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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND ITS BACKGROUND

There is a pincer squeezing the public school administrator. One jaw is the taxpayer, who is pressing school systems to prove that they are effectively and efficiently educating the children entrusted to them. The concerns about the quantitative aspects of education have shifted to the matter of quality.

In the past two and one-half decades, one of the major problems has been to provide buildings and teachers to accommodate 80 per cent increase in the school population. This unprecedented growth has been aggravated by the mass migration to urban and suburban areas. Seemingly, now this period of rapid growth is over, and the push is shifting to demands for better quality education.

Taxpayers who contentedly passed levy after levy for the past twenty-five years are putting their foot down—hard. In those years they were often willing to take the educator's word that the schools were doing a good job. Possibly this laissez faire attitude was predicated on the "American Dream." Many parents, through education, envisioned for their children a better life than they were able to fashion for themselves. Now the taxpayer is becoming more and more critical of where the tax dollars go and how those dollars are being used. The "watchword" is accountability. Certainly, economic conditions and factors have influenced this surge of taxpayer revolt. The President
recently observed that we now spend as much on education as the rest of the world combined. Financial support of public elementary and secondary education is primarily dependent upon local property taxes. The taxpayer is losing the war against inflation with its concomitant effect of diminishing the taxpayer's purchasing power.

With many Ohio school systems spending nearly 90 per cent of the general operating budget for salary related costs, it is readily evident that to improve the overall quality of education, the performance of teachers must be improved. It all hinges on the teacher. In the final analysis, what makes the difference in education is how effectively each teacher performs his responsibilities. In his hands lie the realization of the goals and objectives for which youngsters go to school and the public pays.

Historically, the effectiveness of a teacher has been judged on the basis of some type of formal or informal program for appraising performance. As a means of assuring the public of the merit of the teacher, the town selectmen in the early New England community appointed an annual visitation committee to inspect the school and to report to the town meeting on the progress of the "scholars" under the tutelage of the schoolmaster. The status of the teacher in the New England community rested very largely on the evaluation by the visiting committee.

The use of appraisal programs to make decisions relating to merit pay, gaining tenure, promotion, or dismissal from the job has given rise to a fundamental issue in education which has had the effect of alienating teachers to appraisal programs and, in turn, to school administrators. Thus, the second jaw of the pincer squeezing the public school
administrator is the teaching profession which currently holds in sus­pect those appraisal programs that are specifically designed to assess the quality of their teaching ability. The teaching profession is be­coming convinced that appraisal does more to interfere with professional concerns for quality teaching than it does to assist it.

David E. Dial's article in a Missouri teachers' journal typifies the position of many in the profession. He states:

... the immediate prospects of arriving at a mutually acceptable evaluative instrument remains remote. Checklists, schedules, and other criteria are subjective, opinionated, and totally unsupported in terms of educational research ... The only major conclusion that can be drawn from research is that we cannot evaluate teachers by mere classroom observations.1

Rabinowitz and Travers seem to support the stand taken by many teacher organizations. They state:

There is no way to discover the characteristics which distin­guish effective and ineffective teachers unless one has made or is prepared to make a value judgment. The effective does not exist pure and serene, available for scientific scrutiny, but is instead a fiction in the mind of men. No teacher is more effective than another except as someone so decides and designates.2

The public school administrator's and, particularly, the super­intendent of schools' dilemma is compounded by existing tenure laws. These laws generally require the superintendent to make recommendations for the granting or denial of tenure status.

The State of Ohio has mandatory tenure for teachers. The Ohio Teacher's Tenure Law was both enacted and made effective in 1941. It was

---

patterned after similar acts of other states, and in many respects, it resembles a civil service law. Tenure legislation achieved its present status largely on the argument that it protects the competent teacher and enables him to be more effective without offering similar protection to the incompetent teacher. Yet, in spite of the claims which have been made, it is common knowledge that many observers of the educational scene believe that tenure provides security to the incompetent as well as to the competent. The question of whether tenure for teachers is a boon or bane remains a subject for serious debate and study. No matter how one views this issue, the fact remains that in school districts tenure is granted to a great number of teachers, and someone in position of authority has the responsibility for passing judgment upon the merits of teachers to receive the benefits of tenure.

In many states, minimum state standards require the evaluation of teachers. In Ohio, the State Board of Education has, through its minimum standards, required the evaluation of teachers. The recently approved State Minimum School Standards include:

It shall be the special responsibility of the principal to make periodic studies of the qualifications and performance of the teaching staff, to make the results available to the superintendent and the board of education, and to recommend ways to overcome weaknesses revealed.3

Provisions are made for the evaluation of the services of all professional personnel in relation to the quality of the instructional program and the efficient operation of the schools.4


The cry for accountability places further pressure on the school administrator. The recent statements of the Chairman of the National School Boards Association's Council of Big City Boards of Education, David E. Wagoner, seems to illustrate the press in which the administrator finds himself. Wagoner commented:

Accountability is the current cry. It is here that public sympathies on the issue of teacher accountability are on the board's side . . . In some respects the public is ahead of the educational hierarchy. The public has long identified the differences in quality of performance represented in the several classrooms of any school. It wants improvement . . . In this setting are compelling reasons for the earliest possible development of teacher performance criteria, which, if they are to be workable, must be reasonably objective and essentially fair. Only recently private industry has demonstrated its willingness to put its profits on the line by contracting with school districts to guarantee specified improvement over a given period. Why should not teachers who demonstrate similar improvements be specially awarded?\(^5\)

It appears that the battlelines are beginning to be drawn, and the feeling of teachers on this matter of appraisal has brought them to a point where more and more professional teacher organizations are seeking to treat teacher appraisal in their school districts as a negotiable item. For the moment at least, the school administrator may be the man in the middle.

**Statement of the Problem**

One of the most challenging tasks facing public education is the design and development of programs for appraising teacher performance which the teaching profession will accept as valid and useful, the

public will perceive as accounting for effective and efficient use of teacher manpower resources, and school administrators will judge as acceptable in developing, maintaining, and controlling the quality of probably the most crucial of all variables in education—the teacher.

The problem is to develop criteria that can be used in the evaluation of programs for appraising teacher performance, to use these criteria in judging teacher appraisal programs in selected Ohio city school districts, and to examine the criteria developed in light of this application to current practices.

The Need for the Study

A number of factors pointed toward the need for the study. Before the writer presented the problem to the members of his advisory committee for their consideration, he talked informally with a number of school administrators and other educators regarding the need for research in this area. The educators gave considerable evidence of interest in the writer's proposed study.

The responses of the jury of authorities, discussed in detail in Chapter III, strongly substantiated the writer's belief that the problem was worthy of investigation. Furthermore, in light of the fact that teacher organizations generally hold in suspect those appraisal programs that are specifically designed to assess the quality of their teaching ability, it behooves the practicing or potential Ohio school administrator to know the current practices in Ohio's public school districts. Teacher organizations are becoming more concerned about programs to appraise teacher performance. This concern is being
revealed consistently through their (the teacher organizations') activism. Simply, they are demanding a voice in the decision-making process ex ante. This may lead to teacher appraisal programs becoming a negotiable item in more and more school districts.

An additional need for the study was revealed through a review of the literature. While the writer found much research in the area of teacher appraisal, few of the studies dealt specifically with formal programs for appraising teacher performance. The writer found two doctoral dissertations that dealt with appraisal programs for evaluating probationary teachers for tenure. The first was a doctoral dissertation completed in 1961 by Max Wellington Evans, titled: *An Analysis of Programs for Evaluating Probationary Teachers in Selected Ohio School Districts*. The second piece of research was the dissertation in 1968 by Bennett Herschel Litherland, titled: *An Analysis of Programs For Evaluating Teachers for Tenure in Selected Michigan Public School Districts*. Since both these studies dealt exclusively with programs for appraising teacher prior to tenure decisions, there seemed to be a need for this study. This is especially true when one considers the possible changes in appraisal programs resulting from teacher organizations' activism and lay pressures for accountability that may have taken place in Ohio in more recent years.

**Assumptions of the Study**

The need for this study is based on these assumptions:

1. That every teacher's performance is appraised sometime in his career through either informal or formal means.
2. That most major Ohio city school districts have formal programs for appraising teacher performance.

3. That certain general and procedural, or implementing, criteria can be identified for use in evaluating programs for appraising teacher performance.

4. That the practices and procedures included in programs for appraising teacher performance can be secured through the research procedures to be employed in this study.

5. That the practices and procedures found in selected Ohio city school districts' programs for appraising teacher performance will have implications for similar programs in other public school districts.

Scope of the Study

Geographically, the scope was confined to public school districts in Ohio. Within the state, the study was limited to twenty-three of the twenty-five largest public school districts based on student enrollments.

The study was concerned primarily with programs for appraising teacher performance. Other facets of teacher appraisal, such as appraisal for salary advancement, for promotion, or for traditional maintenance of personnel records, were not considered integral parts of the study.

Limitations of the Study

A research study is invariably circumscribed by certain limiting factors. The writer sees the following as the major limitations of the study:

1. The set of criteria for evaluating teacher appraisal programs, as developed by the writer, are intentionally somewhat limited in scope. The writer believes that the use of an exhaustive list of criteria would severely restrict the ultimate utility of the study for administrators, board members, or teacher
organizations when approaching the task of developing, revising, or evaluating programs for appraising teacher performance.

2. The set of criteria, as developed by the writer, did not enumerate or reflect specific standards of effective teaching.

3. The twelve-member jury of authority constituted a somewhat limited sampling of experts. Some researchers may question the validity of the findings resulting from such a limited sampling.

4. The study, in some of its phases, was an assessment of the present status of programs in selected Ohio public school districts for appraising teacher performance. For those educational research workers who tend not to hold survey studies in high esteem, this fact will be regarded as a limitation.

Procedures of the Study

Insofar as one of the major purposes of this study was to develop criteria that can be used as guidelines in the development, modification, or evaluation of programs for appraising teacher performance, the writer tentatively established eighteen general and twenty-nine procedural, or implementing, criteria. These criteria were established by the writer after an extensive search of the literature. First, the writer extracted from the various writings what he considered to be key concepts and, in turn, he translated these concepts into criteria. A listing was then made of the criteria. Certain procedural, or implementing, criteria which lacked specific literature based references were added to the list by the writer. These criteria were developed from concepts which the writer gained during his professional employment experiences in staff personnel work. From the listing, the writer selected those criteria which he perceived to be most significant. Only those criteria selected from the list appear in this study. The
majority of the criteria selected from the list were then substantiated by specific references from the literature. Those few procedural, or implementing, criteria not substantiated by literature based references were supported by rationales developed by the writer.

As a means of testing the appropriateness of the criteria, the opinions of a jury of authorities in the field of teacher appraisal were sought. The twelve-member jury of authority consisted of two professors of education from The Ohio State University; two superintendents and one assistant superintendent of city school districts in Ohio and the president of the teachers' bargaining unit in each of these same three school districts; a representative of the Buckeye Association of School Administrators, Ohio Education Association, Ohio School Boards Association, and the Ohio State Department of Education. Through the use of a questionnaire, the jury was asked to react to and rate each criterion on two five-point rating scales. The first scale was an "agreement scale," and the second, an "importance scale." Space was provided at the bottom of each questionnaire page for comments or adding other appropriate criterion for consideration by the writer. In addition, the writer conducted a structured interview with each jury member several weeks after the questionnaire had been mailed. The purpose of the interview was to clarify any questions the jurors had concerning the criteria and to gain additional reactions to the writer's criteria.

Data was collected from twenty-five school districts in Ohio. The Educational Directory, School Year 1970-71 was used to select the
twenty-five largest school districts based on student enrollment. The assumption was that these twenty-five school districts employed almost one-half of the teachers in Ohio and that more than likely they would have the more highly-refined programs for appraising teacher performance.

The twenty-five school systems were asked to forward to the writer copies of appraisal instruments, handbooks, or manuals used by the district; copies of the board of education policies, and administrative rules and regulations pertaining to teacher appraisal; and any other information relevant to their programs for appraising teacher performance. This information provided the writer with a basis for determining the prevalent practices followed by the major Ohio city school districts in appraising teacher performance. The prevalent practices were examined and categorized into topical areas which corresponded to the general criteria developed previously by the writer. There was a limited statistical analysis made of some of the prevalent practices, however, the majority of the discussion was in the form of a summation which included the identification of some major trends and generalizations regarding the most prevalent practices.

Formal policy statements regarding programs for the appraisal of teacher performance were requested from the Ohio Education Association, National Education Association, Buckeye Association of School Administrators, American Association of School Administrators, Ohio School Boards Association, and the National School Boards Association. The writer reported the positions held by those aforementioned associations which had formal policies or positions regarding
Finally, following the recommendations for further study, the writer made some alterations and revisions to the general and procedural, or implementing, criteria which were based on the findings of the study.

**Definition of Terms**

The following terms, used throughout the study, are defined to prevent misunderstanding or confusion on the part of the reader.

**Formal Program for Appraising Teacher Performance:** A formal program for appraising teacher performance is defined as having the following characteristics:

a. Written and adopted board of education policies pertaining to the appraisal of teachers.

b. A clear delineation of responsibility for carrying out the appraisal process.

c. A systematized means of collecting, recording, and reviewing the work of teachers.

d. Clearly defined criteria, standards, or factors upon which teachers' performance is appraised.

**Teacher Performance:** The term "teacher performance" is used to describe actual accomplishment as distinguished from potential ability, capacity, or aptitude.

**Teacher Effectiveness:** The degree of success of a teacher in performing instructional and other duties specified in his contract and demanded by the nature of his position.  

**Teacher Efficiency:** This term was used by earlier writers instead of the term "teacher effectiveness."

**Teacher Evaluation:** This term is often used synonymously with the term "teacher appraisal."

---

Tenure: A system of school employment in which the teacher, having served a probationary period, retains his position indefinitely and is protected in his position either by statute or by rule of the school board; dismissal of employees having such protection must follow certain specified procedures.7

Review of Related Literature

Efforts to appraise the quality of teaching are probably as old as teaching itself. Certainly, the first teachers evaluated their own work and were evaluated by those they taught. More recently, there have been attempts to develop more formal objective methods in parallel with the scientific movement in education. A survey of the literature on teacher appraisal and on studies or research into teaching effectiveness yields considerable information from many voices in the field. The sources reported in this review range in quality from statements of intuitive, or experienced-based, judgments to quite carefully conceived, exhaustive studies or experiments and their recorded outcomes.

What research says about teacher effectiveness cannot be summarized in a few words. Research shows that it is not the clearly-defined quality that many would have us believe. In fact, research indicates that teacher performance is one of the most complex human phenomena that one can study.

The investigations, which are cited herein, are treated in a somewhat chronological order as a means of revealing the trends and emphases. One of the earliest pieces of research in the field of teacher appraisal was conducted by J. L. Meriam in 1905. Meriam's paper, entitled Normal School Education and Efficiency in Teaching, is

7Ibid., p. 256.
number one in the Teachers College, Columbia University, Contributions to Education. Using a sample of 1185 normal school graduates, Meriam attempted to show the relationship between professional scholarship and teaching ability. He was forced to conclude from the extremely low correlations that normal school scholarship had a negligible relationship to future performance in teaching and that practice teaching was only slightly prophetic. Other data indicated that the first year of teaching experience had little effect on teaching efficiency.

The early interest of administrators in obtaining some workable method of measuring teacher performance is shown by the presentation of a report on the topic at a convention in 1910. The report, "A Tentative Scheme for the Measurement of Teaching Efficiency," was given by Edward C. Elliot. The method proposed was intended to discover whether "quantitative standards" might be applied to the measurement of teaching efficiency. The scale presented was composed of weighted sections and points as shown in the following table:

---


TABLE 1
CATEGORIES AND POINT SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Number of Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical efficiency</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral nature</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic efficiency</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative efficiency</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected efficiency</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved efficiency</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social efficiency</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 100

The unusual nature of Elliot's categories and the apparent rationalization between the objective of "quantitative standards" and the extremely indeterminate qualities listed depict the unscientific "state of the art" that prevailed at that point in time. However unscientific this type of procedure may appear, it doubtless had an effect, along with other efforts of intrinsically negligible value. Such studies directed attention to the possibility and desirability of a more careful diagnosis of teaching.

