13.2	2.0				
30. The current evaluation system provides my evaluatees with information that they can use to set personal goals for instructional growth.	P:	28	10.3	69.1	10.3	6.9	3.4	5.248	2	0.073	Combine (SA) (A) (D) (SD)
	T:	199	12.1	45.2	17.1	21.6	4.0				
31. The current evaluation process has improved my evaluatees' teaching.	P:	28	0.0	51.9	29.6	11.1	7.4	5.824	4	0.213	
	T:	199	6.0	38.7	22.6	26.1	6.5				

TABLE XXXIX (Continued)

Question	Job Title*	N	Percentage					$\chi^2$	D.F.	Prob.	Comments
			SA (1)	A (2)	U (3)	D (4)	SD (5)				
32. The teacher evaluation system can and should be improved.	P:	28	42.9	42.9	10.6	3.6	0.0	19.742	4	0.001	
	T:	199	13.6	31.2	26.1	24.6	4.5				
33. I am very satisfied with the evaluation process.	P:	28	0.0	18.5	18.5	44.5	18.5	9.977	4	0.041	
	T:	198	12.6	32.8	21.2	25.3	8.1				

NOTE: Although the questions were somewhat parallel, building administrators and teachers responded to different questionnaires.

\*A = Building-level administrator responses; T = Teacher responses.

## REVIEW: OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

The final portion of the questionnaire provided all respondents the opportunity to comment on the current system and to recommend changes that they would like to see occur in the evaluation process. This section was divided into seven categories: Orientation Process, Pre-conference, Observational Process, Report Preparation, Post-conference, Goal Setting, and General Comments. This section will discuss the comments received from both teachers and building-level administrators.

### Orientation Process

Seven building-level administrators responded to this area. Of the comments, two of them expressed concern in having teachers trained in understanding the district's evaluation criteria and process. It was generally felt by administrators that teachers do not know, nor do they understand what the evaluator is looking for when an evaluation occurs.

Thirty-six teachers chose to comment on the orientation process. Of those, six individuals were generally pleased with the current methods being used to orient staff members to the current evaluation system. It appeared from the comments that a general belief exists that improvement by administrators could be made in the area of orientation

prior to the beginning of the process. Included in this orientation should be a general statement of expectations by the administrator, a review of the criteria to be used, the evaluation format, and the evaluation process.

### Pre-conference

Of the nine responses in this category by administrators, five of them included comments regarding the time constraints on the job that make it difficult to perform effective pre-conferences. Although principals would like to conduct more pre-conferences than they currently do, it was generally expressed that the other responsibilities of the job make such a process difficult, if not impossible.

Thirty-eight teachers responded to this category, of which eight were supportive of current practices. Generally, the other 31 responses stated that pre-conferences do not exist. No reasons were given for this. Teachers stated that the pre-conference could be used by the administrator to obtain additional information of what was to be observed in the classroom. It could also be used to review the findings of the previous evaluation. One comment stated that the pre-conference would allow the teacher to prepare better for the observation and provide the opportunity to be observed at the teacher's best. The comments opposing pre-conferences stated that they are not helpful, except in the case of probationary teachers.

### Observational Process

The nine building administrator comments in this area were generally supportive of the current methods being used for observations. No recommendations were given for change.

Forty-four teachers responded in this category. Eleven teachers were generally satisfied. Of the other 33, several general categories of comments were identified. Teachers made comments and suggestions in the areas of frequency of observations by administrators, the process used by administrators in obtaining the information, and questioned the ability of administrators to evaluate adequately in curricular areas in which they lacked experience or skills. Of the comments, eleven teachers recommended more frequent evaluations. The recommendations for frequency of observations varied from a minimum of one observation per year to visits in classes on a weekly basis. One teacher recommended the special training of one administrator whose only responsibility would be that of evaluating staff.

In regards to the process used by administrators to obtain their information, two teachers expressed concern with the process of taking verbatim notes in the classroom while observing. It was felt by both respondents that by writing down verbatim notes, the observer missed much of what was occurring in the classroom. Both teachers felt

that they could receive more constructive information from their evaluators if the evaluator took a more global view of the classroom during the observation than to just focus upon verbatim notes.

One foreign language teacher questioned whether her evaluators could accurately evaluate her performance since they have not spoken nor taught the language she teaches. Her comments obviously showed that she was looking for comments to improve her performance, but had not been receiving them from her evaluators.

#### Report Preparation

Five of the eight administrator comments in this category demonstrated displeasure with the current rating system (the use of numbers 1, 2, and 3, meaning excellent, fair to good, and needs improvement, respectively). Comments suggested the elimination of the numerals on the form. No alternative system was proposed, however.

Thirty-two teachers made general comments in the area of report preparation. Of that number, thirteen teachers were satisfied with current practices. Generally, comments and recommendations from teachers were vague. (The reports that I receive could be improved). However, several recommendations included a review of the current evaluation form in the areas of the current 1, 2, 3 point system and the desire for the evaluator to meet with the teacher to

explain why certain comments and scores were given to the teacher. Several teachers commented that the information received from the report does not give teachers specific recommendations to improve upon their teaching. Instead, general comments, such as, "you're doing great" often appear on the evaluation form.

### Post-conference

The six administrator comments in this category were supportive of the post-conference and the necessity of giving feedback to teachers on what was observed. One evaluator called this the most important step in the entire evaluation process.

Thirty-eight teachers responded in this category. Of those, fourteen respondents were satisfied with the current system of post-conferencing. The major concern expressed by other teachers was the desire to receive comments that could be utilized to make improvement within the classroom. Eight respondents made comments in this area relating to the need to receive some form of recommendations for improvement. The other mentioned concern was that the post-conference needs to be held as soon as possible after the evaluation.

### Goal Setting

Eight evaluators commented on this area. The lack of time due to other job responsibilities was once again mentioned as a problem in this portion of the process.

Forty-one teachers made comments in this area. Although twelve teachers were happy with the current system, 26 teachers made comments and recommendations with the goal setting process. Several teachers stated that this does not currently occur within the school district. Some teachers, when it has occurred, have found it to be beneficial in their teaching. Other comments included recommendations of when it should occur (during either the conferencing or prior to the evaluation), the necessity for explicitness in goal setting, and the need for the process to be a mutually agreed-upon goal by both the evaluator and the evaluatee.

### General Comments

Twelve administrators responded to this category. Three administrators suggested hiring other professionals to conduct staff evaluations. These three plus two other respondents stated that they lacked the time in their jobs to be effective evaluators.

Thirty-eight teachers made general comments at the end of the open-ended page. Of these, only five

respondents stated that they would not make any changes in the current evaluation process. The rest of the comments covered a wide range of topics within the evaluation system. Four teachers expressed concern in the area of evaluator time, in that they questioned whether the jobs of principals and assistant principals allow them to give the time necessary to be effective evaluators. Three other teachers felt that in order for building administrators to be effective, it is necessary for them to return to the classroom to teach on a periodic basis. Several teachers in specific curricula areas, such as foreign language and special education, stated in their comments that the current system did not adequately address teaching in their subject areas.

#### SUMMARY OF RESULTS

This study has investigated the perceptions held by teachers and building-level administrators of the evaluation process being used in the Vancouver (Wash.) School District. Through the administration of separate questionnaires to teachers and building administrators, research was conducted to find answers to the following research questions. A summary of the findings in relationship to the research questions is also listed below.

1. Is there a statistically significant difference between the perceptions of building-level

elementary and secondary administrators regarding the effectiveness of the current teacher evaluation process?

As a group, building-level administrators perceive themselves to be well qualified and effective in the evaluation process. However, no significant difference was found between the two building-levels in this area. In relationship to comfort with the evaluator, building administrators felt that an effective level of comfort exists between the evaluator and evaluatee. No difference occurred in this regard between the two building-levels. Neither did a difference between building-levels occur in relationship to the perception by administrators that fair evaluations are given to the evaluatees.

In relationship to the frequency of classroom visitations, elementary-level administrators spend more time in classrooms than do secondary-level administrators. On both levels, administrators wish that they had more time to visit classrooms. However, the frequency of visits was not found to be significantly different between the two administrative levels.

In relationship to evaluation procedural points, building-level administrators generally see themselves as not scheduling observations and not pre-conferencing prior to the observation. Neither do building administrators feel that they are aware of teacher objectives. There was

a significant difference found in this area in regards to the two administrative level's perception in taking accurate verbatim notes. Elementary-level administrators see themselves taking accurate verbatim notes at a higher percentage than do secondary-level administrators.

There was a general dissatisfaction and desire for improvement to be made with the currently used evaluation process. These feelings were not significantly different between the two administrative levels.

2. Is there a statistically significant difference among the perceptions of teachers in various demographic groups (gender, age, teaching level, teaching experience) regarding the effectiveness of the current Vancouver School District teacher evaluation process?

Significant differences in perceptions of the teacher evaluation process were not found between the five teaching clusters and the demographic groups of gender, age, and teaching experience. Significant differences were found between the various teaching levels (primary, intermediate, middle, and high school). These differences in teaching level occurred in the clusters of General Perceptions of the Evaluator's Skills, Frequency of Classroom Visits by Evaluator, the Evaluation Process, and The Use of Evaluation Information and Overall View of the Evaluation Process.