The work of Buellesfield\(^\text{10}\) shows the negative approach of the early studies which sought primarily to determine why teachers fail. The low level of training provided, the pitiful remuneration, and the inadequacy or total absence of certification standards in this period, are largely responsible for focusing attention on failure rather than

\(^{10}\)Henry Buellesfield, "Causes for Failure Among Teachers," *Educational Administration and Supervision*, I (1915) 439-52.
the improvement of teaching.

In 1915 Arthur Clifton Boyce did a study of methods and practices used to measure teaching efficiency. To determine the ten prevalent practices of measuring teacher performance, Boyce surveyed 350 cities having populations of over 10,000. Replies were received from 242 representative cities in all parts of the United States.\(^\text{11}\)

He found in general, two methods used to measure teacher performance: examination, and rating. However, promotional examinations were not prevalent and did not play a large part in measuring teaching efficiency.

Methods of rating teachers fell into two classes: the first was called the "general impression method," and the second, the "analytical method." The "general impression" method was characteristic of the method used by the majority of the school systems surveyed. Boyce stated, "This is one evidence of how little this important work of judging teacher efficiency has been systematized, rationalized, and controlled."\(^\text{12}\)

Interest in teacher appraisal increased rapidly during the 1920's. Knight's study of qualities related to success in teaching was published in 1922. In his writing, he called attention to dangers in the use of the increasingly popular rating scales of the period and


\(^{12}\)Ibid., p. 14.
the "halo" effect of judgments made by close associates of the person being rated.13

One of the best known studies in the field of evaluation is the Commonwealth Teacher Training Study reported by Charters and Waples in 1929.14 The study attempted to ascertain the traits that characterized excellent teachers and, in turn, developed a listing of these traits. The study identified 25 teacher traits as being significant. Some of the traits are: adaptability, attractiveness, cooperation, dependability, enthusiasm, good judgment, health, leadership, progressiveness, scholarship, and thrift.

Most of the early attempts to identify patterns of teacher behavior, which were assumed to be related to teacher effectiveness, placed their emphasis on examining teacher personality characteristics. Turner and Fattu are of the opinion that this type of research has reached a dead end because negligible relationships exist within and among the various criteria of teacher personality characteristics, the ultimate criterion of pupil growth along desired dimensions, the immediate criterion of student teaching grades, and the intermediate criterion of administrators', supervisors', or peers' ratings.15

13F. B. Knight, Qualities Related to Success in Teaching, Contributions to Education, No. 120 (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1922).


Even though the characteristic-based research studies failed to produce appreciable relationships to teacher effectiveness and had reached a dead end, David Ryans completed a prodigious study in 1960 entitled *Characteristics of Teachers*. This study aroused considerable interest, but the classification system which he developed employed such gross terms that it failed to provide the concepts around which a theory of teaching might be constructed. After a study of these types of research attempts, Getzels and Jackson concluded:

Despite the critical importance of the problem and a half-century of prodigious research effort, very little is known for certain about the nature and measurement of teacher personality and teaching effectiveness. The regrettable fact is that many of the studies so far have produced only pedestrian findings. For example, it is said after the usual inventory tabulation, that teachers are friendly, cheerful, sympathetic, and morally depraved. But when this has been said, not very much that is especially useful has been revealed. For what conceivable human interaction—is not the better if people involved are friendly, cheerful, sympathetic, and virtuous rather than the opposite? What is needed is not research leading to the reiteration of the self-evident, but to the discovery of specific and distinctive features of teacher personality and of the effective teacher.

In 1945, Reavis and Cooper attempted to enumerate all available methods of teacher appraisal which they presented in the following outline form:

---


I. Rating Instruments

A. Classified by form
   1. Check scale
   2. Characterization report
   3. Ranking report
   4. Guided comment report
   5. Descriptive report
   6. Man-to-man report
   7. Observation scale
   8. Quality scale

B. Classified in terms of rater
   1. Administrator
   2. Supervisor
   3. Self
   4. Pupil
   5. Associate teacher

II. Teacher examinations

A. Of subject matter and professional knowledge
B. Of personal characteristics (intelligence, leadership, etc.)

III. Measures of prerequisites to successful teaching

A. Preparation
B. Experience
C. Intelligence
D. Health
E. Certification
F. Scholarship

IV. Evidences of growth and maintenance of professional competence

A. Health

1. Attendance

B. Inservice training

V. Evidences of productivity in pupil growth

A. Class promotion

B. Raw achievement

C. Accomplishment quotient and pupil-progress indices

D. Deviations from the normal growth curve

E. Attention score

F. Memory and reasoning ability

G. Marks and interests in later courses

VI. Other evidences of productivity

A. School-wide service

B. Community service

VII. Composite systems--The Cumulative Personnel Record

Concurrently with the emphasis on teacher personality characteristics was the interest in the development of rating devices. Barr, in 1948, summarized the findings of more than 150 research studies since 1900 which included data on 209 rating scales. He identified a number of common assumptions surrounding the use of teacher rating devices, notably the assumption that teachers are good

\[\text{18William C. Reavis and Dan H. Cooper, Evaluation of Teacher Merit in City School Systems, Supplementary Educational Monographs, No. 59 (Chicago: The University of Chicago, January, 1945), p. 79.}\]
or bad regardless of the varying situations in which they are placed.\textsuperscript{19}

Rating scales are classified by Rosenshine as "high-inference" measures because they lack specificity. Items on rating instruments such as "clarity of presentation," "enthusiasm," or "helpful toward students" require that an observer infer these constructs from a series of events.\textsuperscript{20}

The conclusions of several studies refuted the then prevalent use of rating scales. Hellfritzsch, in a study completed in 1945, stated that "teacher rating scales . . . are only slightly related to observed pupil growth" . . .\textsuperscript{21} This conclusion was supported by Anderson who says ". . . no appreciable relationship exists between rating criteria and pupil attainment criteria."\textsuperscript{22}

In 1952, Shane observed that "the retreat from arbitrary rating scales (used in fewer than 25 per cent of the districts that he studied) seems sound, but it is reasonable to assume that no agreement has been reached as to a completely acceptable objective substitute for check


lists or scales."²³

Barr, in 1953, drew the following conclusions regarding the status of teacher appraisal:

The simple fact of the matter is that, after 40 years of research on teacher effectiveness during which a vast number of studies have been carried out, one can point to few outcomes that a superintendent can safely employ in hiring a teacher or granting him tenure, that an agency can employ in certifying teachers or that a teacher education faculty can employ in planning or improving teacher education programs.²⁴

The past fifteen years has witnessed a significant change in the direction of educational research dealing with the study of teaching. The focus of inquiry became what actually happens in the classroom, with attempts being made to describe, through direct and systematic observation, what a teacher does and how he behaves while teaching. There appears to be a major assumption underlying the research: an increased understanding of the processes of teaching can be gained by the technique of direct observation in the classroom.

While this emphasis has not been without its critics, many voices in the field can be found in support. Typical of the criticisms directed at the analysis of classroom performance are Medley and Mitzel in their comments:

There is no misconception more deeply rooted in the mind of modern man—layman and professional educator alike—than the notion that it is possible to recognize a good teacher by watching him teach.²⁵

²³Harold G. Shane, "Seven Types of Teacher Appraisal," Nation's Schools, L (July, 1952), 58-59.

²⁴Barr, op. cit., p. 657.

Since inquiry in what actually happens in the classroom was initiated, several studies have been made which resulted in the development of instruments for the study and analysis of classroom performance. There are now available a variety of instruments for analyzing teaching performance skills. The instruments provide feedback data through systems of categorizing and coding verbal and nonverbal discourse.

Rosenshine identified four potential uses of instruments for the observation of classroom instruction. The uses are:

1. Assessing variability in classroom behavior.
2. Assessing whether the teacher's performance agrees with specified criteria.
3. Describing classroom interaction.
4. Determining relationships between observed classroom behavior and outcome measures.26

The importance of pupil-teacher interaction is recognized by Jackson who views it as perhaps the chief determiner of the psychological climate that characterizes the classroom.27 The importance of the variable of pupil-teacher interaction has been explicitly stated by Hughes28 and demonstrated by Gage.29

26Rosenshine, op. cit., p. 279.
The work of Mitzel and Rabinowitz\textsuperscript{30} set the stage for a system of interaction analysis that was developed by Flanders.\textsuperscript{31} The Flanders' system is an observational technique which can be used to classify the verbal behavior of teachers and pupils. Using this system, verbal behavior in the classroom is classified into ten category designations. There are seven categories for teacher behavior, four of which are classified as indirect influence. They are (1) accepting pupil feeling, (2) praising and encouraging, (3) accepting pupil ideas, and (4) asking questions. There are three categories of direct teacher influence which are (5) giving information or opinion, (6) giving directions, and (7) criticizing. Two categories of pupil talk are used in the system, (8) pupil response to the teacher and (9) pupil initiated talk. Category 10 is used to indicate silence or confusion. The research in this particular technique of interaction analysis was designed to relate pupils' attitudes to patterns of teacher behavior. The findings indicated that pupils of indirect teachers were more interested in subject matter and liked the methods used by their teachers better than students of direct teachers.  


\textsuperscript{31} N. A. Flanders, \textit{Teacher Influence, Pupil Attitudes, and Achievement} (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, U. S. Office of Education Cooperative Research Project No. 397, 1960) (Mimeographed.)

\textsuperscript{32} Edmund Amidon and N. A. Flanders, \textit{The Role of the Teacher in the Classroom} (Minneapolis: Paul S. Amidon and Associates, 1963), p. 56.
Subsequent research of Amidon revealed that eighth grade geometry pupils, taught by indirect methods, learned more than dependent-prone youngsters taught by direct methods. Similar results were experienced in a study of higher-achieving and lower-achieving elementary classes.

More than eighty observation systems have been developed by researchers. Among the developers are: Aschner, Bellack, Medley, Smith and Zahorik.

In recent years, there is a noticeable trend toward the use of goal setting techniques in programs of appraising teacher performance. The efforts of Redfern represent some of the initial activities with

---


cooperative goal-setting. Redfern uses the terms "job targets" and "performance targets" when discussing cooperative goal-setting. In describing the process he states:

... This is a real problem having direct bearing upon her effectiveness in teaching. She and her principal talk the matter over. They agree that this is a desirable "job target." An understanding is reached as to the procedure that will be followed during the year to accomplish improvement ... Agreement is reached as to the way success or the lack of it will be judged. At the end of the year, the appraiser, in cooperation with the teacher, will make a judgment as to the results attained ... Appraisal, from this point of view, is conceived, planned and carried out in a manner that puts a premium upon job performance. Performance targets are established. Supervision and help are related to evaluation and results are assessed at the end of the year.

Fox and Jones see the use of no-threat, cooperative self-evaluation, and highly personalized but nonpersonal goal-setting conferences as a means of helping to create stronger levels of confidence on the part of the school staff.

Musella urges the use of techniques of analysis (interaction analysis, for example) and cooperative goal-setting with the assessing being left to the teacher. Specifically, he states that through the use of this procedure the following results might be predicted:

---

40 George B. Redfern, How to Appraise Teaching Performance (Columbus, Ohio: School Management Institute, Inc., 1963).

41 Ibid., pp. 15-16.


1. The teacher and rater become the developers of criteria against which certain behaviors are to be assessed;

2. The teacher and rater focus on actual classroom events and specific behaviors, not generalities; . . .

3. The teacher and rater have a common frame of reference for view and judging teaching . . .; and

4. The situation, as well as the relationship between the rater and ratee, remains relatively free from threat, since reference to effective-ineffective teacher behaviors are obtained through one's own perception, and not simply from direction and/or implications presented by the rater. 44

In 1955, the Ohio Education Association published the results of a survey of teacher appraisal programs in Ohio schools. Some of the findings were:

1. Evaluation is made by administrators, supervisors, and principals, individually or collectively. Usually it is the combined efforts of all three . . .;

2. A rating instrument is used in most of the schools contacted . . .;

3. In some schools, administrators and teachers make the evaluation cooperatively . . .;

4. Self-evaluation is practiced in a number of schools . . .; and

5. Evaluation does not usually include a conference unless the work of the teacher is unsatisfactory or he is on probationary status. 45

A second survey by the Ohio Education Association, completed in 1960, had as its purpose determining appraisal practices and discovering similarities and differences in appraisal programs among the

44 Ibid., pp. 20-21.

school systems. The appraisal programs were found, in general, to apply only to beginning and new teachers.46

Evans undertook a study of Ohio programs for evaluating probationary teachers for tenure in 1961 and reported the following conclusions:

1. The development of school board policies relating to the appraisal of teachers is entirely lacking in the vast majority of Ohio's school systems . . .

2. School principals are reported to be the key figures in the actual appraisal of teachers although supervisors bear a joint responsibility with principals in a relatively small percentage of the school systems.

3. There seems to be a widespread tendency toward involving more than one person in the appraisal of probationary teachers.

4. Evaluation instruments, designated as rating scales or check lists, are used widely throughout Ohio's schools.

5. Self-evaluation practices appear not to have been clearly defined in many school systems.

6. There is some indication that the predominating criteria used in the appraisal of probationary teachers are those which relate to the teacher's relationships with others and the teacher's personal characteristics.47

Organization of the Study

In Chapter II, the writer developed general and procedural, or implementing criteria for teacher appraisal programs. In Chapter III,


the responses to the criteria by a jury of authorities are reported. In Chapter IV, survey findings of twenty-three major Ohio city school districts' programs of teacher appraisal are reported.

In Chapter V, conclusions from the study, recommendations for further study, and revisions to the criteria are presented.
A general review of the literature, relating to teacher appraisal, confronted the writer with a multiplicity of purposes, principles, practices, and procedures for organizing programs for the appraisal of teacher performance. A distinguishing feature of this literature seemed to be the extent to which there was a lack of agreement among authors regarding practices.

The writer has established eighteen general criteria and twenty-nine procedural, or implementing, criteria which may be used to judge programs for appraising teacher performance. The majority of the general criteria are accompanied by one or more procedural, or implementing, criteria. The general and procedural, or implementing, criteria are not meant to be all inclusive, but rather to serve as guidelines for viewing appraisal programs. The criteria presented in this chapter were considered tentative since they were developed prior to submitting them to a jury of authorities for judgments.

The writer attempted to substantiate the majority of the criteria by references from the literature. The few procedural, or implementing, criteria not substantiated by literature based references were supported by rationales developed by the writer.

The criteria to be described and discussed in this chapter are as follows: (general criteria are identified by 1, 2, 3, etc.;
implementing, or procedural, criteria are identified by 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, etc.).

1. The program should have as its primary goal the personal growth and development of each professional staff member.

2. There should be cognizable purposes and objectives for the teacher appraisal program.
   2.1. The purposes and objectives of the program for appraising teacher performance should be identified by a committee comprised of representatives from the board of education, central office administrative staff, building principals, supervisors, students, laymen, and classroom teachers.
   2.2. Classroom teachers should constitute a majority of the membership on the committee.
   2.3. Consensus should be gained among the committee members on the purposes and objectives of the program for appraising teacher performance.
   2.4. The purposes and objectives of the program for appraising teacher performance should be explicit.

3. There should be a commitment by the board of education to the importance of the program for appraising teacher performance.
   3.1. There should be financial resources provided to support adequately the program.
   3.2. There should be some rational planning technique or approach, such as Planning-Programming-Budgeting-Systems (PPBS), for relating the board's commitment to the program to specific resources.

4. There should be wide, active involvement at all levels of the professional staff in the development of policies and procedures pertaining to teacher appraisal.
   4.1. Classroom teachers should constitute a majority of the representatives on committees and other ad hoc bodies which are involved in developing policies and procedures pertaining to teacher appraisal.

5. The policies, rules, and regulations pertaining to the program for appraising teacher performance should be formalized.
5.1. Written policy statements should be adopted by the board of education which will provide a framework for the effective execution of the appraisal program.

5.2. Written administrative rules and regulations should be developed which enumerate and specify the procedures to be followed in implementing and administering the written policies.

6. Clear and meaningful criteria, standards, or principles of effective teaching should be developed and defined in terms that will insure a common meaning to all members of the professional staff.

6.1. The criteria, standards, or principles of effective teaching should be expressed in terms of observable teacher and student behavior.

6.2. The criteria, standards, or principles of effective teaching should be developed exclusively by classroom teachers.

7. The actual appraisal of teacher performance should be a team effort.

7.1. An appraisal team consisting of the teacher himself, the building principal or assistant principal, and two "master" teachers at his grade level and/or subject area should serve as the appraisers.

7.2. The appraisers should serve as advisors to the teacher.

7.3. The emphasis should be on the performance and not on the personality of the teacher.

7.4. The appraiser-teacher relationship should be one of mutual trust and confidence, and nonthreatening in nature.

7.5. Each teacher should develop a job description which is reviewed and mutually agreed upon by the appraisal team.

8. Provisions should be made for special preparation and training for those personnel whose responsibility it is to carry out the appraisal function.

8.1. The special preparation and training of personnel participating in the appraisal process should be initiated prior to their involvement in the actual appraisal.
9. Each teacher should establish goals for improvement or "performance targets" that clearly identify improvements to be achieved.

9.1. Goals for improvement or "performance targets" should be both short and long term in nature.

9.2. The goals for improvement or "performance targets" should be limited to a reasonable number, meaning a number for an individual teacher which he sees as feasible and obtainable.

10. Systematic observations of the classroom activities of students and teachers should be a major source of data concerning teacher performance.

10.1. Classroom observations should be mutually planned and agreed upon by the appraisers and the teacher.

10.2. Teacher members of the appraisal team should be given released time for classroom observation.

11. Student "feedback" instruments should be used to provide the appraisal team with additional insight regarding the teacher's performance.

12. Teacher self-appraisal should be one of the most important aspects of the program for appraising teacher performance.

12.1. Teachers should rate their own performance against standards or principles of effective teaching and their established "performance targets."

13. The appraisal of teacher performance should be a continuing process.

13.1. The appraisal team should meet periodically during the year to review the progress of the teacher.

13.2. A summary of each appraisal conference should be prepared and entered into the teacher's personnel file.

13.3. Teacher members of the appraisal team should be given released time for the conferences.

14. Extensive in-service opportunities should be available to teachers to enhance their personal growth and development.

15. All appraisal data should be kept confidential.
15.1. Only information signed by all members of the appraisal team should be placed in the teacher's personnel file.

16. The appraisal team should recommend a teacher to the superintendent for retention or dismissal.

17. The appraisal program should be fully explained to prospective employees.

17.1. The purposes, objectives, practices, and procedures of the appraisal program should be explained to prospective teacher employees when they are interviewed for a position, and reviewed again during the orientation program for new teachers.

18. All aspects of the program for appraising teacher performance should be periodically evaluated.

18.1. Each year a permanent evaluation committee, including representatives from the original committees on purposes and objectives, policies and procedures, and standards should evaluate the effectiveness of the program for appraising teacher performance.

18.2. Revisions should be made in the program when deemed advisable in light of evaluation results.

1. The program should have as its primary goal the personal growth and development of each professional staff member.

   The premise is that the personal growth and development of each professional staff member will lead to a corresponding improvement of teaching.

   There are those who say that in education our main concern and attention seems to be the teacher, teaching techniques, and professionalization.\(^{48}\) As one looks at the various administrative techniques and programs (e.g., nongraded classes, team teaching, small group and large group instruction, differentiated staffing, modular scheduling, learning

---

centers, etc.), one becomes impressed by the amount of professional time which is devoted to the study of teaching techniques and the nature of the teacher. The concern with these aforementioned elements of education is criticized by those who hold that the focus should be on learning and the learner. They contend that there is no teaching without learning; furthermore, learning must be measurable before one can say that teaching exists. This model of placing as the primary purpose the learning outcomes of the students has produced a host of unanswered questions. (e.g., How can specific learning outcomes be related to specific teaching acts?)

Musella states, that until we have conclusive evidence on certain cause-effect variables of teaching-learning outcomes, it might be most productive and desirable to direct our efforts toward enhancing and extending the opportunities for the personal development of professional staff members.

Most writers agree that programs for appraising teacher performance are more acceptable to professional staff members when they have teacher development as the primary purpose. Writings in the areas of industrial psychology and human relations theory point to corresponding phenomenon with respect to industrial appraisal programs.

---


50 Musella, op. cit., p. 19.

Troyer and Pace found that the weight of professional opinion supports appraisal as a service to the teacher. They state:

To the extent that evaluation fails to result in teacher improvement, to that extent it becomes a disservice to the child.\textsuperscript{52}

They reported that teachers were reluctant to take part in any evaluation if they felt that the results might be used against them. And contrariwise, teachers were eager to participate in evaluations which they could see as furthering their own profession competence.\textsuperscript{53}

Howsam supported this position in a report by a California committee on personnel problems. The report concluded that teachers can be expected to cooperate more in developing appraisal programs for the purpose of improving instruction than appraisal for improving the program by dismissing the less competent teacher. Similarly, a teacher is more likely to accept an evaluation conducted to see if he should receive a citation for meritorious service than he is to accept one to discover whether he is to be dismissed, even though the processes of evaluation were the same. In each case, one purpose is less threatening and more acceptable than the other.\textsuperscript{54}

2. There should be cognizable purposes and objectives for the teacher appraisal program.

2.1. The purposes and objectives of the program for


\textsuperscript{53}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 11.

appraising teacher performance should be identified by a committee comprised of representatives from the board of education, central office administrative staff, building principals, supervisors, students, laymen, and classroom teachers.

2.2. Classroom teachers should constitute a majority of the membership on the committee.

2.3. Consensus should be gained among the committee members on the purposes and objectives of the program for appraising teacher performance.

2.4. The purposes and objectives of the program for appraising teacher performance should be explicit.

As is true for most programs, the program of appraising teacher performance should have cognizable purposes and objectives. Not only are they needed to guide the development phase, but equally as important, the evaluation of successes or lack of successes of the teacher appraisal program is dependent upon the existence of cognizable purposes and objectives.

Beecher and Troyer support the need for establishing purposes and objectives in their following statement:

A first step in teacher evaluation is the classification of objectives which in turn becomes the basis for establishing the criteria of effective teaching.55

Howsam agrees with this position and states, "The school system which would evaluate teachers should first evaluate its objectives and state them clearly."56 He points out that the teaching profession is known to favor appraisal for some purposes and not for others, presumably because of differences in effect. In general, teachers have opposed


56 Howsam, op. cit., p. 11.
appraisal for external purposes such as motivation, incentive, and administrative decision; they have tended to favor evaluation for self-improvement purposes.\textsuperscript{57}

In the publication \textit{Better Than Rating}, the Association For Supervision and Curriculum Development of the National Education Association depicted the establishment of purposes and objectives for an appraisal program as a cooperative enterprise involving pupils, school people, and lay citizens. The following rationale given for such a cooperative undertaking is open to serious question:

\ldots Such a program puts no teacher, principal, superintendent, school, or school system on the spot.\textsuperscript{58}

Seemingly, this rationale is supporting the cooperative process as a technique for eluding blame or escaping accountability and responsibility rather than recognizing that all groups (e.g., teachers, laymen, students, board members, administrators, etc.) have a definite stake in the outcome of any program for appraising teacher performance. Be it the establishment of the objectives for appraisal programs, formulation of the educational goals and objectives of a school system, or curriculum development activities, the day of isolation or unchallenged authority is past. Representative lay citizens and students should be actively involved in the process from its very beginning. Only in this manner can the school community organize all its human resources for the meeting of its needs.

\textsuperscript{57}Ibid., p. 14.

While some may argue that since students have the greatest stake in the outcome of any school program, they should constitute the majority of the membership on any such committee. The success of the program is dependent upon the full acceptance of the program's purposes and objectives by the rank and file of the teachers' organization. Thus, the writer is recommending that classroom teachers constitute the majority of the membership on the committee for identifying purposes and objectives.

The importance of gaining consensus on the purposes and objectives for the program of teacher appraisal is somewhat obvious. While the membership of the committee may well represent a wide divergency of thinking, consensus is important if the program is to truly reflect the desires of the community. It is expected that the representatives will communicate and interpret the purposes and objectives to their respective groups, thus generating understanding and, hopefully, support.

The statement of explicit purposes and objectives is often lacking in many programs for appraising teacher performance. Frequently, the purposes and objectives are couched in such general terms that they lose meaning. Further, the use of eloquent educational jargon compounds the problems of interpreting the purposes and objectives to lay and student groups. To serve as effective guides to the development and ultimate evaluation of the program, the purposes and objectives should be stated in explicit terms.

3. There should be a commitment by the board of education to the importance of the program for appraising teacher performance.
3.1. There should be financial resources provided to support adequately the program.

3.2. There should be some rational planning technique or approach, such as Planning-Programming-Budgeting-Systems (PPBS), for relating the board's commitment to the program to specific resources.

It has been previously stated that the success of the program depends upon the acceptance of, and the commitment to, the program by the classroom teachers. It is almost self-evident that an equal commitment should be made by the board of education to the importance of the program. One way of evidencing such a commitment is through the budgetary processes.

Every aspect of the educational program requires resources (e.g., personnel, instructional materials, facilities, etc.) which, in turn, costs money. Educational planning and finances are inseparable. The educational program must first be defined, and then the financing of the program should be tailored to fit. The budget of a school system should be its educational plan expressed in dollars. This is diametrically opposite to practices in many school districts in which an estimate or guess is made of the money that will be available and then the program is made to fit.

To implement and sustain an effective program of appraising teacher performance requires a substantial amount of funds over a long term. While a commitment by the board of education to the extreme importance of the program for appraising teacher performance is the important concept, the writer suggests the use of some rational planning technique or approach, such as PPBS, for relating the board's commitment to the program to specific resources.
School budgets tend to be prepared in the "incremental style," which means that the primary basis for next year's budget is this year's budget. The major difference between the two is likely to be only an increase in each of the traditional categories of an object-of-expenditure type budget. Next year's budget, for example, contains the same structure as this year's. Little attempt is made to evaluate the various programs, or outputs, which are presumed to be supported by the budget. In contrast, the program budget places emphasis upon the final product, or at least the programs of the school and provides for continual evaluation and time-phased systematic planning.59

Hartley, emphasizing the advantages of the planning-programming-budgeting-systems (PPBS) approach, states:

The underlying premise for this approach is that it represents an improvement over existing educational planning techniques. In very simple terms, the advantages of the proposed approach over traditional means is that in the new format, emphasis is placed upon the outputs, or programs of the school, rather than on the inputs that are necessary to support these programs.60

PPBS relates the output-oriented programs, or activities, to specific resources that are then stated in terms of budget dollars. Both programs and resources are projected for at least several years into the future. Emphasis is upon outputs, cost-effectiveness methods, rational planning techniques, long-range objectives, and analytical tools for decision-making.


60Ibid., p. 4.
4. There should be wide, active involvement at all levels of the professional staff in the development of policies and procedures pertaining to teacher appraisal.

4.1. Classroom teachers should constitute a majority of the representatives on committees and other ad hoc bodies which are involved in developing policies and procedures pertaining to teacher appraisal.

The recommendation of wide, active involvement at all levels of the professional staff is based on the premise that the democratic process must prevail in all teacher appraisal activities where policies are being made or where procedures are being developed. One of the fundamental tenets of the democratic process, as interpreted by scholars, is that those who are affected by policies and decisions are entitled to participate in making them.

In the book Public Administration, the authors express their views on the value and utility of the democratic process. The authors attribute the following values to the democratic process:

1. The democratic process enriches the thinking of all parties concerned . . .

2. When individuals have a voice in decisions and engage in the study and thinking that precede the making of a decision, they are more likely to accept the result with satisfaction than if they had no part in it.

3. Esprit de corps on staff unity is more likely to develop when members cooperate in attacking problems . . .

4. The democratic process fosters self-realization through freedom to express one's ideas . . .

5. Tensions among individuals and groups are more likely to be dissipated as persons work together and get to know each other's qualities . . .

6. Persons who participate regularly in policy-formation and decision-making are more likely to be enthusiastic about their school system and their work than persons who have
limited opportunity or none at all to participate. 61

Developing morale or esprit de corps, aforementioned as one of the values of the democratic process, is reinforced by Griffiths in his discussion of team effort. He concludes:

Morale requires the establishment of a team effort on the part of the staff, administrators and teachers. A team spirit includes the feeling that all members are pulling together to achieve a commonly held purpose . . . all members share success, and all members are striving to meet a significant challenge . . . 62

Mort and Ross, in treating the subject of staff participation in policy formation, include the development of personnel policies (e.g., selection, appointment, appraisal, dismissal) as an area appropriate for staff participation. They state, "There is no school so restricted that there is not vast leeway for policy formation in this supremely important area." 63

Recognizing the importance of staff participation in the development of policies and procedures pertaining to teacher appraisal, the writer has taken the position that teachers should constitute a majority of the representatives on committees and other ad hoc bodies having as their purpose such development activities. The rationale for this position is based upon the premise that such a majority is needed to counteract the adverse effects of past misuses of the democratic processes. Frequently, vocal critics from the teaching ranks pronounce

---


the use of "so-called" representative committees as a ploy by the board of education or administration to achieve results which are not in keeping with the best interests of the teaching profession. Hopefully, with teachers having a majority of the representatives, many of these criticisms would be dispersed.

5. The policies, rules, and regulations pertaining to the program for appraising teacher performance, should be formalized.

5.1. Written policy statements should be adopted by the board of education which will provide a framework for the effective execution of the appraisal program.

5.2. Written administrative rules and regulations should be developed which enumerate and specify the procedures to be followed in implementing and administering the written policies.

It is generally recognized that among the many powers of a board of education, the one of greatest importance is the establishment of policies in accord with which the schools are administered. Formalized policies are the outcome of planning, usually accomplished through a joint effort (e.g., board of education, superintendent, staff, and advisory committees), and are essential to the guidance of both the board and the school personnel.

In speaking of some of the advantages of written policies, Griffiths states:

The superintendent is more likely to really be the executive officer of the board if there are written policies, since both he and the board would be more secure in allowing him to act independently. A set of policies also gives the teachers greater security, since it specifies those areas in which they are free to act. In general, it can be said that boards which operate under written policy are more effective
than those which do not.\textsuperscript{64}

The authors of \textit{Public School Administration} identify five distinct advantages of having policies in written form. These advantages are as follows:

1. \textbf{For orientation of new board members and staff.} Written policies afford an excellent means of acquainting new board members with the organization and policies employed in the district. They also help teachers and other employees understand common goals and their respective obligations and rights.

2. \textbf{Guidance for the school system.} In the process of formulating policies, board members, administrators, staff, and perhaps representative laymen think through the nature of the school district's goals. Policies serve as guides for present services and future development.

3. \textbf{Continuity in educational administration.} Written policies furnish a steadying influence which discourages ill-considered or ephemeral changes and tinkering. There is nothing eternal and immutable about policies, but changes ought to be founded on study and well-thought-out proposals.

4. \textbf{Improvement of general efficiency.} Any organization's effectiveness depends largely on how well every member understands his place in it and the policies which govern the organization . . . Some studies show that when board members participate in policy-writing, they become more competent as board members by virtue of having studied carefully all aspects of the school enterprise.

5. \textbf{Improved community relations.} Written policies, if they are carefully worked out and made available to people, let the public know that an attempt has been made by the board and others to think through community educational problems . . .\textsuperscript{65}

Accompanying the written policy statements, which provide for the effective execution of a teacher appraisal program, should be written administrative rules and regulations which enumerate and

\textsuperscript{64}Griffiths, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 337.

\textsuperscript{65}Grieder, Pierce, and Rosenstengel, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 120-121.
specify the procedures to be followed in implementing and administering the adopted policies.