In relationship to General Perceptions of the Evaluator's Skills, it was found that primary teachers tended to have higher regard for their evaluators than did middle school teachers. In relationship to Frequency of Classroom visits by Evaluator, it was found that the frequency of classroom visits decreased within each level from primary to high school. In The Evaluation Process, it was found that primary teachers possessed the highest satisfaction with the evaluation process and middle school teachers possessed the lowest satisfaction with the evaluation process. And, in relationship to The Use of Evaluation Information and Overall View of the Evaluation Process, it was found that significant differences in responses were found between primary and high school teachers.

3. Is there a statistically significant difference between the perceptions of teachers and building-level administrators regarding the effectiveness of the current Vancouver School District teacher evaluation process?

There was found to be significant agreement between teachers and building-level administrators regarding the feedback received by teachers following an observation.

A statistically significant difference was found between building administrators and teachers regarding the amount of feedback teachers receive following classroom visitations. Building administrators expressed to a higher

degree than teachers that feedback is given to teachers following classroom observations.

A significant difference in perceptions between building administrators and teachers was also found in relationship to classroom visits by building administrators. Building administrators felt that teachers wanted them in their classrooms more often; yet teachers expressed general satisfaction with the number of visitations by building administrators as currently exists.

A significant difference was found in response to whether teachers would perform better if they knew when an observation was planned to occur. Although building administrators felt teachers would perform better if they knew when an observation would occur, teachers did not believe their performance would be different.

Finally, a significant difference was also found in relationship to general views of the evaluation process. Both building-level administrators and teachers agree that the current evaluation process needs improvement. However, this opinion is far more dominant among administrators than it is among teachers.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### INTRODUCTION

This chapter contains a summary of this research study which addressed the Vancouver School District building-level administrator and teacher perceptions of the effectiveness of the current teacher evaluation system and process. The following sections will be covered in this chapter: (1) Summary and Conclusions; (2) Limitations of the Study; (3) Recommendations; and, (4) Recommendations for Further Study.

#### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The central purpose of this study was to determine teacher and building-level administrator perceptions of the current teacher evaluation process in the Vancouver School District. From the teacher and building-level administrators' completion of the previously discussed questionnaires, three research questions were analyzed. These questions and a summary of the results are listed below.

1. Is there a statistically significant difference between the perceptions of building-level elementary and secondary administrators regarding the effectiveness of the current teacher evaluation process?

No significant difference was found between the two building-levels in their self-perceptions of evaluator quality. All administrators generally believed that they are well qualified and effective in the evaluation process. Likewise, no statistically significant difference existed in relationship to perceived comfort with the evaluator. Building administrators felt that an effective level of comfort exists between the evaluator and evaluatee, regardless of administrative level. Neither did a difference between building-levels occur in relationship to the perception by administrators that fair evaluations are given to the evaluatees.

Although the data indicated that elementary-level administrators spend more time in classrooms than do secondary-level administrators, the results were not significantly different. There was common agreement on both levels in relationship to administrators wishing that they had more time to visit classrooms.

Although no significant differences occurred in relationship to evaluation procedural points, the descriptive data indicated that building-level administrators generally see themselves as not scheduling observations, not

pre-conferencing prior to the observation, and not being aware of teacher objectives before the observation.

There was demonstrated a general dissatisfaction with the currently used evaluation process by both administrative levels. This general dissatisfaction was not significantly different between the two administrative levels.

2. Is there a statistically significant difference among the perceptions of teachers in various demographic groups (gender, age, teaching level, teaching experience) regarding the effectiveness of the current Vancouver School District teacher evaluation process?

No significant difference was found in teacher perceptions, when compared among the subgroups of gender, age, or teacher experience. Significant differences were found to occur between the various teaching levels (primary, intermediate, middle, and high school) in relationship to four of the five clusters. These clusters were: (1) general perceptions of the evaluator's skills; (3) frequency of classroom visits by evaluator; (4) the evaluation process; and (5) the use of evaluation information and overall view of the evaluation process.

#### Cluster 1: General Perceptions of the Evaluator's Skills

A significant difference was found in relationship to the perceptions of primary and middle school teachers regarding evaluator skills. Primary teachers felt quite strongly that their evaluators possessed the skills and were accurate in the evaluation process, whereas middle

school teachers felt that their evaluators did not possess these skills and were not accurate in evaluating teachers. The results indicate that middle school building administrators must demonstrate greater proficiency in the evaluation process in order to gain greater confidence from middle school teachers.

#### Cluster 2: Comfort with the Evaluator

No significant difference was found in this cluster.

#### Cluster 3: Frequency of Classroom Visits by Evaluator

Significant differences were found in this cluster when comparing the responses of primary school teachers with the responses of middle and high school teachers, and when comparing the responses of intermediate school teachers with the responses of high school teachers. Primary school teachers felt that their building administrators were in their classrooms more often than that which was felt by middle and high school teachers. The same opinion was also expressed by intermediate school teachers in comparison to high school teachers. A large percentage of primary and intermediate school teachers felt that their building administrators were not too busy to visit their classrooms more often, while over 80 percent of the high school teachers felt that their building administrators were too busy to visit classrooms more often.

It was interesting to note that in the frequency of classroom visitations, the responses of primary school teachers was the highest, followed in descending order by intermediate, middle, and high school teachers. This may support the perception that secondary building administrators have more responsibilities that make it more difficult to spend time visiting classrooms.

#### Cluster 4: The Evaluation Process

Statistically significant differences were found when comparing the responses of primary school teachers with those of both middle and high school teachers. The same was also found to be true when comparing the responses of intermediate school teachers with those of high school teachers. It was found that primary and intermediate teachers perceived their principals to be more consistent compared to middle school and high school administrators in scheduling dates for observations, telling the teacher what was to be observed, being more accurate in recording verbatim notes, accurately recording what is observed, and promptly reporting the results. The greatest dissatisfaction in the evaluation process, based upon teacher responses, appeared to come from the middle school teachers.

Cluster 5: The Use of Evaluation Information and Overall View of the Evaluation Process

Statistically significant differences were noted when comparing the responses of primary school teachers with the responses of high school teachers in relation to the fifth cluster. Primary teachers felt that their evaluators used the evaluation data to help them set goals, while high school teachers were less likely to believe that the evaluation data was used for this purpose. Primary teachers also felt that the post-conference was a mutual sharing of perceptions, while high school teachers were less likely to believe that a mutual sharing of perceptions occurred during the post-conference. Overall, primary school teachers had greater confidence in the evaluation process as a means to improve instruction than did high school teachers.

3. Is there a statistically significant difference between the perceptions of teachers and building-level administrators regarding the effectiveness of the current Vancouver School District teacher evaluation process?

There was found to be a significant difference between teachers and building-level administrators in the category of Evaluator Quality regarding the feedback received by teachers following an observation. Although both large groups felt that teachers generally do receive feedback about their performance following an observation,

teachers did not feel as positive as building administrators in relationship to the amount of feedback received.

A statistically significant difference occurred between building administrators and teachers in the category of Comfort with the Evaluator regarding perceptions with classroom visitations. Building administrators believed that teachers want more classroom visits by administrators. Yet, teachers stated that they were quite pleased with the current frequency of classroom visitations by the building administrators.

Finally, a statistically significant difference occurred between the two groups in relationship to satisfaction with the current evaluation process. While building administrators were overwhelmingly dissatisfied with the current process and felt that the process was in need of improvement, only about one-third of the teachers shared these same opinions. In both groups, nearly one-fifth of the respondents were undecided as to whether the evaluation process needed to be improved.

#### LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Originally, 42 building administrators were asked to participate in this study. With only 29 responding, the sample of principals turned out to be small. This limited the strength of conclusions that could be drawn from this group.

Recommendations that followed the questionnaires did not provide much in the area of ideas and recommendations for change in the current evaluation process. Although teachers and building administrators are not happy with the current process, it may be that they do not know what can be done to improve it.

A single survey limits the amount of data that can be obtained. Several differently designed surveys which asked more specific questions could have been used, or could have followed the original questionnaires for obtaining further information from the respondents.

Although building principals were given specific directions on how to administer the questionnaire, there was no way of knowing that these directions were followed. Although a high percentage of valid surveys were completed and returned, some returned surveys were thrown out for inaccurate and incomplete answers.

In order to maintain confidentiality, it was impossible to follow-up with given subjects to obtain additional information on the open-ended questions. It was further difficult to ascertain the accuracy of individual subjects in the completion of demographic data.

Finally, the study was limited to teachers and building administrators in the Vancouver School District. No external validity was shown in the study. This study may

not, therefore, represent the perceptions of professional educators within other school districts.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

In comparing the Vancouver School District evaluation process with other school systems which have been identified through the research as having effective evaluation programs, it would appear that the Vancouver process meets most of the criteria found in effective programs. According to the National School Public Relations Association (1974), and as mentioned earlier in this study, an effective evaluation process should possess the following: (1) the process should be continuous; (2) it should utilize a variety of methods and techniques; (3) in-service training in the use of the evaluation instrument should be provided for teachers so that they understand the evaluation instrument and its use; and (4) evaluators should be well trained in the use of the instrument.

Although all four of these elements are present in the Vancouver evaluation process, the study indicated a general weakness in the in-service training that is being provided to teachers. It appeared through the results of the study that teachers are often unsure of what the evaluator will be looking for during the observation. Building administrators must consider this and improve upon their

methods of in-servicing teachers in the use of the evaluation process.

The study strongly supported the view that principals in the district are well trained and competent in the evaluation process. This is a critical element in the evaluation process as shown by the National School Public Relations Association (1974), Wise, et al. (1984), and McGreal (1984).

Based upon the results of this study, it is recommended that the Vancouver School District review its current evaluation process in several areas. The areas that will be discussed are: (1) Building Administrator Responsibilities; (2) Goal Setting Process; (3) Evaluation Processes; and (4) Review of Effective Evaluation Programs.

#### Building Administrator Responsibilities

Since the study found that building administrators are too busy to be in classes any more than currently occurs, it would be fruitless to review the evaluation process without taking a critical look at how these administrators are spending their time. Are administrators using their time in ways that are constructive and designed to improve instruction? How much of the administrator's time is being spent on student supervision, curriculum improvement, and activities that can be delegated to others? It would be extremely beneficial for the district to have its

building administrators chart their time utilization to determine current uses and develop ways that time could be better managed.

Secondly, the central office is encouraged to discuss the concept of the current role of the building administrator. Is it the philosophy of the district that building administrators are managers of schools or are they instructional leaders? If it is the latter, then the district is encouraged to reassess the current expectations and responsibilities that are given to building administrators. How can the school district provide more time for building administrators to be in classrooms and perform those activities that have been identified through the research as exemplifying the characteristics of instructional leaders? Does the district need to reassess its current job descriptions and responsibilities for its building administrators?

Thirdly, since there is a high level of dissatisfaction on the part of the evaluators with the current evaluation process, it would be beneficial for the school district to discuss with its building administrators their views on the current evaluation process and to determine what options are available that could diminish current negative feelings towards the evaluation process.

### Goal Setting Process

Research in this study has supported an evaluation process that results in the establishment and review of goals for teachers. The data supported the use of goals in the evaluation process; however, goal development did not appear to be used consistently throughout the teaching levels.

The district's current evaluation format should be reviewed and revised in a way that can include a goal setting process. Principals need additional training in this area, since this is not a part of the current procedures and criteria that are included in current evaluator training in the district.

### Evaluation Process

Currently, the district seldom employs experts to assist teachers in need of remediation. Such a plan has been found to be quite successful in exemplary school districts (Wise, et al., 1984). This process should be explored as a method of providing additional help and expertise to principals who are perceived by both themselves and teachers in the system to be too busy to commit any further time to the evaluation process.

### Review of Effective Evaluation Programs

Although much of what is part of Vancouver's evaluation process has been supported through the literature as

being desirable in an effective system, the current program should be critically reviewed to determine where positive changes could be made. Since this study found a high degree of dissatisfaction with the process by building administrators and a reasonably high feeling of dissatisfaction from teachers, the district is encouraged to determine what further information can be obtained to better identify the basis for this dissatisfaction and what can be done to improve upon the process. Furthermore, since the research supports the necessity of having teacher input in the evaluation process (French-Lazovik, 1982; Speicher & Schurter, 1981; Genck, 1983), it would be important for the district to include teachers in any decisions that might affect utilization or changes in the current evaluation system.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

Relatively few school districts make objective reviews of their evaluation process after it is adopted. Often, the process that is used has been in place for many years, was selected as a part of a negotiated agreement and is something that school districts are reluctant to review because of the controversy which might arise with local teacher unions. However, it cannot be denied that the evaluation process within a district has the potential of

having a significant effect upon the teaching and learning that occurs within the classroom.

As with any study that reviews a specific population, external validity was not established through this study. It is, therefore, important for other researchers to consider conducting similar research within local school districts to ascertain the effectiveness of evaluation systems and to make recommendations on how such systems may be improved.

The Vancouver School District evaluation system is a traditional system that uses a traditional process. The results of the research have shown this system to have both benefits and disadvantages. Researchers could add further information in the field of teacher evaluation if future research was conducted within school districts which utilize less conventional methods of teacher evaluation.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barber, L. (Ed.), Teacher evaluation and merit pay. Background paper for the Task Force on Education for Economic Growth (Report No. TF-83-5). Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.
- Beach, D. M., & Reinhartz, J. (1984, November). Using criteria of effective teaching to judge teacher performance. NASSP Bulletin, 68(475), 31-33.
- Berliner, D. (1975). Impediments in measuring teacher effectiveness. In G. D. Borich. (1977). The appraisal of teaching concepts and process. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley.
- Berliner, D. (1984, November). The half-full glass: a review of research on teaching. In D. M. Beach, & J. Reinhartz. (1984, November). Using criteria of effective teaching to judge teacher performance. NASSP Bulletin, 68(475), 32.
- Blumberg, A. (1980). Supervisors and teachers: A private cold war. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Bolton, D. L. (1973). Selection and evaluation of teaching. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Borich, G. D. (1977). The appraisal of teaching concepts and process. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley.
- Boyan, N. (1988). Handbook of research and development in educational administration. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Boyce, A. C. (1915). Methods of measuring teachers' efficiency; 14th Yearbook, National Society for the Study of Education, Part 2. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. In C. J. Wood, & P. A. Pohland. (1983, Summer). Teacher evaluation and the hand of history. The Journal of Educational Administration, 21(2), 175-179.
- Carfield, R. D., & Walter, J. K. (1984, November). Teacher evaluation and RIF--can there be peaceful coexistence? NASSP Bulletin, 68(475), 48.

- Carroll, G. J. (1981). Faculty self evaluation. In J. Millman (Ed.). (1981). Handbook of teacher evaluation. National Council of Measurement in Education. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Chirnside, C. (1984, November). Ten commandments for successful teacher evaluation. NASSP Bulletin. 68(475), 42-43.
- Cogan, M. (1973). Clinical supervision. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin. In D. J. McCarty, J. W. Kaufman, & J. C. Stafford. (1986). Supervision and evaluation, two irreconcilable processes? The Clearinghouse, 59, 351.
- Cooper, J. M. (1984). Supervision models. Instructional leadership handbook. Reston, VA: The National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and internal structure of tests. Psychometrika, 16, 207-233.
- Cummings, L. L., & Schwab, D. P. (1978). ERS report evaluating teacher performance. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Wise, A. E., and Pease, S. R. (1983, Fall). Teacher evaluation in the organizational context: A review of the literature. Review of Educational Research, 53(3), 285-328.
- Davis, H. (1964). Evolution of current practices in evaluating teacher competence. In B. J. Biddle & W. J. Ellena (Eds.). (1964). Contemporary research on teacher effectiveness. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Dejnozka, E. L. & Kapel, D. E. (1982). American educator's encyclopedia. Westport, Conn: Greenwood.
- DeRoche, E. F. (1981). An administrator's guide for evaluating programs and personnel. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Dillman, D. A. (1978). Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method. New York: John Wiley & Sons. In Jane Braunger. (1983). Teacher attitude toward composition instruction at the postsecondary level: Identification and formation. (Doctoral Dissertation, Portland State University, 1983).

- Doyle, K. O., Jr. (1983a). Evaluating teaching. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Doyle, K. O., Jr. (1983b). Student evaluation of instruction. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Drake, T. L., & Roe, W. H. (1986). The principalship (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan.
- Dreeben, R. (1970). The nature of teaching. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman and Co.
- Duke, D., & Stiggins, R. (1986). Teacher evaluation: Five keys to growth. Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- Dull, L. W. (1981). Supervision: School leadership handbook. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.
- Educational Research Service. (1978). Evaluating teacher performance. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service. In C. J. Wood & P. A. Pohland. (1983, Summer). Teacher evaluation and the hand of history. The Journal of Educational Administration, 31(2), 168.
- Ellis, T. I. (1984). Teacher competency: What administrators can do. ERIC Digest. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, 9, 2-3.
- Ellis, T. I. (1986). Teacher evaluation. Research Round-up. Alexandria, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals.
- Embretson, G., Ferber, E., & Langager, T. (1984, March). Supervision and evaluation: Helping teachers reach their maximum potential. NASSP Bulletin, 68(469), 26-30.
- Evaluating Teachers for Professional growth: Current trends in school policies and programs. In ERS report evaluating teacher performance. (1978). Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.
- Feiman-Nemser, S., & Floden, R. E. (1984). The cultures of teaching. Draft manuscript, Michigan State University. In M. W. McLaughlin. (1984). Teacher evaluation and school improvement. Teachers College Record, 86(1), 193-205.

- Fredrich, G. H. (1984, November). Supervision and evaluation -- recognizing the difference can increase the value, effectiveness. NASSP Bulletin, 68(475), 12.
- Frels, K., Cooper, T. T., & Reagan, B. R. (1984). Practical aspects of teacher evaluation. Topeka, KA: The National Organization on Legal Problems of Education.
- French-Lazovik, G. (1981). Peer review: Documentary evidence in the evaluation of teaching. In J. Millman (Ed.) (1981). Handbook of teacher evaluation. National Council of Measurement in Education. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- French-Lazovik, G. (1982). Practices that improve teaching evaluation. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gage, N. L. (1978). The scientific basis of the art of teaching. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gallup, G. H. (1979). The eleventh annual Gallup Poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan. In L. Darling-Hammond, A. E. Wise, & S. R. Pease. (1983). Teacher evaluation in the organizational context: A review of the literature. Review of Educational Research. (pp. 285-328).
- Genck, F. H. (1983). Improving school performance. New York: Praeger.
- Glatthorn, A. (1984). Differentiated supervision. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. In S. J. Tracy, & R. H. MacNaughton. (1986, Spring). Contemporary Education, 57(3), 131-132.
- Goldhammer, R. (1969) Clinical supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teachers. New York: Holt. In D. J. McCarty, J. W. Kaufman, & J. C. Stafford. (1986). Supervision and evaluation, two irreconcilable processes? The Clearinghouse, 59, 351.
- Good, T. (1981). Teacher expectations and student perceptions: A decade of research. Educational Leadership. 38(5), 418. In M.W. McLaughlin. (1984). Teacher evaluation and school improvement. Teachers College Record, 86(1), 193-205.