Howsam stresses the need for clearly, concisely-developed administrative rules and regulations. He states:

The procedures to be followed in teacher appraisal should be clearly established and each person should become aware of his role and the role of each other person involved. No possibility of misunderstanding should exist.66

6. Clear and meaningful criteria, standards, or principles of teaching should be developed and defined in terms that will insure a common meaning to all members of the professional staff.

6.1. The criteria, standards, or principles of effective teaching should be expressed in terms of observable teacher and student behavior.

6.2. The criteria, standards, or principles of effective teaching should be developed exclusively by classroom teachers.

Howsam supports the need for clear and meaningful criteria, standards, or principles by which achievement or results may be judged. He states:

Criteria or standards of effective teacher behavior should be established and they should be clearly understood by raters and teachers alike . . . Agreement on criteria demands agreement on purposes or goals. Where such agreement is lacking, evaluation will tend to be difficult and contradictory.67

To enhance objectivity, the criteria, standards, or principles of effective teaching should be expressed in terms of observable teacher and student behavior. The writer is of the opinion that the most significant shortcoming of past practices in teacher appraisal

66Howsam, op. cit., p. 43.

has been the lack of observable or measurable standards. Too frequently, standards have been expressed in subjective terms such as desirable personal characteristics, professional attitudes, satisfactory interpersonal relationships, etc. This recommendation is also consistent with the current emphasis of stating instructional objectives in behavioral terms. The statement of objectives in behavioral terms poses the possibilities for a genuine breakthrough in answering the challenges for accountability.

One might question the feasibility of criteria, standards, or principles of effective teaching being developed exclusively by representatives of the teaching staff. The writer maintains that, as a society, we are committed to the process and principles of democracy which, among other things, calls for respect of individuals and their participation where their welfare is involved. Almost seventy years ago, John Dewey asked, "What does democracy mean save that the individual is to have a share in determining the conditions and the aims of his own work"? While Dewey emphasized that the individual is to have a share in determining the conditions and the aims of his own work, the writer takes the position that teachers should have the full right to make this determination when it pertains to standards of effective teaching. This position is supported by Griffiths who states:

Decisions which are going to affect the professional behavior of teachers should be made at the faculty level.

---

If the teacher's behavior is to be changed, they cannot be made anywhere else.69

Griffiths' recommendation coincides with the model followed by college and university faculties. In suggesting that this model is also appropriate for public schools, this writer postulates that there are sufficient checks and balances in the existing system to maintain accountability. State standards, administrative prerogatives, and the legal powers of the board of education are just a few of the existing checks and balances.

7. The actual appraisal of teacher performance should be a team effort.

7.1. An appraisal team consisting of the teacher himself, the building principal or assistant principal, and two "master" teachers at his grade level and/or subject area should serve as the appraisers.

7.2. The appraisers should serve as advisors to the teacher.

7.3. The emphasis should be on the performance and not on the personality of the teacher.

7.4. The appraiser-teacher relationship should be one of mutual trust and confidence, and nonthreatening in nature.

7.5. Each teacher should develop a job description which is reviewed and mutually agreed upon by the appraisal team.

Bayroff makes the following comments regarding the desirability of using more than one person, or a team approach, in the appraisal process:

The results indicated that the more effective method for increasing validity of ratings remains the averaging of

69Griffiths, op. cit., p. 230.
ratings by a number of equally competent raters for each 
ratee rather than the use of a particular technique of 
rating . . . Stated broadly, the rater is more important 
than the rating technique, and the larger the number of 
competent raters employed, the greater is the resulting 
validity.70

The study of Morsh and Wilder reports:

Available studies show in general that teachers can be 
reliably rated by administrative and supervisory personnel 
(usually with r's of .70 or above).71

Bryan,72 Remmers, et. al., 73 found that the realibility of 
rating scales is increased by pooling the rating of several judges. 
Although the team rating implies the probable use of some instrument, 
check list, narrative form, or rating scale for the purpose of ranking 
or judging teachers, it would seem that the results of available 
 studies support the reliability of administrators and supervisors in 
performing appraisal functions.

When traits or qualities other than general ability are rated,

70O. G. Bayroff et. al., "Validity of Ratings and Related to 

71Morsh and Wilder, op. cit., p. 3.

72R. C. Bryan, Pupil Rating of Secondary School Teachers, 
Contributions to Education, No. 708, (New York: Bureau of 
Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1937).

73H. H. Remmers et. al., "An Empirical Study of the Validity 
of the Spearman-Brown Formula as applied to the Purdue Rating Scale," 
Journal of Educational Psychology XVIII (1947), 187-195.
Barr\textsuperscript{74} and Boardman\textsuperscript{75} found that the reliabilities tend to be somewhat lower than those found for general effectiveness.

Teachers and teacher organizations are beginning to insist that teachers become participants in the actual appraisal process. Seemingly, in many instances, teachers prefer to be appraised by their peers, particularly those teaching at the same grade level or in the same subject area. Howsam concludes that research generally shows that peer ratings compare favorably with supervisor and other such ratings.\textsuperscript{76} He states:

More than one person should rate each teacher; such ratings should be done independently. Validity may be improved by the ratings of several persons.\textsuperscript{77}

The writer has included the building principal as one of the members of the appraisal team even though this choice will meet with resistance from many writers in the field. Some writers would prefer an "outside" appraiser while others would maintain that the principal cannot be effective in his day-to-day relationships with teachers and also be involved in the appraisal process. The writer takes the position that it is most desirable to include the principal as a

\textsuperscript{74}A. S. Barr, Characteristic Differences in the Teaching Performance of Good and Poor Teachers of the Social Studies. (Bloomington, Ill: Public School Publishing Co., 1929).

\textsuperscript{75}C. W. Boardman, Professional Tests as Measures of Teaching Efficiency in High School, Contributions to Education, No. 327, New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1928).

\textsuperscript{76}Howsam, op. cit., p. 33.

\textsuperscript{77}Ibid., p. 44.
viable member of the appraisal team when the primary goal of the appraisal program is to foster the personal growth and development of each professional staff member. It is recommended that assistant principals serve, instead of the principal, in large schools since the demands on the principal may cause serious constraints on his time available for appraisal activities.

The writer recommends that the appraisers serve as advisors to the teacher. Beecher and Troyer suggest that the appraisal process should be considered as a guidance procedure. They state:

> It should be thought of as the basis for guidance and constructive criticism. All too frequently, teachers feel that the principal or supervisor is sitting in judgment and that the appraisal being made is in the nature of a final verdict rather than a guidance procedure inspiring them to self-improvement... Evaluation is a guidance procedure. It is aimed clearly at helping the teacher to help himself to the end that children may be more effectively taught. The administrator whose counseling of teachers is carefully founded on this philosophy will find other values to such a program. It may frequently result in guiding unsuccessful teachers out of the profession rather than necessitating summary dismissals.\(^\text{78}\)

A statement of Kurt Lewin supports the proposition that the appraisers should serve in an advisory capacity. He states,

> "Objectivity cannot arise in a constraint situation; it arises only in a situation of freedom."\(^\text{79}\)

Further, the writer recommends that the appraiser-teacher relationship should be one of mutual trust and confidence, and nonthreatening in nature. Ryans holds that teaching is, by nature, a

\(^{78}\)Beecher and Troyer, *op. cit.*, pp. 81-84.

group-cooperative process. Ryans also believes that the use of external rewards and punishments can only result in teachers becoming self-seeking and unco-operative. He uses the findings in industry to support the contention that the external motivation approach has definite limitations. Ryans states:

It has been recognized that good human relations based on recognition of personal worth and integrity of individuals, effective communications, congeniality, and participation of employees in company goals—which promotes feelings of belongingness and security among employees—are even more important factors of motivation than the financial incentives and working conditions.

Regarding job descriptions, there is literally a void of information in the literature pertaining to job descriptions for teachers. Much has been written about the need for administrative job descriptions, but little can be found related to job descriptions for teaching positions.

There are those critics who would oppose a written job description for each teaching position on the grounds that job descriptions are too rigid and constraining. Robert Townsend, if he were in the field of education, would certainly be such a critic. Townsend considers job descriptions as strait jackets—good for low-level jobs having high turnover and repetitive tasks, but not appropriate for jobs that pay $150.00 a week or more.

---


81 Ibid., p. 58.

Townsend states:

At best, a job description freezes the job as the writer understood it at a particular instant in the past. At worst, they're prepared by personnel people who can't write and don't understand the jobs. Then they're not only expensive to prepare and regularly revise, but they're important morale-snappers.\(^{83}\)

The writer takes the position that each teaching position is unique. For example, a single job description for all sixth grade teachers in a school is not only difficult to write, but usually it also fails to adequately describe the job each sixth grade teacher does.

The advent of differentiated staffing and increased specialization compounds the need for job descriptions. Allowing the teacher to prepare his own job description should decrease the possibilities of negative effects such as rigidity and conformity. The job description is then, in a sense, a "tailor-made" description.

Redfern is of the opinion that a job description is quite important in that the teacher and the person or persons who will supervise and evaluate his work know exactly what is expected and precisely what will be the basis of appraisal.\(^{84}\)

8. Provisions should be made for special preparation and training for those personnel whose responsibility it is to carry out the appraisal function.

8.1. The special preparation and training of personnel participating in the appraisal process should be initiated prior to their involvement in the actual appraisal.

\(^{83}\text{Ibid.}, \ p. \ 73.\)

\(^{84}\text{Redfern, op. cit.}, \ p. \ 11.\)
It cannot be assumed that school staff members, including administrators and supervisors, are adequately prepared for the responsibility of appraisal or advising simply on the basis of their certification, previous experience, or degrees held. Therefore, it is the recommendation of the writer that provisions should be made for additional preparation for those persons whose responsibility it is to carry out the appraisal process. The extra preparation might take the form of additional graduate courses in supervision. However, to follow the criteria proposed by the writer would necessitate a commitment of the majority of the staff to participation in the appraisal process. Under these conditions, it would seem more feasible to offer the opportunities for additional preparation through in-service activities.

Some of the topics emphasized in the in-service program might be: what to look for in a teacher's performance when observing, how to correctly interpret different types of teaching behavior, how to hold a single or group conference with a teacher, how to help a teacher evaluate himself, what kinds of positive suggestions to give a teacher to improve performance, how to correctly interpret video recordings of teacher performance, how to develop job descriptions, and how to establish rapport with the teacher being appraised. Additional recommendations for appropriate in-service activities will be made under Criterion 14.

Additional preparation for those involved in the appraisal process should add credibility to any program for appraising teacher performance, thus limiting criticism directed toward the adequacy of
the appraiser's preparation. Additional preparation also affects inter-rater agreement. Howsam states, "Adequate preparation for the task of rating tends to greatly increase the inter-rater agreement."

To enhance the opportunities for a successful appraisal program, the special preparation and training of personnel participating in the appraisal process should be initiated prior to their involvement in the actual appraisal. As was previously cited, the preparation should add credibility to the program since the participants would have, at the outset, at least some minimal appraisal skills.

9. Each teacher should establish goals for improvement or "performance targets" that clearly identify improvements to be achieved.

9.1. Goals for improvement or "performance targets" should be both short and long term in nature.

9.2. The goals for improvement or "performance targets" should be limited to a reasonable number, meaning a number for an individual teacher which he sees as feasible and obtainable.

The job description (discussed in a previous criterion) provides the basis for setting individual performance targets. As a result of thinking through the interrelationships between the various aspects of his job, the teacher should be able to be more effective in targeting his individual effort.

Since the proposed purpose of the program for appraising teacher performance is the personal growth and development of each professional staff member, the individual teacher should direct his

85Howsam, op. cit., p. 34.
"performance targets" to the areas of his perceived weaknesses.

The job description should be reviewed by the appraisal team. Fox and Jones view highly-personalized, but nonpersonal, goal-setting conferences as the "heart" of any appraisal program.86

The writer recommends that "performance targets" be both short and long-term in nature. It is important for the teacher to experience some immediate satisfactions or gratifications. This can be accomplished through the identification of several short-term, attainable "performance targets." Some of the "targets" may be revised periodically since performance inputs, conferences, and teacher self-appraisal activities may reveal a need to revise the order of priorities. Long-term "performance targets" may take an entire school year or more to achieve.

Redfern suggests that the appraisers and the appraisee have the responsibility of deciding how many "performance targets" there should be. He says that it makes more sense to limit the "performance targets" to a reasonable number than to attempt to fulfill an excessive quantity.87 The writer fully supports Redfern's position and suggests that the number of "performance targets" established for an individual teacher should be limited to an obtainable and achievable number.

10. Systematic observations of the classroom activities of students and teachers should be a major source of data concerning teacher performance.

86Fox and Jones, op. cit., p. 542.

87Redfern, op. cit., p. 32.
10.1. Classroom observations should be mutually planned and agreed upon by the appraisers and the teacher.

10.2. Teacher members of the appraisal team should be given released time for classroom observations.

One prominent feature of recent research in the field of appraising teacher performance is the systematic observation of the classroom activities of students and teachers. In increasing numbers, researchers are focusing attention on verbal and nonverbal behavior of students and teachers in the classroom, with special attention to roles, functions, and activities of teachers. (A more extensive coverage of this research was given in Chapter I of this study.)

Hughes comments on the increased use of systematic classroom observations:

The increased use of transcriptions of classroom proceedings is most encouraging. The expense and time is considerable, and even these data do not obtain all the useful data; for example, the activities of the student not in direct interaction with the teacher. 88

The writer postulates that the problem of student activities not in direct interaction with the teacher can be handled by the use of anecdotal notes by the observer(s) or video-taping the classroom proceedings.

Smith in discussing the study of classroom performance states:

The question of what knowledge is relevant to the control of teaching behavior is an empirical one, because teaching is a natural social phenomenon. It has its own forms, its own constituent elements, its own irregularities, and its own problems. It takes place under a stable set of conditions--time

limits, authority figures, systems of knowledge, social structures, psychological capacities, etc. If we would understand teaching and thereby gain control over it, we must first study it in its own right.\textsuperscript{89}

If Smith's position can be assumed to be valid, it seems very reasonable to believe that these aspects of teaching performance skills can be identified, observed, and the possible effects analyzed. On this basis, it is also reasonable to conclude that the teacher can be helped to study his own teaching performance skills with the goal of becoming a more effective teacher.

Mitzel and Rabinowitz report some interesting findings in their use of Witall's technique to assess the classroom climate of four teachers. Their observation data were organized to permit an analysis of variance between teacher, visits, and observers. Since the median length of the observer's visit was twenty minutes, the finding of statistically significant, wide variability among visits for the same teacher suggests that teachers adopt their behavior to the immediate situation.\textsuperscript{90}

Flanders suggests that there may be several reasons for the flexibility of teacher behavior. Teachers may adapt their behavior to fit different phases of problem solving that occur in the classroom. Secondly, teachers may adapt their behavior to fit the needs of the


\textsuperscript{90}Mitzel and Rabinowitz, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 1-19.
individual pupil in contacts with single pupils.91

The writer recommends that the classroom observations be mutually planned and agreed upon by the appraisers and the teacher. Again, the program of appraisal should be positive and not punitive in nature. The traditional, unannounced visits by principals and supervisors present a threat to many teachers. The "scare tactic" approach of unannounced visits is not compatible with the goal of personal growth and development.

If possible, the teacher should be observed in person or via video tape by at least one member of the appraisal team every two weeks. All members of the team should observe the teacher at least once a month. More than one member of the team could observe a teacher at the same time.

The writer further recommends that the teacher members of the appraisal team be given released time for observations. This recommendation is made fully realizing the constraints of scheduling and costs. However, if meaningful observations are to be accomplished to any significant degree, released time is essential. To expect teachers to make a true commitment to the program for appraising teacher performance within a framework whereby observations are made during preparation or planning periods, is somewhat naive.

11. Student "feedback" instruments should be used to provide the appraisal team with additional insight regarding the teacher's performance.

There is a growing body of research on the use of students' rating of their teachers. This literature is probably more favorable and more consistent than any other in the area of teacher appraisal. Almost without exception, the research reports indicate that students do make reasonably accurate appraisals of teachers. Their appraisals tend to agree with each other, and the teachers who are rated best by students tend to obtain the highest student gains.