- Good, T. (1983). Research on classroom teaching. In L. Shulman, & G. Sykes. (1983). Handbook of teaching and policy. New York: Longman. In M.W. McLaughlin. (1984). Teacher evaluation and school improvement. Teachers College Record, 86(1), 193-205.
- Good, T. (1984). Observation and the evaluation of teaching. Tallahassee Presentation. (NSPER 80). Bloomington, In: Phi Delta Kappa. In N. Hobar, & D. K. Sullivan. (1984, Summer). Systematic observation of instruction: Genesis, research, practice, and potential. Journal of Classroom Interaction, 19(2), 26-34.
- Gorton, P. A. & McIntyre, K. E. (1978). The senior high principalship; Vol. II: The effective principal. Reston, VA: The National Association of Secondary School Principals. In A. Blumberg, & W. Greenfield. (1980). The effective principal. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Gudridge, B. M. (1980). Teacher competency: Problems and solutions. AASA Critical Issues Report. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators. In T. I. Ellis. (1984). Teacher competency: What administrators can do. ERIC Digest No. 9. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, 9, 2-3.
- Haefele, D. D. (1980, January). How to evaluate thee, teacher--let me count the ways. Kappan, 61(5), 349.
- Harris, B. M. (1986). Developmental teacher evaluation. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hawes, G. R., & Hawes, L. S. (1982). The concise dictionary of education. NY: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Hobar, N., & Sullivan, D. K. (1984, Summer). Systematic observation of instruction: Genesis, research, practice, and potential. Journal of Classroom Interaction, 19(2), 26-34.
- Hunter, M. (1976). Rx improved instruction. El Segundo, CA: TIP Publications. In D. J. McCarty, J.W. Kaufman, & J. C. Stafford. (1986). Supervision and evaluation, two irreconcilable processes? The Clearinghouse, 59, 351-353.

- Hunter, M. (1984). Knowing, teaching and supervision. In L. Hosford (Ed.), Using what we know about teaching. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. In S. J. Tracy & R. H. MacNaughton. (1986, Spring). Contemporary Education, 57(3), 131-132.
- Jackson, P. (1968). Life in the classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. In R. H. MacNaughton, S. Tracy, & J. F. Rogus. (1984, November) Effective teacher evaluation--process must be personalized, individualized. NAASP Bulletin, 68(475), 1.
- Joki, R. A. (1982, November). Make teacher competency your policy. American School Board Journal. 169(11), 32. In T. I. Ellis. (1984). Teacher competency: What administrators can do. Eric Digest No. 9. Eugene, OR: (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 259 452)
- Jones, A. S. (1972). A realistic approach to teacher evaluation. The Clearinghouse, 46, 474-491. In G. R. Weisenstein, (1976). Teacher evaluation: The principal's role. Bulletin. Eugene, OR: School Study Council, 20(3), 2-8.
- Killian, M. G., & Sexton, J. J. (1979, March). Climbing the ladder of leadership. NAASP Bulletin, 63(425), 47.
- Klein, K. (Ed.). (1986). Evaluation of teaching: The formative process. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappan.
- Knapp, M. S. (1984). Teacher evaluation practices within schools. In K. Klein (Ed.). (1986). Evaluation of teaching: The formative process. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.
- Kowalski, J. P. (1978). Evaluating teacher performance. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service. In M. S. Knapp. (1984). Teacher evaluation practices within schools. Evaluation of teaching: The formative process. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.
- Lewis A. (1982). Evaluating educational personnel. Arlington, VA.: American Association of School Administrators. In L. Darling-Hammond, A. E. Wise, & S. R. Pease. (1983, Fall). Teacher evaluation in the organizational context: A review of the literature. Review of Educational Research, 53(3), 285-328.

- Lewis, J. (1973). Appraising teacher performance. West Nyack, NY: Parker.
- Manatt, R. P. (1981). Manatt's exercise in selecting teacher performance evaluation criteria based on effective teaching research. National Symposium for Professionals in Evaluational Research. Albuquerque, N. Mex. In D. M. Beach, & J. Reinhartz. (1984, November). Using criteria of effective teaching to judge teacher performance. NASSP Bulletin, 68(475), 32.
- Manatt, R. P., Palmer, K. L., & Hidlebaugh, E. (1976, April). Evaluating teacher performance with improved rating scales. NASSP Bulletin, 60(401), 21-23.
- McCarty, D. J., Kaufman, J. W., & Stafford, J. C. (1986). Supervision and evaluation, two irreconcilable processes? The Clearinghouse, 59, 351-353.
- McLaughlin, M. W. (1984). Teacher evaluation and school improvement. Teachers College Record, 8(1), 193-205.
- McDonnell, L., & Pascal, A. (1979). Organized teachers in American schools (R-2407-NIE). Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation. In L. Darling-Hammond, A. E. Wise, & S. R. Pease. (1983, Fall). Teacher evaluation in the organizational context: A review of the literature. Review of Educational Research, 53(3), 285-328.
- McGreal, T. L. (1984). Teacher performance appraisal. Instructional leadership handbook. Reston, VA: The National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- McIntyre, J., & Morris, W. R. (1982, May). Time management and instructional supervision. Clearing House. In R. H. MacNaughton, S. Tracy, & J. F. Rogus. (1984, November). Effective teacher evaluation--process must be personalized, individualized. NASSP Bulletin, 68(475), 1.
- Medley, D. M. (1972). Early history of research on teacher behavior. International review of education. 430-439. In N. Hobar, & D. K. Sullivan. (1984, Summer). Systematic observation of instruction: Genesis, research, practice, and potential. Journal of Classroom Interaction, 19(2), 26-34.

- Medley, D. M. (1978, Summer). Research in teacher effectiveness: Where it is and how it got here. Journal of Classroom Interaction. 13(2), 16-21. In N. Hobar, & D. K. Sullivan. (1984, Summer). Systematic observation of instruction: Genesis, research, practice, and potential. Journal of Classroom Interaction, 19(2), 26-34.
- Medley, D. M., Coker, H., & Soar, R. S. (1984). Measurement-based evaluation of teacher performance an empirical approach. New York: Longman.
- Medley, D. M., & Crook, P. R. (1980, Winter). Research in teacher competency and teacher tasks. Theory into Practice. 19(4). In N. Hobar, & D. K. Sullivan. (1984, Summer). Systematic observation of instruction: Genesis, research, practice, and potential. Journal of Classroom Interaction, 19(2), 26-34.
- Medley, D. M., & Mitzel, H. E. (1958, November). A technique for measuring classroom behavior. Journal of Educational Psychology. 49, 86-92. In N. Hobar, & D. K. Sullivan. (1984, Summer). Systematic observation of instruction: Genesis, research, practice, and potential. Journal of Classroom Interaction, 19(2), 26-34.
- Medley, D., Soar, R., & Coker, H. (1983). The minimum conditions for valid evaluation of teacher performance. Journal of Classroom Interaction. 19(1), 22-27.
- Minton, E. (1979). Clinical supervision: Developing evaluation skills for dynamic leadership. (cassette recording). Englewood, CO: Educational Consulting Associates.
- Miller, R. I. (1972). Evaluating faculty performance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Miller, R. I. (1974). Developing programs for faculty evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Millman, J. (Ed.). (1981). Student achievement as a measure of teacher competence. Handbook of teacher evaluation. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

- Mooney, J. P. (1984, March). A systems supervisory model for principals: Where are we? NASSP Bulletin, 68(469), 1.
- Mosher, R., & Purpel, D. (1972). Supervision: The reluctant profession. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- National School Public Relations Association. (1974). Evaluating teachers for professional growth. Arlington, VA: Author.
- Neville, R. F. (1966, May). Supervisors we need. Educational Leadership, 23(8), 634-640. In R. H. MacNaughton, S. Tracy & J. F. Rogus. (1984, November) Effective teacher evaluation--process must be personalized, individualized. NASSP Bulletin, 68(475), 1.
- Page, C. F. (1974). Student evaluation of teaching: The American experience. New York: Society for Research into Higher Education.
- Pearson, A. T. (1980). The competency concept. Educational Studies, 11(2), 145-52. In T. I. Ellis. (1984). Teacher competency: What administrators can do. ERIC Digest No. 9. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, 9, 2-3.
- Prince, J. D. (1984, June). Formative teacher evaluation: The crucial element in an outcome-based education program. Paper presented to the Phi Delta Kappa Conference on Teacher Evaluation. The University of Southern Mississippi. In K. Klein (Ed.) (1986). Evaluation of teaching: The formative process. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.
- Raths, J., & Preskill, H. (1982, January). Research synthesis on summative evaluation of teaching. Educational Leadership, 39(4), 310-13. In T. I. Ellis (1986). Teacher evaluation. Research Roundup. Alexandria, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals.
- Reavis, W. C., & Cooper, D. H. (1945). Evaluation of teacher merit in city school systems. Supplementary Educational Monographs. No. 59. Chicago: University of Chicago. 36. In C. J. Wood & P. A. Pohland. (1983, Summer). Teacher evaluation and the hand of history. The Journal of Educational Administration, 21(2), 168-181.

- Redfern, G. B. (1980). Evaluating teachers and administrators: A performance objectives approach. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Rosenshine, B., & Furst, N. (1971). Research in teacher performance criteria. In B. O. Smith (Ed.). Research in teacher education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. In D. W. Beach & J. Reinhartz. (1984, November). Using criteria of effective teaching to judge teacher performance. NASSP Bulletin, 68(475), 32.
- Ryan D. G. (1960). Characteristics of teachers. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Scheffe, H. (1959). The analysis of variance. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Scott, W. R. (1966). "Professional in bureaucracies - areas of conflict." In H. Vollmer & D. Mills, (Eds.). (1987). Professionalism, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Soar, R. S., Medley, D. M., & Coker, H. (1983, December). Teacher evaluation: A critique of currently used methods. Kappan, 65(4), 239-246.
- Speicher, A. D., & Schurter, W. A. (1981). Instructional improvement and student learning through good teacher evaluation. Madison, IN: Penn-Harris-Madison (IN.) School Corporation.
- Stodolsky, S. S. (1984, November). Teacher evaluation: The limits of looking. Educational Research, 13(9), 11-18.
- Superintendent of Public Instruction, (1987). Common school manual. Common school laws of the state of Washington (Title 28A and other selected laws), rules and regulations of the State Board of Education (Title 180 WAC), and rules and regulations of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (Title 392 WAC). Olympia, WA: Author.
- Tracy, S. J., & MacNaughton, R. H. (1986, Spring). The neo-traditional approach to instructional supervision: Problems, promises, and outcomes. Contemporary Education, 57(3), 130-134.

- Travers, R. M. W. (1981). Criteria of good teaching. In J. Millman (Ed) (1981). Student achievement as a measure of teacher competence. Handbook of teacher evaluation. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- United States Department of Education. (1986). What works - Research about teaching and learning. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- Vancouver School District No. 37. (1987-88). Vancouver school district application for a short form of evaluation for school year 1987-88. Vancouver, WA: Author.
- Vancouver School District No. 37. (1986-89). Comprehensive professional agreement between the Vancouver school district no. 37 and the Vancouver education association. Vancouver, WA: Author.
- Vancouver School District No. 37. (1986-89). Professional evaluation interview schedule. Vancouver, WA: Author.
- Vancouver School District No. 37. (1986-89). Professional evaluation interview schedule. (1986-89). Vancouver, WA: Author.
- Walberg, H. J., Schiller, D., & Haertel, G. D. (1979, November). The quiet revolution in educational research. Kappan, 61(3), 179-183. In D. M. Beach & J. Reinhartz. (1984, November). Using criteria of effective teaching to judge teacher performance. NASSP Bulletin, 68(475), 32.
- Weisenstein, G. R. (1976). Teacher evaluation: The principal's role. Bulletin. Eugene, OR: School Study Council, 20(3), 2-8.
- Wise, A., Darling-Hammond, L., McLaughlin, M., & Bernstein, H. (1984). Teacher evaluation. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.
- Wood, C. J. & Pohland, P. A. (1983, Summer). Teacher evaluation and the hand of history. The Journal of Educational Administration, 31(2), 168-181.

**APPENDIX A**  
**PROFESSIONAL EVALUATION INTERVIEW SCHEDULE**

VANCOUVER SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 37  
Vancouver, Washington

PROFESSIONAL EVALUATION INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Observation Summary                      Certificated Classroom Teachers

Teacher: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_ Time: \_\_\_\_\_ To: \_\_\_\_\_

Activity Observed: (Teaching, Testing, etc.) \_\_\_\_\_

Location: (Classroom, Laboratory, Gym, etc.) \_\_\_\_\_

Special Considerations: (Class composition, equipment or facility situations, first year in assignment, etc., that merits comment.) \_\_\_\_\_

The Professional Evaluation Interview Schedule sets forth the official evaluative criteria and the specific indicators that are to be utilized in making observations and in discussing the observations for improving the performance of a classroom teacher. The interview schedule form is to be completed within three days of an observation by the administrator assigned the supervision of the teacher and a copy provided to the teacher. If the teacher or administrator desires a discussion meeting it will be scheduled immediately. The primary purpose of this interview schedule and summary numeral procedure is to clearly focus attention on a teacher's performance, i.e., those areas of strength that should be recognized and on any area of performance that must be improved. The Professional evaluation Interview Schedule will serve as the primary source of the information to be included on the Report: Professional Performance that is placed in a teacher's file.

Each area is to be marked with a summary numeral of 1, 2, 3 or left blank if the evaluator does not have sufficient information about the area of performance to draw a clear opinion.

1. Performance is exceptional.
2. Performance is acceptable to good.
3. Performance is not acceptable.

An area marked with a summary numeral 2 is in the "satisfactory" range. No written comment is required.

An area marked with a 1 should be explained with a written comment to provide the basis of commendation(s) for

inclusion on the annual Report: Professional Performance. Any area marked with a 3 must be explained with a written comment(s) clearly identifying the step(s) to be taken by the teacher and the supervisor to correct the situation.

This Professional Evaluation Interview Schedule is not a physical part of the Report: Professional Performance and should not be forwarded to the school district's office of certificated personnel services for filing in the employee's personnel file. This schedule will be retained and utilized solely by the supervisor as a basis for substantiating the Report: Professional Performance.

Space is provided following each evaluation criteria topic to record a brief summary for discussion of the topic.

CRITERION 1. INSTRUCTIONAL SKILL. The certificated classroom teacher demonstrates in his or her performance, competent level of knowledge and skill in designing and conducting an instructional experience.

- ☐ A. Teaches to an objective: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ B. Monitors student progress: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ C. Adjusts instruction if needed: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ D. Applies appropriate principles of learning: \_\_\_\_\_

CRITERION 2. CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT. The certificated classroom teacher demonstrates in his or her performance competent level of knowledge and skill in organizing the physical and human elements in the educational setting.

- ☐ A. Organizes the classroom setting: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ B. Establishes clear expectations for student's behavior: \_\_\_\_\_

CRITERION 3. THE HANDLING OF STUDENT DISCIPLINE AND ATTENDANT PROBLEMS. The certificated classroom teacher demonstrates the ability to manage the noninstructional human dynamics in the educational setting.

- ☐ A. Reinforces expectations for students' behavior in room and school: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ B. Demonstrates effectiveness in guidance, individual and group: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ C. Demonstrates fairness and consistency: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ D. Makes referrals of students to support staff and/or parents as necessary: \_\_\_\_\_

CRITERION 4. INTEREST IN TEACHING PUPILS. The certificated classroom teacher demonstrates an understanding of and commitment to each pupil, taking into account each individual's unique background and characteristics. The

certificated classroom teacher demonstrates enthusiasm for or enjoyment in working with pupils.

- \_\_\_ A. Allows for individual differences:\_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ B. Shows enthusiasm in working with students:\_\_\_\_\_

CRITERION 5. RESPONSIBILITY IN GENERAL SCHOOL SERVICE.

- \_\_\_ A. Works in a cooperative manner with principal and staff:\_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ B. Contributes to a positive staff morale:\_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ C. Is punctual to school and meetings:\_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ D. Handles routine reports promptly and efficiently:\_\_\_\_\_

CRITERION 6. KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT MATTER. The certificated classroom teacher demonstrates a depth and breadth of knowledge of theory and content in general education and subject matter specialization(s) appropriate to the elementary and/or secondary level(s).

- \_\_\_ A. Demonstrates an adequate academic background:\_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ B. Shows competency in current assignment:\_\_\_\_\_

CRITERION 7. PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION AND SCHOLARSHIP.

The certificated classroom teacher exhibits in his or her performance evidence of having a theoretical background and knowledge of the principals and methods of teaching, and a commitment to education as a profession.

- \_\_\_ A. Demonstrates a theoretical background and knowledge of the principles and methods of teaching:\_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ B. Shows evidence of a commitment to education as a profession by keeping current with college training courses, inservice/steering committee participation, classroom innovations and participation/leadership in activities of both general and/or subject matter education association groups:\_\_\_\_\_

CRITERION 8. EFFORT TOWARD IMPROVEMENT WHEN NEEDED. The certificated classroom teacher demonstrates an awareness of his or her limitations and strengths, and demonstrates continued professional growth.\_\_\_\_\_

- \_\_\_ A. Solicits specific suggestions from colleagues and administrators:\_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ B. Implements specific suggestions for improvement to meet an adequate level of performance in an identified area:\_\_\_\_\_

**SUMMARY STATEMENT:** List here any and all supervisor's commendations and/or recommendations to correct an identified deficiency and the assistance offered by the supervisor.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Evaluator      Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Evaluatee      Date      The signature of the evaluatee does not indicate concurrence with the evaluator's comments--only that a copy of the interview schedule was provided along with an opportunity to discuss the contents of the evaluation in a timely manner.

A conference is requested and will be held: No\_\_\_ Yes\_\_\_  
If so, when\_\_\_\_\_.

**APPENDIX B**

**REPORT: PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE**

Vancouver School District No. 37  
Clark County  
Vancouver, Washington

REPORT: PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE  
(See C.P.A. Article 8.14, B)

Name of Evaluatee \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
School \_\_\_\_\_ Degree Held \_\_\_\_\_ Years Teaching \_\_\_\_\_  
Position \_\_\_\_\_ Certificate \_\_\_\_\_ Experience \_\_\_\_\_  
Years in \_\_\_\_\_  
Vancouver \_\_\_\_\_

Purposes of Evaluation in Order of Priority:

- to improve the professional performance of the employee.
- to let the employee know how he is getting along on a regular basis, not later than May 25 of each year.
- to specifically inform the employee of ways in which he can improve.
- to identify specific training needs of an employee.
- to establish a basis for contract renewal or nonrenewal, dismissal or any other disciplinary action against an employee: Normally, to be completed prior to February 1, if there is evidence of unsatisfactory service.