McCall's widely quoted study reports:

At last we find some professionally competent judges to teaching skill, namely, the teachers' pupils, especially after they have been taught by the teacher for nearly a year. Out of the mouths of children come more accurate judgments of teachers than are rendered by their peers or superiors and, if our criterion is valid, they appear to have a truer idea of what constitutes good teaching than professors of education.92

In a doctoral study, Ryan concluded that giving the students some sort of rating scale on which to place their teacher is an important part of a successful student "feedback" form. Without this framework, students do not seem to measure their teacher against their ideal. Rather, they appear to respond with total acceptance or rejection of their teacher's behavior. A second conclusion was, to bring about desirable behavior change, students' written "feedback" should carry with it implications of the direction in which the behavior change should take place. It may not be enough to simply make the teacher aware of how his students are perceiving his behavior. Implicit in or combined with the "feedback" there should be

indications of how the teacher can bring about the desired behavior change. 93

In a study by Oliver, the following findings were made:

1. There were significant differences in teacher effectiveness as observed by students between those groups receiving feedback from students, either alone or in combination with feedback from supervisors, and those who received no feedback.

2. The various sources of informational feedback were not equally effective. Student feedback improved teacher effectiveness while supervisor feedback did not. The effect of the combined feedback did not exceed that of student feedback alone.

3. The most experienced teachers (11 years and over) were least receptive to feedback as compared to the intermediate experienced group of teachers (4-10 years) and those teachers with limited teaching experience (1-3 years). The effect of feedback on the intermediate and less experienced teachers was approximately equal but greater at the .05 level of significance than the most experienced group. 94

Hermann H. Remmers has done a considerable amount of research on student ratings of teachers. Major generalizations from his research follow:

1. Grades of students have little if any relationship to their ratings of instructors who assigned the grades.

2. Alumni, ten years after graduation, agree substantially (r's ranging from .40 to .68) with on campus students in their average ratings of the same instructors.


3. Little if any relationship exists between students' rating of the teacher and the difficulty of the course.

4. The sex of student raters bears little or no relationship to their ratings of teachers.

5. The cost in time and money of obtaining student rating of teachers is low; in fact, considerable lower than the cost of administering a typical standardized educational test of some comprehensiveness.

6. Teachers with less than five years experience tend to be rated lower than teachers with more than five years experience.

7. The sex of the teacher is in general unrelated to ratings received.

8. Students are more favorable than instructors to student ratings of instructors, but more instructors than students have noticed improvement in their teaching as a result of student ratings. 95

Another undertaking, relevant to student "feedback," is the study of Nathaniel L. Gage, Phillip R. Runkel, and B. B. Chatterjee. This is one of the few empirical studies concerning the influence of "feedback" on teacher behavior. The effects of "feedback" from pupils to teacher were studied. Comparison of experimental and control groups of sixth grade teachers indicated that when teachers were provided with information obtained from their pupils regarding how the pupils described their actual teacher and how they described their ideal teacher on 12 items of behavior, (1) teachers' behavior changed—in the direction of the pupils' initial description of their ideal teacher, and (2) the teachers receiving feedback became increasingly

accurate in predicting their pupils description of their teacher. The results of this study indicated that there was a relationship between teacher change caused by feedback and the interval between feedback and post ratings of the teachers. The groups with the longest interval approached their pupils pre-ideal most closely.  

In summary, it can be seen from this review of the literature that students can make a contribution by providing informational feedback to their teachers. There is a great body of evidence to support the fact that students do know whether they are working or loafing, whether they are confused or working with a clear purpose, and whether they are inspired or bored.

12. Teacher self-appraisal should be one of the most important aspects of the program for appraising teacher performance.

12.1. Teachers should rate their own performance against standards or principles of effective teaching and their established "performance targets."

There is considerable disagreement over the value of self-appraisal. At least part of this disagreement arises from differences in purpose. Howsam addresses himself to this point as follows:

... If self-improvement is the goal, then self-evaluation may have considerable merit. If, however, administrative action is based on the rating, it is doubtful whether self-rating can be accepted; the ratee becomes both the judge and jury, plaintiff and defendant at his own trial.

Troyer and Pace, speaking of unfavorable reactions on the part of teachers being evaluated, point out that, "They are not likely to

---

96 Gage, et. al., op. cit., p. 90.

97 Howsam, op. cit., p. 32.
react in such manner to an appraisal which they themselves have carried out. 98

Dial expresses the concern that many of the current appraisal techniques create a potential danger of causing teacher conformity by fitting teachers in a predetermined mold. He views teaching individuality and creativity as more important than conformity, and that self-appraisal techniques can be used to help the teachers develop their own professional standards which, in turn, can best meet the goal of improving teacher performance. 99

Dial proposes:

Self-appraisal begins with a statement of professional beliefs. A formal written philosophy of teaching should be a mandatory requirement for every teacher, for each professional must set his own standard for excellence in his profession. The personal statements which can, to a degree, be measured. The advantage of teacher self-appraisal is that there is no need to reach a consensus in regard to a universal scale. No doubt, classroom instruction could be significantly improved if teachers lived up to their own professional standards. 100

Redfern, in discussing self-appraisal, states:

At a predetermined time, the appraisee makes a self-analysis of the year's work in relation to the performance targets. The purpose of self-appraisal is simply to make an assessment of how well the year's work has gone. By and large, the appraisee is in a strategic and enviable position to know what has and has not worked well. He is in a position


100Ibid., p. 23.
to assess the reasons for success as well as the probable causes of failure.\textsuperscript{101}

The process of self-appraisal is not always as easy as it might seem at the outset. It does not mean trying to compare oneself with the teacher across the hall. Thoughtful self-appraisal is a process of reporting as honestly and as accurately as possible how well the teacher feels he has done in each of the areas of performance. The teacher should measure his performance in his target areas against the standards or principles of effective teaching as developed by the committee of teachers. Conferences, observations, pupil growth, and student "feedback" all provide inputs to assist the teacher in making the self-appraisal.

13. The appraisal of teacher performance should be a continuing process.

13.1. The appraisal team should meet periodically during the year to review the progress of the teacher.

13.2. A summary of each appraisal conference should be prepared and entered into the teacher's personnel file.

13.3. Teacher members of the appraisal team should be given released time for the conferences.

In discussing the importance of teacher appraisal being a continuing rather than a periodic procedure, Beecher and Troyer state:

\ldots We cannot afford to have the teacher frustration caused by living in fear and trembling throughout the year while waiting for the annual spring checkup. Teachers have a real cause for criticism of administrators if appraisal at the end of the year, carried on only for purposes of merit rating, reveals weaknesses concerning which there has been no previous appraisal or help. No teacher can do his best work

\textsuperscript{101}Redfern, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 36.
if a feeling of insecurity shrouds his teaching. 102

It is the opinion of the writer that appraisal geared to the personal growth and development of each professional staff member does not stop with the granting of tenure. To expect that a person, after possibly three years of teaching, can make it on his own for possibly the next forty years is somewhat absurd. Changing technologies, the ever-increasing knowledge regarding teaching and learning, almost mandate that the appraisal process be continuing, not only within a particular year, but over the years.

An essential element of the program for appraising teacher performance is the appraisal team conference. The conference is a vehicle for sharing observations, comments, ideas, impressions, and recommendations. Redfern has said, "Of all the aspects of appraisal, a good appraisal conference pays the greatest dividends." 103

To reiterate several previous criteria: the appraisers should serve as advisors to the teacher; the emphasis should be on the performance and not on the personality of the teacher; and the appraiser-teacher relationship should be one of mutual trust and confidence, and nonthreatening in nature. It is recommended that the atmosphere of the conference be as informal as possible.

Typically, the literature recommends that a conference be held with a teacher after each classroom observation. The writer has recommended that the appraisal team be comprised of the teacher himself,

102 Beecher and Troyer, op. cit., p. 84.

103 Redfern, op. cit., p. 39.
the building principal, and two "master" teachers at the teacher's grade level and/or subject area. Furthermore, the writer has recommended that all members of the team should observe the teacher at least once a month. Since the appraisal process is a team effort and members of the appraisal team may be observing the teacher independently at different times during the month, it is recommended that the appraisal team meet once a month to review the progress of the teacher.

Each conference may have a slightly different emphasis. Certainly, the initial conference should include the following: a re-examination of the "performance targets"; a clarification of the roles of the appraisers and the teacher; a delineation and reaffirmation of the step-by-step process of appraisal; and the formulation of a time table for accomplishments. Each conference should include a review of the month's classroom observations, student "feedback" information (formal feedback instruments should not be administered monthly), and the teacher's self-appraisal. The participants should place emphasis on the strengths and weaknesses observed in the teacher's performance during the month. The teacher should be complimented and praised for achievement; and at the same time, there should be no hesitation in giving constructive criticism. It is hoped that the teacher, through self-appraisal, would recognize any weaknesses and, in turn, solicit advice from the participants. Forthright and honest question and answer discussions should prevail. Specific suggestions should be made to assist the teacher in improving his performance. Such suggestions should also include recommendations for appropriate in-service activities. Thus the teacher, in effect, gains a monthly
status report on his progress toward meeting the "performance targets."

The writer recommends that a summary of each appraisal conference should be prepared and entered into the teacher's personnel file. Each member of the appraisal team should also receive a copy of the summary. The teacher can use the information as he strives to achieve his "performance targets." The appraisers can use the summaries as they plan and conduct classroom observations. The importance of keeping all confidential appraisal data will be reviewed under Criterion 15.

The rationale for granting released time to teaching members of the appraisal team is the same as that presented for the implementing, or procedural, Criterion 10.2.

14. Extensive in-service opportunities should be available to teachers to enhance their personal growth and development.

The appraisal process is of little worth unless the weaknesses it reveals are corrected. All the kinds of information and evidence accumulated in the appraisal process as to the strengths and weaknesses of a teacher, even though understood and accepted by the teacher, are of little use unless there are provisions for the teacher to improve his knowledge and skills through in-service activities.

The Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools set forth the following fundamental principles which can serve as guides for developing an in-service program:

1. Responsibility for initiating and planning in-service education activities should rest primarily with local school personnel.
2. In-service education activities should be recognized as an integral part of the school program with respect to scheduling, teacher load, and budgeting funds.

3. In-service education activities should contribute to the unity of the total program of the school and to optimum growth and development of the staff.

4. In-service education activities, which are planned, should support the over-all philosophy and aims of the school.

5. Provisions should be made for continuous evaluation of the total program.

6. Participants should be expected to strive for and achieve high standards of quality in all work which is a part of the in-service teacher education program.  

Morphet, et. al., reports what the authors consider to be some promising in-service procedures used by school districts. These procedures are:

... conferences and special assistance for new teachers by competent consultants or staff members; workshops that are planned by and for teachers to study problems of common interest; ... consultants from colleges or universities or from offices of the intermediate unit selected to work with committees or principals and members of their staff in studying problems of current interest; provision of a competent staff of supervisors or consultants to work with committees and with principals and teachers in the respective schools in planning improvements in individual teaching procedures ...  

In a discussion of comprehensive in-service programs, Beecher and Troyer state:

---


Through such staff activity, weaknesses in the program of the school, rather than the personalities of the teachers, are likely to become the basis for general improvement of the entire program, at the same time distracting attention from the personal aspects of appraisal.\(^{106}\)

Aschner recommends the use of "master" teachers, combined with classroom analysis techniques, as appropriate in-service activities. She states:

... It seems more likely that teachers, once given the opportunity to study actual procedures and techniques of some of these rate "master" teachers—not by the usual brief classroom observations, but by careful analysis of their techniques in process, on class session transcripts—then these master skills and techniques could be understood in detail and tried out by emulation in practice.\(^{107}\)

Another valuable in-service activity is the use of the micro-teaching process to improve teaching skills and techniques. The micro-teaching structure is a scaled-down teaching encounter in class size and class time which has been developed in the Stanford University Secondary Teacher Education Program. Class size is limited to one to five students and class time from five to twenty minute lessons.

Micro-teaching may be used with or without video tape.\(^{108}\)

While micro-teaching was first developed for preliminary experience and practice in teaching and as a research vehicle to explore

\(^{106}\) Beecher and Troyer, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 84.


training effects under controlled conditions, the concept can be of
service to experienced teachers as a means of gaining new information
about their teaching in a relatively short time, and as a means of
changing teacher perceptions of their own teaching behavior. Realistic
approximations to classroom conditions allow predictions of subsequent
classroom teaching to be made with a high degree of accuracy, for the
students are reacting and evaluating as real students, not role-
playing. This constitutes a real teaching encounter, not one which is
simulated; only it is reduced in terms of students and time.¹⁰⁹

15. All appraisal data should be kept confidential.

15.1. Only information signed by all members of the
appraisal team should be placed in the teacher's
personnel file.

The importance of keeping all appraisal data confidential is
self-evident. To do otherwise would be in violation of a person's pro-
essional and individual rights.

It is recommended by the writer that a report be completed by
the appraisal team during each monthly conference. The contents of
the report should reflect unanimous agreement by the members of the
appraisal team. All instruments completed during the month (e.g.,
self-appraisal instruments, student "feedback" instruments, classroom
observation instruments, etc.) and a summary of the conference should
be attached to the report. The teacher may include any student
evaluation information or information on special activities of his
choice. All of these materials should contain the signatures of all

¹⁰⁹ Ibd., pp. 2-3.
appraisal team members. The complete set of materials should be sent to the personnel office for inclusion in the teacher's personnel file. All parties involved should keep a copy of each item sent to the personnel office.

16. The appraisal team should recommend a teacher to the superintendent for retention or dismissal.

The rationale for this criterion may come under attack by many in the field. An example of those who oppose this procedure is Evans, who concludes:

. . . When supervisors assume the dual role of "helpers" to teachers and evaluators of teachers, the possibility of an impaired relationship between supervisors and teachers would seem to exist; this possibility is likely to be heightened if supervisors are given a voice in deciding whether teachers shall be rehired or granted tenure status . . .

The writer has recommended that a program for appraising teacher performance should have as its primary goal the personal growth and development of each professional staff member. Furthermore, the writer has recommended that the appraisers function as advisors to the teacher. Emphasis has been given to the importance of mutual trust and a nonthreatening relationship between the appraisers and the teacher. It has been recommended that the building principal or his assistant be a member of the team rather than an administrator from outside the building. The teacher has been included as a member of the appraisal team.

It is the opinion of the writer that after a reasonable period of time and with adequate help, if the performance of a teacher still

---

remains substantially below reasonable expectations, it is very im-
portant that termination of service be accomplished.

Redfern indicates that experience has shown when a teacher's
work is unsatisfactory, a favorite complaint of the "unsatisfactory"
teacher is that the appraiser has insufficient information upon which
to make a judgment and that he seldom visits the teacher's class-
room.111 This type of complaint would not be valid if the appraisal
program followed the guidelines suggested by the writer.

The rationale for suggesting that the appraisal team (the
teacher is excluded from the term "team" in this instance) recommend a
teacher to the superintendent for tenure status or dismissal is based
on the position that the members of the team are in the best position
to know the actual performance of the teacher. To establish a dual
system whereby a person or persons, other than the appraisal team,
perform this function would seem impractical considering the manpower
resources which would be required to support such a dual system.

Following the guidelines suggested by the writer, the teacher
in a professional manner can be made aware of his progress on a monthly
basis. The honest application of the self-appraisal technique by the
teacher can reveal the degree to which the teacher perceives the
"performance targets" have been satisfied. Through the use of guidance
techniques, the appraisers can guide unsuccessful teachers out of the
profession rather than necessitating summary dismissals. It is the
responsibility of the teaching profession to establish the standards

111Redfern, op. cit., pp. 32-33.
of effective teaching and see that they are achieved.

17. The appraisal program should be fully explained to prospective teacher employees.

17.1. The purposes, objectives, practices, and procedures of the appraisal program should be explained to prospective teacher employees when they are interviewed for a position, and reviewed again during the orientation program for new teachers.