The summary conclusions set forth below are based on the recognized specific minimum evaluative criteria categories as provided by law and included in the Professional Evaluation Interview Schedule (Appendix C) and from the notes made from the observations and discussions held during the time period covered by this Report: Professional Performance.

I. During the period \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_,  
(month) (day) (year) (month) (year)  
the professional services of the above-named staff member have been satisfactory, with the exceptions cited below:  
( ) no exceptions ( )

A. Exceptions:

B. Recommendations for improvement and assistance offered to help the teacher:

II. Special Commendations: (Citing specific strengths, talents or special activities that the evaluator would like to have made a part of the official record.)

III. This report, including attachments as noted, is based on observations made: (Date, location, length of observation and comments.)

And compiled from notes on interview schedules of the current year.

Signature of Evaluator\_\_\_\_\_Date\_\_\_\_\_

I have read and discussed this evaluation with my evaluator. I do\_\_\_do not\_\_\_accept it as an accurate account of my services. An additional statement is\_\_\_is not\_\_\_attached or will be submitted to the personnel office \_\_\_within ten (10) working days with a copy to the evaluator.

Signature of Evaluatee\_\_\_\_\_Date\_\_\_\_\_

Copies to: Evaluator, Evaluatee, Permanent File (Personnel Office)

Received Personnel Office\_\_\_\_\_

**APPENDIX C**  
**BUILDING ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION**  
**PERCEPTION QUESTIONNAIRE**

**BUILDING ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION PERCEPTION QUESTIONNAIRE**

**PART 1: INSTRUCTIONS:** The following questions are written to assess your perceptions of the current teacher evaluation system being used in the Vancouver School District. For each question, using a #2 pencil, shade in the answer in the appropriate box on the attached Scan-tron sheet that best describes your perceptions of your most recent evaluative experience. Use the following as a scale for your answers:

If you...

Strongly Agree:        shade in box (A) on the Scan-tron sheet.  
Agree:                shade in box (B) on the Scan-tron sheet.  
Undecided:            shade in box (C) on the Scan-tron sheet.  
Disagree:             shade in box (D) on the Scan-tron sheet.  
Strongly Disagree: shade in box (E) on the Scan-tron sheet.

---

**SECTION 1: EVALUATOR QUALITY**

1. I possess the skills and training to evaluate the performance of my teachers.
  2. My evaluatees feel that I give them fair evaluations.
  3. My evaluatees see me as being effective in analyzing observed lessons accurately.
  4. After being in my evaluatees' classrooms for an observation, they receive feedback on what was observed.
  5. My evaluatees see me as using the previous evaluation to assist them in setting future goals for instructional improvement.
- 

**SECTION 2: COMFORT WITH EVALUATOR**

6. My evaluatees feel that I respect them as educators.
7. My evaluatees know what I think of their teaching skills.
8. A level of trust exists between my evaluatees and me.

If you...

Strongly Agree: shade in box (A) on the Scan-tron sheet.  
 Agree: shade in box (B) on the Scan-tron sheet.  
 Undecided: shade in box (C) on the Scan-tron sheet.  
 Disagree: shade in box (D) on the Scan-tron sheet.  
 Strongly Disagree: shade in box (E) on the Scan-tron sheet.

---

9. My evaluatees are satisfied with the amount of time I spend in their classrooms.
  10. Teachers feel uneasy and unsure of themselves when I enter a classroom to evaluate.
  11. Teachers feel threatened by me when I enter their room to evaluate.
  12. My evaluatees agree that I observe in their room for a period of time that gives me a fair picture of the activities that were observed.
- 

13. If my evaluatees knew when they were going to be observed, they would do a better job in preparation for the observation.
  14. The post-conference is a mutual sharing of both my evaluatee's perceptions of what happened, and my perceptions of what was seen during the observation.
  15. My evaluatees feel comfortable in the post-conference with me.
- 

### SECTION 3: FREQUENCY OF CLASSROOM VISITATIONS

16. I drop into my evaluatees' classrooms to see how they are doing at least once/week.
17. I drop into my evaluatees' class to observe students and curriculum at least once/week.
18. The only time I am in classrooms is for a formal evaluation.
19. I am too busy to visit my evaluatees' classrooms any more than currently occurs.
20. I wish that I could visit my evaluatees' classrooms more often.

If you...

Strongly Agree:        shade in box (A) on the Scan-tron sheet.  
Agree:                shade in box (B) on the Scan-tron sheet.  
Undecided:            shade in box (C) on the Scan-tron sheet.  
Disagree:             shade in box (D) on the Scan-tron sheet.  
Strongly Disagree:    shade in box (E) on the Scan-tron sheet.

---

#### SECTION 4: EVALUATION PROCEDURAL POINTS

21. Before each evaluation, I schedule the date and time for the observation.
  22. I always conduct a pre-conference with my evaluatees to discuss the lesson to be observed prior to a classroom observation.
  23. Before each evaluation, I know my evaluatees' objective for the lesson to be observed.
  24. Before each evaluation, the evaluatee knows the areas in which the evaluation will focus for observational purposes.
  25. During the observation, I take accurate verbatim notes on what is observed.
  26. I accurately record what happens in the classroom during an evaluation.
  27. I am prompt in completing the evaluation report and setting a time to post-conference.
- 

#### SECTION 5: UTILIZATION OF EVALUATION RESULTS

28. The current evaluation system enables my evaluatees to be evaluated fairly and accurately.
29. My evaluatees are provided with recommendations that they seriously try to implement in their classrooms.
30. The current evaluation system provides my evaluatees with information that they can use to set personal goals for instructional growth.
31. The current evaluation process has improved my evaluatees' teaching.

32. The teacher evaluation system can and should be improved.

33. I am very satisfied with the evaluation process.

PART 2: INSTRUCTIONS: USING THE SCAN-TRON SHEET AND A NUMBER 2 PENCIL, PLEASE SHADE THE APPROPRIATE INFORMATION THAT DESCRIBES YOU AND YOUR CURRENT ASSIGNMENT WITHIN THE VANCOUVER SCHOOL DISTRICT.

34. SEX

- (A) Male
- (B) Female

35. AGE

- (A) 21-30 years old
- (B) 31-40 years old
- (C) 41-50 years old
- (D) 51-60 years old
- (E) Over 60 years old

36. EDUCATION (Check highest degree earned)

- (A) Bachelor's Degree
- (B) BA + 45 Hours
- (C) BA + 90 Hours
- (D) Master's Degree
- (E) EdD or PhD

37. ADMINISTRATIVE CATEGORY

- (A) Elementary Principal
- (B) Middle School Principal
- (C) Middle School Assistant Principal
- (D) High School Principal
- (E) High School Assistant Principal

(38.-41.) UNDERGRADUATE MAJOR (Please check each major you earned)

- 38.
  - (A) Elementary Education
  - (B) Secondary Education
  - (C) Art
  - (D) Health
  - (E) English, Language Arts or Reading
- 39.
  - (A) Foreign Language
  - (B) Music
  - (C) Mathematics
  - (D) Social Studies/Social Science
  - (E) Science
- 40.
  - (A) Physical Education
  - (B) Industrial Art
  - (C) Special Education
  - (D) Vocational
  - (E) Speech/Drama
- 41.
  - (A) Other: Please List \_\_\_\_\_

(42.-43.) TOTAL TEACHING EXPER.      (44.-45.) TEACHING EXPER.:  
VANCOUVER S.D.

- |     |                      |     |                      |
|-----|----------------------|-----|----------------------|
| 42. | (A) 0-4 years        | 44. | (A) 0-4 years        |
|     | (B) 5-9 years        |     | (B) 5-9 years        |
|     | (C) 10-14 years      |     | (C) 10-14 years      |
|     | (D) 15-19 years      |     | (D) 15-19 years      |
|     | (E) 20-24 years      |     | (E) 20-24 years      |
| 43. | (A) 25-29 years      | 45. | (A) 25-29 years      |
|     | (B) 30 or more years |     | (B) 30 or more years |

(46.-47.) ADMIN. EXPER. IN VANC.

- |     |                      |
|-----|----------------------|
| 46. | (A) 0-4 years        |
|     | (B) 5-9 years        |
|     | (C) 10-14 years      |
|     | (D) 15-19 years      |
|     | (E) 20-24 years      |
| 47. | (A) 25-29 years      |
|     | (B) 30 or more years |

(48.-49.) TOTAL ADMIN. EXPER.

- |                      |
|----------------------|
| (A) 0-4 years        |
| (B) 5-9 years        |
| (C) 10-14 years      |
| (D) 15-19 years      |
| (E) 20-24 years      |
| (A) 25-29 years      |
| (B) 30 or more years |

PART 3: PERSONAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TEACHER EVALUATION  
IMPROVEMENT

If you could change the current teacher evaluation process, what would it look like in the following areas?

1. Orientation Process
2. Pre-conference
3. Observational Process
4. Report Preparation
5. Post-conference
6. Goal Setting

**APPENDIX D**  
**TEACHER EVALUATION PERCEPTION QUESTIONNAIRE**

TEACHER EVALUATION PERCEPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

PART 1: INSTRUCTIONS: The following questions are written to assess your perceptions of the current teacher evaluation system being used in the Vancouver School District. For each question, using a #2 pencil, shade in the answer in the appropriate box on the attached Scan-tron sheet that best describes your perceptions of your most recent evaluative experience. Use the following as a scale for your answers:

If you...

Strongly Agree:        shade in box (A) on the Scan-tron sheet.  
Agree:                shade in box (B) on the Scan-tron sheet.  
Undecided:            shade in box (C) on the Scan-tron sheet.  
Disagree:             shade in box (D) on the Scan-tron sheet.  
Strongly Disagree: shade in box (E) on the Scan-tron sheet.

---

SECTION 1: EVALUATOR QUALITY

1. My evaluator possesses the necessary skills and training to evaluate my teaching performance.
  2. My evaluator is fair in his/her evaluations.
  3. My evaluator is effective in being able to analyze observed lessons accurately.
  4. After my evaluator has been in my classroom for an observation, I receive valuable information on what was observed.
  5. My evaluator uses the previous evaluation to assist me in setting future goals for instructional improvement.
- 

SECTION 2: COMFORT WITH EVALUATOR

6. My evaluator has respect for me as an educator.
7. I know what my evaluator thinks of my teaching skills.
8. A level of trust exists between my evaluator and me.
9. I am satisfied with the amount of time my evaluator spends in my classroom.

If you...

Strongly Agree:      shade in box (A) on the Scan-tron sheet.  
Agree:                shade in box (B) on the Scan-tron sheet.  
Undecided:           shade in box (C) on the Scan-tron sheet.  
Disagree:             shade in box (D) on the Scan-tron sheet.  
Strongly Disagree: shade in box (E) on the Scan-tron sheet.

10. I feel uneasy and unsure of myself when my evaluator comes into my room.
11. I feel threatened when my evaluator is in my room to evaluate me.
12. My evaluator makes observations for a period of time that I believe gives a fair picture of the activities that were observed.
13. If I knew when I was going to be observed, I would do a better job in preparation for the observation.

- 
14. The post-conference is a mutual sharing of both my perceptions and the evaluator's perceptions of what was seen during the observation.
  15. My evaluator makes me feel comfortable in the post-conference.

- 
16. My evaluator will drop into my class to see how I am doing at least once/week.
  17. My evaluator will drop into my class to observe students and curriculum at least once/week.
  18. The only time my evaluator is in my room is for a formal evaluation.
  19. My evaluator is too busy to visit my classroom any more than currently occurs.
  20. I wish that my evaluator would visit my classroom more often.
-

If you...

Strongly Agree:      shade in box (A) on the Scan-tron sheet.  
Agree:                shade in box (B) on the Scan-tron sheet.  
Undecided:           shade in box (C) on the Scan-tron sheet.  
Disagree:             shade in box (D) on the Scan-tron sheet.  
Strongly Disagree: shade in box (E) on the Scan-tron sheet.

---

#### SECTION 4: EVALUATION PROCEDURAL POINTS

21. Before each evaluation, my evaluator schedules the date and time for the observation with me.
  22. My evaluator conducts a pre-conference with me to discuss the lesson to be observed prior to a classroom observation.
  23. Before each evaluation, my evaluator knows my objective for the lesson to be observed.
  24. Before each evaluation, I am aware of the areas in which my evaluator will be focusing for observational purposes.
  25. During the observation, my evaluator takes what I believe are accurate verbatim notes of what occurred in the classroom.
  26. My evaluator accurately records what happens in my classroom during an evaluation.
  27. My evaluator is prompt in completing the evaluation report and setting a time to post-conference.
- 

#### SECTION 5: UTILIZATION OF EVALUATION RESULTS

28. The current evaluation system enables my evaluator to evaluate my performance fairly and accurately.
29. My evaluator provides me with recommendations that I seriously try to implement in my classroom.
30. The current evaluation system provides me with information that I can use to set personal goals for instructional growth.
31. The current evaluation system has improved my teaching.

If you...

Strongly Agree: shade in box (A) on the Scan-tron sheet.  
 Agree: shade in box (B) on the Scan-tron sheet.  
 Undecided: shade in box (C) on the Scan-tron sheet.  
 Disagree: shade in box (D) on the Scan-tron sheet.  
 Strongly Disagree: shade in box (E) on the Scan-tron sheet.

---

32. The teacher evaluation system should be improved.

33. I am very satisfied with the evaluation process.

PART 2: INSTRUCTIONS: USING THE SCAN-TRON SHEET AND A  
 NUMBER 2 PENCIL, PLEASE SHADE THE APPROPRIATE  
 INFORMATION THAT DESCRIBES YOU AND YOUR CURRENT  
 ASSIGNMENT WITHIN THE VANCOUVER SCHOOL DISTRICT.

34. SEX

- (A) Male
- (B) Female

35. AGE

- (A) 21-30 years old
- (B) 31-40 years old
- (C) 41-50 years old
- (D) 51-60 years old
- (E) Over 60 years old

36. EDUCATION (Check highest  
 degree earned)

- (A) Bachelor's Degree
- (B) BA + 45 Hours
- (C) BA + 90 Hours
- (D) Master's Degree
- (E) EdD or PhD

37. ADMINISTRATIVE CATEGORY

- (A) Primary (Grades K-3)
- (B) Elementary  
 (Grades 4-6)
- (C) Middle School  
 (Grades 7-8)
- (D) High School  
 (Grades 9-12)

(38.-41.) UNDERGRADUATE MAJOR (Please check each major you  
 earned)

- 38. (A) Elementary Education
- (B) Secondary Education
- (C) Art
- (D) Health
- (E) English, Language Arts or Reading
- 39. (A) Foreign Language
- (B) Music
- (C) Mathematics
- (D) Social Studies/Social Science
- (E) Science
- 40. (A) Physical Education
- (B) Industrial Art
- (C) Special Education
- (D) Vocational
- (E) Speech/Drama

41. (A) Other: Please List \_\_\_\_\_

(42.-43.) TOTAL TEACHING EXPER. (44.-45.) TEACHING EXPER.:

VANCOUVER S.D.

- |     |                      |     |                      |
|-----|----------------------|-----|----------------------|
| 42. | (A) 0-4 years        | 44. | (A) 0-4 years        |
|     | (B) 5-9 years        |     | (B) 5-9 years        |
|     | (C) 10-14 years      |     | (C) 10-14 years      |
|     | (D) 15-19 years      |     | (D) 15-19 years      |
|     | (E) 20-24 years      |     | (E) 20-24 years      |
| 43. | (A) 25-29 years      | 45. | (A) 25-29 years      |
|     | (B) 30 or more years |     | (B) 30 or more years |

(46.-47.) TEACHING EXPER. CURRENT BUILDING

- |     |                      |
|-----|----------------------|
| 46. | (A) 0-4 years        |
|     | (B) 5-9 years        |
|     | (C) 10-14 years      |
|     | (D) 15-19 years      |
|     | (E) 20-24 years      |
| 47. | (A) 25-29 years      |
|     | (B) 30 or more years |

### PART 3: PERSONAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TEACHER EVALUATION IMPROVEMENT

If you could change the current teacher evaluation process, what would it look like in the following areas?

1. Orientation Process
2. Pre-conference
3. Observational Process
4. Report Preparation
5. Post-conference
6. Goal Setting

**APPENDIX E**  
**PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**APPLICATION FOR REVIEW OF RESEARCH PROJECT**

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY  
APPLICATION FOR REVIEW OF RESEARCH PROJECT

TO: Human Subjects Research Review Committee

FROM: Principal Investigator David S. Halstead Dept.  
Educ. Admin.

Date of Application February 5, 1988 Campus Phone N/A

Title of Proposal The Effectiveness of a Teacher Evaluation Process as Perceived by Teachers and Building-level Administrators

Instructors themselves are generally responsible for research done as a class project, but they are encouraged to seek advice from the Committee if the rights and welfare of human subjects of that research are in question.

Applications for research grants and training programs that propose to use human subjects for research purposes must be accompanied by a statement signed by the principal investigator, and by the University's authorized official. This required statement asserts that the proposed investigation has had prior review by an independent University committee, and that the procedures to be used (1) protect the rights and welfare of the subjects, and (2) provide for the securing of informed consent from them, and, if persons under the age of 18 are to participate as subjects, the informed consent of parents or guardians. Answers to the following questions will provide the necessary information for the University committee and the granting agency. Three copies of the APPLICATION FOR COMMITTEE REVIEW MUST BE RECEIVED AT LEAST 10 WORKING DAYS BEFORE ANY SUBMISSION DATE OR OTHER DEADLINE. This application will be kept on file at the Office of Graduate Studies and Research.

The items below are to be completed by the Project Director (chief investigator). Attach additional sheets if necessary clarity.

I. Project Title and Prospectus (300 words or less). State whether the proposed research would be conducted pursuant to a contract or grant and identify the contractor or grantor agency. If proposal is a result of a Request for Proposal, give RFP number. The Effectiveness of a Teacher Evaluation Process as Perceived by Teachers and Building-level Administrators. This project is a doctoral dissertation in which 210 randomly selected teachers and 42 building administrators are asked to complete questionnaires that measure their perceptions of the current evaluation

system. Copies of the Teacher Evaluation Perception Questionnaire and the Building Administrator Evaluation Perception Questionnaire have both been approved by my dissertation committee and are attached.

The purpose of this descriptive study is to determine teacher and building administrator perceptions of the current evaluation process in the Vancouver School District. It is the theory of this study that one's perception of the evaluation system has a direct bearing upon that system's effectiveness in improving instruction. Conversely, the system's effectiveness in improving instruction can be determined by the perceptions of those that use the system.

The research is not being conducted pursuant to any contract or grant.