Explaining the appraisal program to prospective employees is a much-neglected area of employment procedures. A study of practices in Ohio by Evans in 1961 indicated:

... There are data which suggest rather strongly that teachers typically have little or no knowledge about the appraisal program at the time when they are hired. ... data presented earlier showed that over 80 per cent of the probationary teachers reported receiving an explanation of the teacher-evaluation program after they had commenced their teaching duties. In addition, the majority of the superintendents indicated, when interviewed, that ordinarily prospective teachers were not informed of the appraisal program at the time of the interview. The teachers who were interviewed reported usually that they possessed little or no information about the appraisal program at the time when they accepted their teaching position. 112

It is the opinion of the writer that it is the professional obligation of the interviewer(s) to explain in detail all facets of the system's working conditions and the responsibilities of the professional staff members prior to employment. At the time of the new teacher orientation, it is desirable to again review the purposes, objectives, practices, and procedures of the appraisal program. This may best be done at the building on a small group basis rather than at a general meeting of all new staff members.

112 Evans, op. cit., pp. 244-245.
18. All aspects of the program for appraising teacher performance should be periodically evaluated.

18.1. Each year a permanent evaluation committee, including representatives from the original committees on purposes and objectives, policies and procedures, and standards should evaluate the effectiveness of the program for appraising teacher performance.

18.2. Revisions should be made in the program when deemed advisable in light of evaluation results.

To the school administrator who needs information about the effectiveness of a particular program, the word "evaluation" may conjure up some unpleasant memories: a report that took too long to prepare and overlooked the obvious while concentrating on the trite, or an investigator who got in everyone's way and never seemed able to draw definitive conclusions. However, the establishment of systematic evaluation procedures for the periodic evaluation of the program is crucial to the maintenance and renewal of a viable program of appraising teacher performance.

Evaluation is the process of agreeing upon program standards, determining whether a discrepancy exists between some aspects of the program and the standards governing that aspect of the program, and using discrepancy information to identify the weaknesses of the program.113

The writer recommends that each year a permanent evaluation committee, including representatives from the original committees, should evaluate the effectiveness of the program for appraising teacher performance. This type of evaluation is called "summative" evaluation.\textsuperscript{114} The writer assumes that the persons involved at the operations level of the program will make "formulative" evaluations and report their findings to the permanent evaluation committee. A "formulative" evaluation is evaluating separately each component of the program as the component is being implemented.\textsuperscript{115}

The permanent evaluation committee should have the responsibility for recommending to the administration and the board of education revisions in the program when deemed advisable in light of evaluation results.


\textsuperscript{115} Ibid., p. 241.
CHAPTER III

THE JUDGMENTS OF A JURY OF AUTHORITIES REGARDING
CRITERIA FOR TEACHER APPRAISAL PROGRAMS

As a means of testing the appropriateness of the general and procedural, or implementing, criteria for teacher appraisal programs, the writer sought the opinions of a jury of authorities. In addition, the writer thought that the jury responses, when analyzed, could potentially serve as an indication of current prevailing opinions about certain aspects of appraising teacher performance. It is the purpose of Chapter III to present the reactions of a jury of authorities, as secured through questionnaires and personal interviews, to certain criteria related to programs for appraising teacher performance.

The Selection of the Jury of Authorities

The writer attempted to identify jury members who would represent the views and opinions of all segments of the educational profession, (e.g., higher education, state department of education, state educational associations, local administrators, and local teacher representatives).

The twelve-member jury of authorities consisted of two professors of education of The Ohio State University; two superintendents and one assistant superintendent of city school districts in
Ohio, and the president of the teachers' bargaining unit in each of these same three school districts; the executive director of the Buckeye Association of School Administrators; the executive director of the Ohio School Boards Association; the director of instructional services of the Ohio Education Association; and an Ohio State Department of Education assistant superintendent of public instruction.

The local school district members of the jury were employed by a large Central Ohio city, enrolling approximately 115,584 students; a medium-sized Central Ohio city with a student enrollment of approximately 10,155 students; and a smaller suburban Central Ohio school district enrolling approximately 2,729 students.116

The assistant superintendent of the large city school district was selected for his involvement as the board of education's negotiator in teacher and noncertified personnel contract discussions, and his knowledge of staff personnel.

In a previous superintendency, the superintendent of the medium-sized city school district served as the board of education's chief negotiator in discussions with teacher bargaining groups affiliated with the American Federation of Teachers and the Ohio Education Association. A strike by A.F.T. members resulted during the course of the negotiations. This superintendent was chosen as a juror because of these past experiences and his active interest in staff personnel as evidenced by his current doctoral dissertation work in the area of differentiated staffing.

The superintendent of the smaller suburban city school district wrote a doctoral dissertation in the general field of teacher appraisal. All three city school districts have active, viable classroom teachers' organizations led by dynamic, youthful, and knowledgeable presidents.

The executive director of the Buckeye Association of School Administrators (affiliated with the American Association of School Administrators) has co-authored several articles regarding teacher appraisal. The executive director of the Ohio School Boards' Association (affiliated with the National School Boards' Association) provides consulting services to various Ohio school boards concerning the legal ramifications and conditions surrounding the cases of certain teacher dismissals. The Ohio Education Association's director of instructional services was chosen for the jury for his work in the development of the Ohio Education Association's position on teacher appraisal.

The Ohio State Department of Education assistant superintendent was selected for his continuing efforts in teacher appraisal as evidenced by his consultant work and speaking engagements to various groups on the topic of teacher appraisal.

Finally, two professors of education at The Ohio State University were selected as jurors. One of the professors teaches all graduate educational administration courses in the area of staff personnel. The second, the Director of the Education Personnel Placement Office, maintains an up-to-date knowledge of programs for appraising teacher performance through his continuing contact with
educational recruiters.

Questionnaire Submitted to the Jurors

In the covering letter for the questionnaire, the writer invited the authorities to rate the general and procedural, or implementing, criteria for programs of appraising teacher performance on two five-point rating scales. (See Appendixes A and B). The first scale was an Agreement Scale, which is represented by the letters "SA," "A," "U," "D," and "SD." The code for the scale is as follows:

SA. The respondent strongly agrees with the criterion.
A. The respondent agrees with the criterion.
U. The respondent is undecided about the criterion.
D. The respondent disagrees with the criterion.
SD. The respondent strongly disagrees with the criterion.

The second scale was the Importance Scale. The purpose of this scale was to determine the jurors' opinions of the importance of each criterion as related to the other criteria. The code for this second scale is as follows:

4. The criterion is of great importance.
3. The criterion is of much importance.
2. The criterion is of some importance.
1. The criterion is of little importance.
0. The criterion is of no importance.

The jurors were encouraged to add criteria which they believed were important and which were not included by the writer. Space was provided at the bottom of each questionnaire page for this purpose. In
addition, the writer conducted a personal interview with each respondee several weeks after the questionnaire had been mailed. Each interview took from fifteen to forty-five minutes to complete. The purpose of the interview was to clarify any questions the jurors had concerning the criteria and to gain additional insights regarding the positions held by the jurors and their views about the "state-of-the-art" and future trends in the field of teacher appraisal.

General Responses of the Jury

Of the twelve persons selected as authorities, all responded to the questionnaire and were subsequently interviewed. All the respondents made comments, several being quite liberal in the number of their written remarks. Generally, the comments regarding the statements were of a qualifying nature, or explained the juror's position on the criterion. Only one juror added statements which he thought should be included as general and procedural, or implementing, criteria.

The writer wishes to point out that there was no adverse criticism from the authorities regarding the study or the use of a jury as a method for gaining certain information. The majority of the jurors indorsed the importance and utility of the study. One stated, "Your proposal presents a logical, orderly approach to teacher appraisal." Another wrote, "You have covered the important aspects of the topic, and your work represents the current thinking." A third indicated that, "Empirical research is desperately needed in this field, and your efforts will add to that research."
Several of the authorities indicated difficulty in disagreeing with any of the criteria. One indicated that he found his opinions falling at either end of the continuum with few falling in the middle. Another felt that there was too much "God and Country" in the criteria, and that he was desirous of criteria which were more controversial in nature. Several jurors indicated that there was a tendency toward consistency between the two rating scales. If they "strongly agreed" with a criterion, they generally rated it "4" on the importance scale. Likewise, if they "strongly disagreed" with a criterion, they rated it "0" on the importance scale.

Agreement Among Authorities Regarding the General and Procedural, or Implementing, Criteria

The extent to which the twelve authorities in teacher appraisal tended to agree with the 18 general criteria and 29 procedural, or implementing, criteria, is shown in Table 2. The criteria are given in summary form in the table. For any complete statement in which the reader may be interested, it is suggested that he refer to pages 30 through 34.

An analysis of Table 2 shows that a majority of the jurors agreed with 17 of the 18 general criteria and 28 of the 29 procedural, or implementing, criteria. (Agreement consisted of a combination of both the "strongly agree" and "agree" responses). The general criterion that received the highest percentage of "strongly agree" responses (92 per cent) was No. 8—"Provisions should be made for special preparation and training of those personnel whose
responsibility it is to carry out the appraisal function." All jurors either strongly agreed or agreed with 10 of the 18 general criteria while 10 of the 29 procedural, or implementing, criteria received agreement ratings by all jurors.

The general criterion receiving less than a majority agreement (42 per cent) by the jurors was No. 16—"The appraisal team should recommend a teacher to the superintendent for retention or dismissal." While five of the jurors were "undecided" regarding this criterion, only two disagreed and no juror strongly disagreed. It is interesting to note that both superintendents and the assistant superintendent either agreed or strongly agreed with this criterion. Those responding with an "undecided" answer seemed to be concerned about the possibility of the principal's role being usurped by the appraisal team's retention or dismissal recommendation. In the opinion of the writer, one juror made a most cogent comment when he recommended that the wording be revised to read as follows:

"The appraisal team should take part in the decision regarding retention or dismissal."

The procedural, or implementing, criterion receiving less than a majority agreement (17 per cent) was No. 6.2—"The criteria, standards, or principles of effective teaching should be developed exclusively by classroom teachers." Of somewhat a surprise to the writer was the fact that two of the three presidents of teacher organizations either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the criterion. Also, this was the only criterion that did not receive at least one "strongly agree" response.
As indicated previously, only one juror added statements which he thought should be considered for inclusion as criteria for programs of appraising teacher performance. The juror was of the opinion that attention or criteria items should be devoted to:

1. Assessing the subject matter competence of the teacher by means of some nationally-normed test, such as the National Teacher Examination.

2. A more direct relationship of teacher appraisal to the "new due process" positions being emphasized by professional organizations.

3. Relating the appraisal process to decisions regarding promotion.

4. Relating the appraisal process to decisions regarding the gaining of tenure status.

**Importance Assigned to General and Procedural, or Implementing, Criteria**

The jurors were asked in the questionnaire to indicate the importance of each criterion by responding to the five-point scale. In order to determine the relative importance which the authorities attached to each of the 47 criteria, the writer combined the responses with their respective numerical values to attain a total weight. Thus, as shown in Table 3 which follows, Item 8, paraphrased "special training for appraisers," was designated of great importance by 11 authorities and of much importance by one authority. The total weight for this item was determined as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
11 \times 4 & \quad \text{(great importance)} \quad 44 \\
1 \times 3 & \quad \text{(much importance)} \quad 3 \\
0 \times 2 & \quad \text{(some importance)} \quad 0 \\
0 \times 1 & \quad \text{(little importance)} \quad 0 \\
0 \times 0 & \quad \text{(no importance)} \quad 0 \\
\hline
\text{Total Weight} & \quad 47
\end{align*}
\]
Table 3 lists the general criteria in their rank order of importance as perceived by the authorities. The criteria having the greatest importance are found toward the top positions. Conversely, those general criteria receiving ratings of lesser importance are found in the lower positions in the table. The general criteria are given in summary form in the table. For any complete statement in which the reader may be interested, it is suggested that he refer to pages 30 through 34.

The same procedures, as identified above, were used for the procedural, or implementing, criteria listed in Table 4.

It is evident from an examination of Tables 2 through 4 that the jurors, who agreed with the criteria, tended to rate their importance as great. However, on the importance scale there was an apparent movement toward the middle of the scale with fewer responses indicating "great importance" and "little" or "no importance" than was the case on the agreement scale.

An analysis of the total weights for the items shown in Tables 2 and 3 reveals that of the maximum possible weight of 48 which an item could receive, 34 of the 47 items received weights of 36 or more (36 represents an average response of much importance). The general criteria No. 8 and No. 13 received the highest weight of 47. These criteria are as follows:

8. Provisions should be made of special preparation and training for those personnel whose responsibility it is to carry out the appraisal function.

13. The appraisal of teacher performance should be a continuing process.
The procedural, or implementing, criterion receiving the highest weight of 46 was No. 17.1. This criterion, paraphrased, is as follows:

The purposes, objectives, practices, and procedures of the appraisal program should be explained to prospective teacher employees . . .

As one might expect, the general criteria received slightly higher weights than the procedural, or implementing, criteria.

Only two general criteria received a rating of less than 36 (much importance), Nos. 11 and 16. Criterion No. 16 also received the lowest percentage of agreement on the agreement scale.

The general, or procedural, criterion receiving the lowest rating on the importance scale was No. 6.2--"The criteria, standards, or principles of effective teaching should be developed exclusively by classroom teachers." This criterion received an exceedingly low rating of 20.

**Future Development in Teacher Appraisal**

**as Perceived by the Jurors**

During the course of the personal interviews the writer asked each juror what he perceived to be some of the trends or future developments in the field of appraising teacher performance. While some of the responses encompassed other subjects, the opinions are most revealing.

All jurors, who were assistant or chief school administrators, believed that the so-called "teacher surplus" will cause a relaxing of teacher tenure laws. Two of the three presidents of teacher
organizations also held this position and were even stronger in their opinions that existing teacher tenure laws would be ultimately eliminated. One president felt that tenure laws had passed their time of usefulness and that present negotiated contracts provided the teachers with sufficient protection from dismissals without just cause.

The possibility of some form of differentiated staffing becoming commonplace in the foreseeable future also received endorsement by the local administrators and teachers. Teacher president "A" said, "Some type of differentiated staffing with accompanying merit pay is the only answer for education. Teacher president "B" indicated, "The time will come when the exceptional teacher will be rewarded. The present regimented salary schedules lead to a mediocre condition. Differentiated staffing could be a solution." Teacher president "C" stated, "Differentiated staffing will enable individuals to maximize their potentials."

Teacher president "A" indicated that in light of the current teacher surplus, there will be a concerted push by teacher organizations to control who enters the profession. He saw a significant need for providing teachers with in-service experiences in sensitivity training. "Teachers must learn how to relate to inner-city kids. Teaching is becoming rougher--it is no longer the profession for those who can't do anything else. The kids will kick those out."

Teacher president "C" was of the opinion that the trend toward "performance contracting" and "performance standards" will have an effect on teacher appraisal. He stated, "People are tired of paying more and more taxes. They want some indication of how well schools
Superintendent "A" shared these views when he expressed the
thought that teachers will have to be more accountable. "Now we don't
have to put up with weak teaching on the part of beginning teachers."
Superintendent "A" felt that the trends in teacher appraisal are the
increased use of video tape recorders for recording classroom inter-
action, the use of less rating in formal evaluation, and more teacher
involvement in appraisal—a joint activity rather than administratively
controlled.

Association member "A" emphasized that teacher appraisal must
be a continuous process and that teachers must be helped prior to
decisions regarding transfer or dismissal. He viewed the appraisal
process as one of self-evaluation with a concomitant commitment on the
part of the administration. He stated, "The building administrator
must have the resources available (time, human resources, materials)
to work with teachers. The real function of the building principal is
to improve the staff. In-service education should be on an
individualized basis. Teachers having similar needs should be grouped,
similar to how we group students."

Association member "B" stated, "Teacher dismissal is becoming
a major concern of administrators. Teachers have been treated
casually in the past and, in many instances, they have been dismissed
without any documentation. If administrators do a good job of
appraising, guiding and directing, they will have few problems with
teacher tenure."

Professor "A" said, "We need to get off the kick of appraisal
and get on the kick of improving instruction." He viewed appraisal as a negative factor and improving instruction as a positive factor. He said, "Rather than emphasizing appraisal, we should use the same money and effort to improve instruction. For the benefit of the public you may have to have some appraisal—you may have to fire someone."

Professor "A" objected to the writer's criteria regarding in-service education and stated, "In-service education should be based on tomorrow's, not last year's model. The after-the-fact approach is last year's model."

Professor "B" perceived that it will become commonplace to find written in negotiated contracts some conditions and/or the entire appraisal process. He said, "There will be and is a much greater interest on the part of the public for collecting objective data on teacher performance. Public education is experiencing competition from the private sector (performance contracting), and one can expect teacher organizations to enter into performance contracting agreements with boards of education. Teacher appraisal in the future may be built on the concept of the profession policing itself."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Criterion Summary</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>% Of Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Primary goal the personal growth and development of staff</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Cognizable purposes and objectives</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Purposes and objectives identified by widely representative committee</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Teachers constitute a majority of membership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Consensus gained on purposes and objectives</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Purposes and objectives should be explicit</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Board of Education commitment to importance of the program</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Adequate finances to support program</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Rational planning technique for relating board's commitment to specific resources</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Wide staff involvement in development of policies and procedures</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Criterion Summary</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>% Of Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Teachers constitute a majority on policy and procedure development bodies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Formalized policies, rules, and regulations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Written policy adopted by the board</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Written administrative rules and regulations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Criteria, standards, or principles of effective teaching have common meaning to all professional staff</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Criteria, standards, or principles expressed in terms of observable teacher and student behavior</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Criteria, standards, or principles developed exclusively by classroom teachers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Appraisal a team effort</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Appraisal teams -- teacher, principal, and two &quot;master&quot; teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Appraisers serve as advisors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Emphasis on performance not personality</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Criterion Summary</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>% Of Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Relationship based upon mutual trust and confidence</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Teacher-developed job description agreed upon by team</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Special training for appraisers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Special training initiated prior to actual appraisal</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Teacher established &quot;performance targets&quot;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>&quot;Performance targets&quot; both short and long term</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>&quot;Performance targets&quot; limited to a reasonable number</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Systematic observations major source of data</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Mutually-planned classroom observations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>Released time for observations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Use of student &quot;feedback&quot; instruments</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Criterion Summary</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>% Of Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Self-appraisal: one of the most important aspects of program</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>Performance rated against standards and established &quot;performance targets&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Appraisal a continuing process</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>Team meets periodically to review teacher progress</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>Summary of conference entered into teacher's file</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>Released time for conferences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Extensive in-service opportunities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Appraisal data kept confidential</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>Only signed information placed in teacher's file</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Team makes retention/dismissal recommendations to superintendent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Program fully explained to prospective teachers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Criterion Summary</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>% Of Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>Explained during interview and again during orientation program</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Program periodically evaluated</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>Program evaluated yearly by committee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>Revisions made in light of results</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Criterion Summary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>Total Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Special training for appraisers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Appraisal a continuing process</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Program fully explained to prospective teachers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Appraisal data kept confidential</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Primary goal: the personal growth and development of staff</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Program periodically evaluated</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Board of Education commitment to importance of the program</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Wide staff involvement in development of policies and procedures</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Self-appraisal: one of the most important aspects of program</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Criterion Summary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>Total Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Extensive in-service opportunities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cognizable purposes and objectives</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Teacher established &quot;performance targets&quot;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Formalized policies, rules, and regulations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Criteria, standards, or principles of effective teaching have common meaning to all professional staff</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Appraisal a team effort</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Systematic observations major source of data</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Use of student &quot;feedback&quot; instruments</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Team makes retention/dismissal recommendations to superintendent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4

**RANK ORDER OF IMPORTANCE OF PROCEDURAL, OR IMPLEMENTING, CRITERIA FOR PROGRAMS OF APPRAISING TEACHER PERFORMANCE AS DETERMINED BY 12 AUTHORITIES IN TEACHER APPRAISAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Criterion Summary</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>Explained during interview and again during orientation program</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Special training initiated prior to actual appraisal</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Written administrative rules and regulations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Relationship based upon mutual trust and confidence</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>&quot;Performance targets&quot; limited to a reasonable number</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>&quot;Performance targets&quot; both short and long term</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>Revisions made in light of results</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Adequate finances to support program</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Criterion Summary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>Total Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>Performance rated against standards and established &quot;performance targets&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Purposes and objectives should be explicit</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>Summary of conference entered into teacher's file</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Purposes and objectives identified by widely representative committee</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Written policy adopted by the board</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>Only signed information placed in teacher's file</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>Program evaluated yearly by committee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Consensus gained on purposes and objectives</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>Team meets periodically to review teacher progress</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Criterion Summary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>Total Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Criteria, standards, or principles expressed in terms of observable teacher and student behavior</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Rational planning technique for relating board's commitment to specific resources</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Mutually-planned classroom observations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Teachers constitute a majority of membership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Teacher-developed job description agreed upon by team</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Appraisal teams -- teacher, principal, and two &quot;master&quot; teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Emphasis on performance not personality</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>Released time for observations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Teachers constitute a majority on policy and procedure development bodies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Appraisers serve as advisors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Criterion Summary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>Total Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>Released time for conferences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Criteria, standards, or principles developed exclusively by classroom teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV

THE STATUS OF PROGRAMS FOR APPRAISING TEACHER PERFORMANCE IN SELECTED OHIO PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS

In Chapter II, the writer developed certain criteria for evaluating programs for appraising teacher performance. In Chapter III, he reported the judgments of a jury of authorities in teacher appraisal regarding these selected criteria. With this information as background data, the reader will find in the present chapter a summation of prevalent appraisal practices in major Ohio public school districts.

It is the purpose of the writer to present a broad picture of some of the characteristics of programs for appraising teacher performance as found in major Ohio school districts. The chapter's scope is therefore panoramic rather than one of depth. Finally, the writer will present the formal policy positions of the Ohio Education Association and the National Education Association regarding programs for appraising teacher performance.

The data relating to Ohio appraisal programs, presented and described in this chapter, were secured by requesting superintendents, assistant superintendents, or directors of personnel of each of Ohio's twenty-five largest public school districts to send the writer copies of the following information: (See Appendix C for letter of request).
1. All board of education policy pertaining to the program for appraising teacher performance.

2. All administrative rules and regulations pertaining to the program for appraising teacher performance.

3. Any instruments used in appraising teacher performance.

4. Any teacher manuals, handbooks, or orientation materials pertaining to the program for appraising teacher performance.

5. Any other pertinent information regarding the program not included in Items 1-4 above.

The Educational Directory, School Year 1970-71 was used to identify the twenty-five largest Ohio public school districts based upon student enrollment. The twenty-five school districts are listed in Appendix D. The assumption was that these twenty-five school districts employ almost one-half of the teachers in Ohio, and they would more than likely have the more highly developed programs for appraising teacher performance. Twenty-three of the twenty-five school districts returned what the writer considered to be usable information.

The writer realized the limitation of gaining information from written policies or procedures. Policies or procedures may not be inclusive, and actual practices may deviate from those specified in writing. However, since the purpose is to present a broad picture of certain Ohio programs for appraising teacher performance, the writer chose to rely on existing written information rather than developing a questionnaire or conducting on-site visitations to collect the data.

The items pertaining to Ohio appraisal practices, to be described and discussed in this chapter, are categorized or grouped by topics which correspond to the general criteria developed and reported
in Chapter II. These items include:

1. Names given to the appraisal programs.

2. The primary goal of programs for appraising teacher performance.


4. Commitment by the boards of education to the importance of the program.

5. Involvement of professional staff in the development of policies and procedures pertaining to teacher appraisal.

6. Formalized policies, rules, and regulations.

7. Clear and meaningful criteria, standards, or principles of effective teaching.

8. The appraisers.

9. Preparation of appraisers in the application of appraisal techniques.

10. Establishment of goals for improvement or "performance targets."

11. Systematic observation of classroom activities.

12. Use of student "feedback" instruments.


14. In-service education opportunities for professional staff members.

15. Teachers' signatures on appraisal forms.

16. Person(s) responsible for recommending to the superintendent retention, promotion, or dismissal of teachers.

17. Appeal procedures open to teachers.

18. Informing new teachers of the appraisal program.

19. Internal evaluation of the appraisal program.
Names Given to the Appraisal Programs

The writer is of the opinion that the name given to an appraisal program is, at least, a superficial indication of the goal and/or purpose(s) of the program. Certainly, the name can capture or signify an impression of positiveness or negativeness. The names given to teacher appraisal programs by the twenty-three city school districts are as follows:

TABLE 5

NAMES GIVEN TO TEACHER APPRAISAL PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Evaluation Procedures</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Evaluation Program</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Evaluations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Teacher Performance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Appraisal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Personnel Appraisal Program</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Staff Appraisal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Teacher Job Appraisal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Evaluation of Teacher Performance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Appraisal Program</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative teacher Performance Appraisal Program</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Growth and Development Program</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Teacher Development Program</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The word evaluation appeared in nine of the names, with appraisal appearing in six. Three of the names emphasized the cooperative nature of the program. Teacher development was stressed in two of the names, while two more emphasized instructional improvement.

It is interesting to note that a name for the program seemingly was not deemed important by four of the school districts, and that three others named their program, "Teacher Evaluation Procedures."

The Primary Goal of Programs for Appraising Teacher Performance

There was somewhat more commonality among the twenty-three school districts on the primary goal of programs for appraising teacher performance than almost any other aspect of the programs.

More than half (13 of 23) of the city school districts had as their major goal of appraisal programs, "the maintaining and improving the quality of instruction."

Five of the twenty-three districts cited, "the professional growth and development of staff members" as their primary goal. Two
of the school districts listing, "the professional growth and development of staff members" as a primary goal also mentioned with equal importance the goal of "improving the quality of instruction."

One district stated their goal in the following manner:

The goal of the evaluation program shall be teacher growth and development which in turn improves the quality of instruction.

Two of the districts had "improved teacher performance" as the desired goal of teacher evaluation.

Of concern to the writer was the fact that four of the twenty-three major Ohio public school districts did not identify any goals for their program of appraising teacher performance.

Purposes and Objectives of Programs for Appraising Teacher Performance

Cognizable purposes and objectives for the teacher appraisal program did not exist in fifteen of the twenty-three school districts.

The information gained from the school districts lacked any references to the genesis of the purposes and objectives for the teacher appraisal program. Further, the writer could not determine the parties who participated in developing the purposes and objectives.

The cognizable purposes and objectives that were established by the eight school districts were so diverse that the writer was unable to discern any common characteristics among the eight. Instead, the writer has identified the statement of purposes and objectives used by one district which he considered to be the most complete listing. This is as follows:
1. Promote improvement in teaching performance.
2. Enable personnel to be cognizant of standing.
3. Make appraisal a systematic and professional process.
5. Stimulate growth and development.
6. Establish good working relationships between appraisee and appraiser.
7. Provide the superintendent with a systematic means for gathering data.
8. Provide a uniform appraisal program for appraising all professional personnel.
9. Make appraisal a part of the appraisee's ongoing instructional process.
10. Obtain a commitment from each individual to the philosophy and goals of the school district.
11. Enable teachers and administrative staff to focus attention and work as a team on an individual's concern.
12. Provide planning for the future.

Commitment by the Boards of Education to the Importance of the Program

The information received from the twenty-three city school districts did not reveal the nature or degree of commitment to the program by the various boards of education. There were no references to specific financial resources being provided to support the programs. There were no indications that some rational planning technique, such as PPBS, was being used to relate the boards' commitments to the programs to specific resources.
Only one of the school district's policies and procedures included a statement related to the board of education's commitment. This statement is as follows:

In support of the above policy, the Board of Education pledges that it will continually strive to promote the feasibility of such a program by:

1. Providing the best possible facilities
2. Promoting conferences, workshops, and in-service training opportunities
3. Working for better economic conditions for its employees

Involvement of Professional Staff in the Development of Policies and Procedures Pertaining to Teacher Appraisal

While the information pertaining to the procedures followed in developing appraisal policies and procedures was limited, the writer makes the assumption that, more than likely, there was some degree of staff involvement in the development of the majority of the teacher appraisal programs. This assumption has as its basis the fact that all of the twenty-three city school districts have formal negotiation procedures which provide the framework for board-teacher representative discussions. Such negotiation procedures typically enumerate the topics which are considered for negotiation. Programs for appraising teacher performance or teacher evaluation are generally included under the topic "working conditions," and thus are negotiable in the majority of the school districts surveyed.

Credit is given in the program procedures to teacher-administration representatives for the development of the appraisal
programs in seven of the twenty-three school districts. In all instances where the names of participants were listed, administrative representatives outnumbered the teacher representatives.

It is interesting to note that the classroom teachers were represented by organizations affiliated with the American Federation of Teachers in only two of the twenty-three school districts. However, in both instances, the A.F.T. affiliated organizations were credited with co-operative planning in the development of the policies and procedures pertaining to the teacher appraisal programs.

**Formalized Policies, Rules and Regulations**

In recent years, the development of written personnel policies has been receiving increasing attention. Much of the impetus for this phenomenon has been formal negotiations and negotiated contracts between boards of education and teacher organizations.

Whereas the development of written personnel policies has been receiving increasing attention, seemingly, this emphasis does not apply to teacher appraisal programs, if the findings by the writer regarding practices in the major Ohio city school districts are representative. Perhaps the most significant fact regarding policies, rules, and regulations is the surprisingly small percentage of major Ohio school districts which have developed policies to serve as a framework for executing and maintaining the teacher appraisal program.

Two of the twenty-three districts did not have identifiable board of education policies pertaining to the teacher appraisal program. The writer judged the policies of fifteen more districts to
be extremely incomplete and somewhat void of administrative rules and regulations. An example of this incompleteness is one district's policies which are as follows:

**Appraisal of Employees' Work**—The superintendent shall establish and maintain suitable procedures for adequate and periodic appraisal of the work of each employee, and shall maintain suitable records of the fact and results of such appraisals. These appraisals shall be made at least annually for a professional employee during his first three years. For a professional employee beyond the third year, the appraisals shall be made during the seventh, eleventh, and fifteenth years of service and at such other times as may be indicated by reason of doubtful competence.

As incomplete as the above policy is, the policy apparently was not being implemented in its entirety since there were no procedures developed for the "adequate and periodic appraisal of the work of each employee."

Another example which reflects the incompleteness of teacher appraisal administrative rules and regulations is a major Ohio city school district which has a fifty-eight page agreement (contract) between the board of education and the teachers association. This agreement includes, among many other topics, an extensive treatment of curriculum revision procedures. However, the only reference to teacher appraisal found in the fifty-eight pages is as follows:

All evaluations pertaining to the performance of a member shall be conducted openly and with full knowledge of the member.

In those cases where a member is required to evaluate his own performance, a conference with the building principal shall be required, prior to the transmittal of the evaluation to the Office of Professional Personnel.

A member shall not be requested or required to sign any evaluation until it is fully completed and signed by the principal.
A member shall be given a copy of any evaluation report pertaining to his performance.

At the request of the member, a conference with the principal shall be held within (5) days after completion and before a copy is submitted to the member's file.

An examination of the policies, rules, and regulations of the twenty-three districts showed that the most frequently-mentioned rule or regulation related to teacher's signing appraisal forms (22 of 23 school districts). The second most frequently-mentioned rule or regulation pertained to the number of evaluations per year (21 of 23 school districts). Other rules, or regulations frequently found, pertained to the person(s) responsible for making the appraisals, and the requirement of a conference between the teacher and the appraiser(s).

**Clear and Meaningful Criteria, Standards, or Principles of Effective Teaching**

One of the most critical and controversial factors in the process of appraising teachers involves the choice of criteria, standards, or principles upon which judgments regarding the teacher's effectiveness will be based.

The process of categorizing the factors upon which teachers are judged by the twenty-three city school districts followed several distinct steps. A first step in the analysis of the factors involved the arbitrary establishment of categories into which the various criteria, standards, or principles could be grouped and classified. The writer, after having worked with the factors and having acquired a
definite familiarization, made a judgment determination. He established certain major categories such as "personal characteristics," "professional preparation and professional growth," "interpersonal relationships," and "teaching skills" for the categorization of factors.