II. Subject Recruitment. Describe subject recruitment procedures for all subjects used in the study. Of the 727 teachers employed within the Vancouver School District, 210 subjects were randomly selected by computer to participate in the completion of the questionnaire. Additionally, all 42 building administrators will be asked to participate. Each selected subject will be given a copy of the appropriate questionnaire with an attached letter that asks for their cooperation in the completion and return of the questionnaire. A copy of the letter is attached. All subject participation is strictly voluntary.

III. Informed, voluntary consent in writing. Describe subject sample(s) and manner in which consent was obtained for each appropriate category.

- A. Adult Subjects. (Includes persons 18 years of age and over). Subject consent required.

Describe who/where/when/how. All subjects within the study are either teachers or building-level administrators employed within the Vancouver School District. Subject consent will be obtained in two ways.:

1. An application to conduct research within the Vancouver School District has been completed and approved by the Vancouver School District Research Review Committee.
2. Each subject will receive a copy of the attached letter which asks for their help in the completion of the questionnaire. No subject is required to participate in the project if s/he chooses not to.

- B. Child Subjects (includes all persons under 18). Parent/Guardian consent required. (Subjects over seven years of age must give their consent as well).

Describe who/where/when/how. No child subjects will be used in the study.

- C. Institutionalized Subjects. Subject consent and consent of appropriate, responsible institutional staff person (e.g., prison psychiatrist) required.

Describe who/where/when/how. No institutionalized subjects will be used in the study.

IV. First Person Scenario (short paragraph presenting participation experience from subject's point of view; e.g.: "I was seated at a table by the Investigator and...").

- A. Teacher Participants: I received a copy of the Teacher Evaluation Perception Questionnaire from my building principal. Included with the questionnaire was a letter which explained the purpose of the study and which asked for my cooperation in completing the survey. The letter also stated that all responses would be kept strictly confidential. A Scan-tron sheet was included on which I was to place my answers to the questions. After completing the questionnaire, it was returned to my building principal who sent it to the researcher for compilation and interpretation.
- B. Building Administrator Participants: The researcher called and asked if I would be willing to assist him in conducting some research that had received district approval. He then met with me, explained the purpose of the study, and asked that I distribute questionnaires to teachers that had been randomly selected and that I complete a questionnaire that measured my own perceptions. I was told that participation was strictly voluntary and results were to be kept strictly confidential. I distributed the questionnaires to the teachers, collected the finished results and returned them to the researcher.

V. Potential Risks and Safeguards.

- A. Describe risks (physical, psychological, social, legal or other). To my knowledge, no potential risks exist.
- B. Explain procedures and precautions safeguarding against risks noted above.

All participants will be told to not put their names on the Scan-tron sheets. When the sheets are collected, no method will be used to determine who has not resubmitted their questionnaire results. Additionally, the names of those individuals who were selected within the district will be kept in confidence with the researcher.

VI. Potential benefits of the proposed investigation (brief outline).

- A. By questioning and obtaining the information from certificated employees within the Vancouver School District about their perceptions of the current evaluation system, the District can critically examine its current evaluation system's strengths and weaknesses.
- B. If the results indicate dissatisfaction or perceived ineffectiveness with the current evaluation model, the District may decide to revise the current model and develop a more effective system.
- C. If the study results in obtaining information that validates current satisfaction with the system and perceived effectiveness in its ability to improve instruction, then the results support continued use of the current evaluation system by the school district.

VII. Records and distribution. In the event that information from the investigation will be kept on file or distributed (published, copied), what provisions for subject anonymity have been adopted?

The original list of subjects involved in the study rests with the researcher. No one else will have access to the names of those persons involved within the study. Additionally, after the questionnaires are submitted, there will be no way of knowing who has and who has not returned their questionnaire.

VIII. Monitoring System. Either: A) Indicate compliance with your department system for monitoring human subjects research activities or B) Describe your own monitoring system for this investigation (only the portion pertaining to use of human subjects).

The process has been reviewed by my Doctoral Dissertation Committee, which is composed predominantly of members of the Educational Administration program.

I have read and approved application submitted by:

_____ Signature of Dept. Head	_____ Date	_____ Signature of Prin. Investigator	_____ Date
----------------------------------	---------------	---	---------------

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Advisor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

If a thesis/dissertation the prospectus or proposal must be approved prior to HSRRC Review:

_____	Master Thesis	_____
_____	Doctoral Dissertation	_____
Signature of Thesis/Dissertation Advisor/Date		

FROM: Principal Investigator David S. Halstead Dept.  
Educ. Admin.

Date of Application February 5, 1988 Campus Phone N/A

Title of proposal The Effectiveness of a Teacher Evaluation Process as Perceived by Teachers and Building-level Administrators

I. Project Title and Prospectus. The Effectiveness of a Teacher Evaluation Process as Perceived by Teachers and Building-level Administrators. This project is a doctoral dissertation in which 210 randomly selected teachers and 42 building administrators are asked to complete questionnaires that measure their perceptions of the current evaluation system. The purpose of this descriptive study is to determine teacher and building administrator perceptions of the current evaluation system in the Vancouver School District. It is the theory of this study that one's perception of the evaluation system has a direct bearing upon that system's effectiveness in improving instruction. Conversely, the system's effectiveness in improving instruction can be determined by the perceptions of those that use the system.

II. Subject Recruitment. Of the 727 teachers employed within the Vancouver School District, 210 subjects were randomly selected by computer to participate in the completion of the questionnaire. Additionally, all 42 building administrators will be asked to participate. Each selected subject will be given a copy of the appropriate questionnaire with an attached letter that asks for their cooperation in the completion and return of the questionnaire. All subject participation is strictly voluntary.

III. Informed, voluntary consent in writing.

- A. Adult Subjects. All subjects within the study are either teachers or building level administrators employed within the Vancouver School District. Subject consent will be obtained in two ways.
1. An application to conduct research within the Vancouver School District has been completed and approved by the Vancouver School District Research Review Committee.
  2. Each subject will receive a copy of the attached letter which asks for their help in

the completion of the questionnaire. No subject is required to complete the project if s/he chooses not to participate.

- B. Child Subjects. No child subjects will be used in the study.
- C. Institutionalized Subjects. No institutionalized subjects will be used in the study.

#### IV. First Person Scenario

- A. Teacher Participants: I received a copy of the Teacher Evaluation Perception Questionnaire from my building principal. Included with the questionnaire was a letter which explained the purpose of the study and which asked for my cooperation in completing the survey. The letter also stated that all responses would be kept strictly confidential. A scan-tron sheet was included on which I was to place my answers to the questions. After completing the questionnaire, it was returned to my building principal who sent it to the researcher for compilation and interpretation.
- B. Building Administrator Participants: The researcher called and asked if I would be willing to assist him in conducting some research that had received district approval. He then met with me, explained the purpose of the study and asked that I distribute questionnaires to teachers that had been randomly selected and that I complete a questionnaire that measured my own perceptions. I was told that participation was strictly voluntary and results were to be kept strictly confidential. I distributed the questionnaires to the teachers, collected the finished results and returned them to the researcher.

**APPENDIX F**  
**LETTER TO CLASSROOM TEACHERS**

(NAME FIRST) (NAME LAST)  
(SCHOOL) (TITLE)

November 1987

Dear (NAME FIRST):

My name is David Halstead. I am principal of Hudson's Bay High School and a doctoral candidate at Portland State University. I am in the process of conducting research for my doctoral dissertation and am asking for your assistance.

The focus of my dissertation is upon the perceptions that both teachers and building administrators have regarding the effectiveness of the current evaluation system within the Vancouver School District. Your name has been randomly selected by computer from all the classroom teachers within the school district to participate in this survey.

I would appreciate your assistance by taking a few moments in completing the attached questionnaire and returning it to me in the enclosed envelope. ALL RESPONSES WILL BE KEPT STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL AND THE INFORMATION WILL ONLY BE REPORTED BY CATEGORY OF RESPONDENT FROM THE COMPLETED DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION. The greater the return of responses, the more accurate the results will be. So, it is important that you spend a few moments completing the questionnaire for greater accuracy.

I would be happy to share the results of my study with you. If you are interested in obtaining results, feel free to contact me at Hudson Bay High School, 696-7221.

Sincerely,

David Halstead  
Doctoral Candidate, Portland State University

**APPENDIX G**  
**LETTER TO BUILDING ADMINISTRATORS**

(NAME FIRST) (NAME LAST)  
(SCHOOL) (TITLE)

November 1987

Dear (NAME FIRST):

My name is David Halstead. I am principal of Hudson's Bay High School and a doctoral candidate at Portland State University. I am in the process of conducting research for my doctoral dissertation and am asking for your assistance.

The focus of my dissertation is upon the perceptions that both teachers and building administrators have regarding the effectiveness of the current evaluation system within the Vancouver School District. As a building administrator that evaluates teachers, I am asking for your assistance in compiling data regarding the perceptions that administrators have about the current system in use.

I would appreciate your assistance by taking a few moments in completing the attached questionnaire and returning it to me in the enclosed envelope. ALL RESPONSES WILL BE KEPT STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL AND THE INFORMATION WILL ONLY BE REPORTED BY CATEGORY OF RESPONDENT FROM THE COMPLETED DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION. The greater the return of responses, the more accurate the results will be. So, it is important that you spend a few moments completing the questionnaire for greater accuracy.

I would be happy to share the results of my study with you. If you are interested in obtaining results, feel free to contact me at Hudson Bay High School, 696-7221.

Sincerely,

David Halstead  
Doctoral Candidate, Portland State University