The next step involved analyzing each factor, which was identified by the school districts, and placing each criterion or factor into one of the major categories. Criterion which did not seem to relate clearly to any of the established categories was placed in the "general category." Up to this stage, the original working of the criteria, standards, or principles had been largely retained. Each category of factors was then re-examined and those which appeared to have the same meaning in spite of slightly different wording were combined. One of the categories was designed "other responses" and contained seventy-seven items which, according to the writer's judgment, were not classifiable within the other five categories.

The terms "criteria and standards," although used in this section, did not seem to be descriptive of the type of information found in the twenty-three districts' programs for appraising teacher performance since a standard or norm was not suggested by a single school district. For example, the single word "cooperation" was given as a criterion by several of the school districts, yet there were no indications given by these same school districts as to the level, quality, or kind of cooperation which was desired. In light of this, the word "factors" may more accurately describe the basis for teacher appraisal rather than "criteria, standards, or principles."

The following table is a summary of the factors used by the
twenty-three major Ohio school districts to appraise teacher effectiveness. Factors were ranked by category in the order of frequency with the most frequently-found factors appearing at the top of each category. The group designated "miscellaneous factors" within each category contains those items mentioned only once.

TABLE 6

FACTORS OF EFFECTIVE TEACHING UPON WHICH TEACHERS ARE APPRAISED IN 23 SELECTED OHIO CITY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grooming and general appearance</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and vigor</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice and effective speech</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional stability and maturity</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound judgment</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poise and self-control</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility, adaptability to change</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of humor</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal qualities or characteristics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindness, consideration, and patience</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-confidence and control</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural interests</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resourcefulness and industriousness</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership and executive ability</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows intellectual curiosity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous factors</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>114</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Professional Attitudes**                           |           |
| Professional ethics                                  | 10        |
| Response to supervision, suggestions, school policies, and procedures | 10        |
| Recognition and acceptance of out-of-class responsibilities | 9         |
| Attitude toward school and teaching                  | 7         |
| Public relations                                     | 5         |
TABLE 6—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in school related activities or organizations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm for working with children</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to appraise self critically</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shares willingly materials, techniques, and knowledge with others</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous factors</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional Preparation and Professional Growth

| Professional growth                                                   | 10        |
| Professional participation                                           | 8         |
| In-service growth                                                     | 7         |
| Effort to improve or self-improvement                                 | 4         |
| Keeping abreast of current practices                                  | 3         |
| Miscellaneous factors                                                 | 13        |
| **Total**                                                             | **45**    |

Interpersonal Relationships

| Parent-community relationships                                       | 18        |
| Relationships with the staff                                         | 17        |
| Rapport or relationships with pupils                                  | 15        |
| Cooperation with administration                                      | 5         |
| Miscellaneous factors                                                 | 11        |
| **Total**                                                             | **69**    |

Teaching Skills

| Planning and organizing                                              | 19        |
| Variation in materials and teaching techniques                        | 16        |
| Knowledge of subject                                                  | 14        |
| Classroom control or discipline                                       | 14        |
| Providing for individual differences                                  | 12        |
| Student motivation and participation                                  | 11        |
| Classroom atmosphere or environment                                   | 10        |
| Effective pupil evaluation                                            | 7         |
| Classroom management                                                  | 6         |
| Use of good teaching principles                                       | 5         |
| Professional and teaching skills                                      | 5         |
| Student growth and achievement                                        | 5         |
| Skilled in questioning and explaining                                 | 4         |
| Assignments clear and reasonable                                     | 4         |
| Improves student study and work habits                                | 4         |
| Definite goals and objectives                                         | 3         |
| Provides opportunity for student self-evaluation                      | 3         |
| Achieves desired results or goals                                     | 3         |
TABLE 6—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional effectiveness</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages independent thinking</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves pupil self-direction</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous factors</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>165</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Responses

| Promptness and accuracy of reports      | 8         |
| Punctuality and attendance             | 6         |
| Broad general knowledge                | 2         |
| Counseling of students                 | 2         |
| Provides for student safety            | 2         |
| Does not permit outside activities to interfere with school work | 2 |
| Regards student information as confidential and shares it only with authorized persons | 2 |
| Miscellaneous factors                  | 53        |
| **Total**                               | **77**    |

**Total For All Categories**           | **531**   |

It is important to note that "personality" factors were found with greater frequency (114) than any other category except "teaching skills" (165). The factor of "grooming and general appearance" was the most frequently-mentioned "personality" factor, being mentioned by 17 school districts, while two school districts mentioned the factors "creativity" and "intellectual curiosity."

"Professional ethics" and "response to supervision, school policies, and procedures" were the most frequently-mentioned "professional attitudes." The words, "conformance to school policies," were used by a majority of the school districts when referring to "response to supervision, school policies, and procedures." "Willingness to appraise self critically" was mentioned by only two school
It was somewhat of a surprise to the writer that more school districts did not mention factors relating to "professional preparation and professional growth." Not only was there an overall low frequency of mention, but there were also a limited number of different factors identified for this category.

"Parent-community relationships" was the most frequently-mentioned "interpersonal relationship." This factor was found more frequently (not a level of significance) than "rapport or relationships with pupils."

"Planning and organizing" was the most frequently-mentioned "teaching skill." "Classroom control or discipline" also ranked high on the list. Only two school districts mentioned "encourages independent thinking" and "improves pupil self-direction."

The factors mentioned most-frequently in the "other responses" category were "promptness and accuracy of reports" and "punctuality and attendance."

The writer found that the factors used to appraise teacher performance were expressed in behavioral terms by eight of the twenty-three school districts. While the degree of specificity varied among the eight, the writer judged them to be expressed behaviorally. No district identified standards or norms for their "so-called" criteria.

The writer judged the following examples of "so-called" criteria for appraising teacher performance, used by one school district, to be the most complete among the twenty-three school districts:
1. Skill in planning
   a. Content and procedures are selected to achieve purposes of the lesson and of long-term plans.
   b. Daily plans are written in the plan book, detailed enough for the teacher's use or for a substitute, if necessary. These may be checked weekly by the principal or assistant principal upon four school days advance notice.
   c. There is thorough understanding of the material to be taught.
   d. There is sufficient familiarity with the lesson plan and teachers' guides so that they are used effectively and creatively.
   e. Plans provide variety balance in types of activities.
   f. Necessary chalk board preparation has been made prior to the beginning of class. Chalk board should be used throughout the lesson for clarification as needed.
   g. Teaching aids, such as cards, charts, books, and films, are ready for use.

2. Resourceful use of instructional materials
   a. A variety of materials is used to stimulate interest and enrich learning.
   b. Materials are properly related to the class work and are appropriately timed.
   c. The ideas of pupils and other approaches are considered although the textbook is the primary resource.

3. Skill in using motivating techniques
   a. The teacher uses questions leading into the day's work, pictures or other concrete materials, and short reviews.
   b. Lessons provide a balance of pupil and teacher interaction.
   c. The enthusiasm of the teacher is sustained throughout the lesson.
4. Skill in questioning techniques
   a. Is closely related to pupils' level of comprehension.
   b. Makes pupils think reflectively and deeply.
   c. Motivates them to read, to find out, and to create.
   d. Helps pupils clarify meanings and check understandings.
   e. Helps pupils organize their thinking in a logical way.
   f. Helps pupils pull a number of ideas together, to generalize.
   g. Points out how new learnings can be applied.

5. Skill in making assignments
   a. Pupils are helped to relate new subject matter to previous learnings.
   b. Presentation follows planned steps for most effective learning and shows adjustment to needs of the group and individuals.
   c. Worthwhile and interesting assignments are presented clearly and explicit directions are given.
   d. Classwork and homework assignments are made realistic in length and difficulty to the grade, ability, and home background of the student.

6. Ability to recognize and provide for individual differences
   a. The teacher shows a personal interest in each pupil's progress.
   b. Each pupil is helped to achieve the maximum of his ability through varying assignments and teaching methods.

7. Skill in developing good work study habits
   a. High standards of work are consistently encouraged.
   b. Opportunities are provided for creative, independent work . . .

From the information obtained from the school districts, the
writer was unable to ascertain the procedures which were followed in the development of the "factors" of effective teaching or the participants in the development of the "factors."

The Appraisers

In almost one-half of the systems (11 of 23), the principal is the sole person to evaluate teachers. Five other districts indicated that the principal, while having the responsibility for teacher appraisal, is assisted in the task by assistant principals, unit principals, coordinators, or supervisors.

Six of the districts indicated that the principal or immediate supervisor is responsible for appraising teacher performance.

None of the districts indicated that department chairmen had any formal responsibility for appraising teacher performance. One district indicated that department chairmen or subject specialists may make classroom observations, but only for the purpose of assisting the teachers.

Unique to the above practices was a procedure used by one of the school districts where the teachers are represented by an A.F.T. affiliated teachers' organization. In this district, first and second-year teachers may request a formal observation by one of their peers.

The procedure is as follows:

First and second-year teachers may request a formal observation by a teacher agreed upon between the principal and teacher in their respective departments (primary, intermediate, junior high, high school). Such observations by other teachers shall be given equal value with any other formal observation in appraising the overall work of the teacher. The same standards, criteria, and forms shall be used, and the observation must be followed by a conference.
It shall be considered unethical for the teacher evaluator to confer in any way with any administrator prior to the conference once the request is made. The teacher evaluator shall be given adequate released time. Recommendation to the Office of Teacher Personnel shall be the responsibility of the principal.

Preparation of Appraisers in the Application of Appraisal Techniques

The information received from the twenty-three school districts did not elude to there being any opportunities for appraisers to gain special preparation in the application of appraisal techniques. Several of the appraisal programs had written instructions that were geared to the appraisers, (e.g., the role of the appraiser, responsibilities of the appraiser, person(s) who should conduct the appraisals, etc.).

Establishment of Goals for Improvement or "Performance Targets"

Ten of the twenty-three school districts combined teacher self-appraisal with the establishment of goals for improvement or "performance targets." One of these ten school districts only used "performance targets" for tenure teachers, while teachers on a limited contract were evaluated by a traditional rating scale.

The programs for appraising teacher performance, which utilized the goals for improvement or "performance targets" procedures, were essentially patterned after George B. Redfern's procedures, How to Appraise Teaching Performance. Dr. Redfern was formerly the Assistant Superintendent for Staff Personnel, Cincinnati City Schools, and has
been a most active consultant to various Ohio school districts.

A brief description of the "performance" or "job targets" method of appraisal, as contained in a bulletin published by one of the ten school districts using this approach, is given at this point.

In general, procedures used are as follows:

On or before October 15, a preappraisal conference is held with the appraisee and appraiser(s). The appraisee receives the appraisal report forms and explanatory information regarding the process. Prior to November 1, the appraisee and appraiser(s) have a conference to determine job targets, using a prepared list as guides. The job or performance targets are written on "work sheets." November through March 30, the teacher and appraiser(s) work together to achieve the performance targets. Not later than April 1, the teacher completes a self-appraisal on the job or performance targets. Not later than April 1, the principal or appraiser(s) evaluate job targets and overall teacher performance on the "appraisal report." Prior to April 10, the appraiser(s) and teacher meet to discuss the year's work and progress on job targets. The teacher may (not required) react to the appraisal by completing a particular section of the "appraisal report." The teacher's signature on the report indicates completion of the process; not necessarily concurrence. Prior to June 1, a post-appraisal conference is held. This activity outlines and establishes an agreed upon specific follow-up activity.

**Systematic Observation of Classroom Activities**

The majority of the programs for appraising teacher performance professes that teacher appraisal is a continuous process, however, actual practices seem to refute this position.

Twenty-one of the twenty-three major Ohio school districts' programs for appraising teacher performance included administrative rules and regulations which specified the minimum number of formal classroom observations to be conducted when appraising teacher performance. (A formal classroom observation is generally considered
to be at least ten minutes in duration and for the purpose of appraising teacher performance). Of these twenty-one school districts which had minimum frequency requirements, such requirements took a variety of forms. In fact, the writer found fifteen different types of frequency requirements. The most prevalent (5 of the 23 school districts) minimum frequency requirement was at least two formal classroom observation of every teacher on tenure or a continuing contract yearly. About 80 per cent of the systems evaluated beginning teachers or probationary teachers more often than continuing or tenure teachers.

Five of the twenty-one districts which identified frequency requirements only required formal classroom observations for teachers on a limited contract. Generally, teachers on tenure could request a formal observation, or they would be observed if their performance was deemed marginal or unsatisfactory.

One school district's requirement was simply that any unsatisfactory teacher would be observed and evaluated twice a year.

The school districts' rules and regulations called for a conference to be held by the appraiser(s) and appraisee following each classroom observation in twenty of the twenty-three school districts. Some of the administrative rules and regulations were quite specific and indicated that the conference should be held the same day or within twenty-four hours of the classroom observation.

There were no indications that video tape recorders were used to record classroom proceedings by any of the school systems, nor was there any indication that some form of systematic analysis of classroom interaction was being used by any of the districts.
Use of Student "Feedback" Instruments

Starting with the 1971-72 school year, a student "feedback" instrument will be used by one of the school districts. All other districts do not use such instruments. The instrument to be implemented by the aforementioned school district is to be used at the option of the teacher, and the results of student evaluation will remain with the teacher and need not be revealed to anyone. There was no indication of grade level or student age limitations regarding the use of the "feedback" instrument.

Since only one student "feedback" instrument was in existence, the writer chose to reproduce it in its entirety, thus providing the reader with an opportunity to gain some insights regarding the nature of the instrument. The instrument is as follows:

**FORM A - RETAINED BY TEACHER**

Rating Code:  
S = Satisfactory  
NI = Need Improvement  
IE = Insufficient Evidence

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Teacher usually shows respect, concern, and warmth for all students regardless of race, religion, intellectual, or socioeconomic status.
2. Teacher usually is confident and usually maintains self-control.
3. Teacher is patient most of the time.
4. Teacher is well-groomed and dresses neatly.
5. Teacher is honest with students.
6. Teacher is punctual.
7. Teacher has a good sense of humor.
8. Teacher is generally respected by students.
9. Teacher's voice is pleasant, clear, and expressive.
10. Teacher usually holds students' attention.
11. Teacher is usually enthusiastic.
12. Teacher is reasonably flexible in his class direction.
13. Teacher uses a variety of methods and approaches in his teaching.
14. Teacher tries to stimulate learning.
15. Teacher is usually prepared.
16. Teacher encourages students: ideas, suggestions, and investigation of special areas.
17. Teacher usually answers students' questions.
18. Teacher is fair in his grading.
19. Teacher interacts with students in class.
20. Teacher understands students' problems.
21. Teacher is usually in a good mood.
22. Teacher admits his errors rather than trying to cover up.
23. Teacher allows students time to think without pressure to get the "answer."
24. Teacher gives students individual attention as needed.

**Teacher Self-Appraisal**

The use of some type of teacher self-appraisal procedure was a prevalent practice among the major Ohio school districts. Eighteen of the twenty-three city school districts utilized some type of teacher self-appraisal. The typical self-appraisal procedure followed the pattern of the teacher appraising himself according to the prescribed appraisal instrument, the principal appraising the teacher using either the same instrument or an identical copy, and the teacher and principal then conferring to discuss the appraisals. Eight of the districts used appraisal instruments designed for cooperative appraisal which provided parallel columns in order that both the teacher and principal or appraiser might register their appraisal on the same copy of the form.

Self-appraisal was optional at the choice of the teacher in two of the eighteen school districts which used some form of self-appraisal. The optional self-appraisal was a narrative type whereby the teacher evaluated himself in a narrative report, without the benefit of any specific criteria or rating form.
In-service Education Opportunities for Professional Staff Members

Although the Ohio State Department of Education standards require each school district to provide an adequate in-service education program for professional staff members, mention of in-service education relating to their programs for appraising teacher performance was made by only two of the school districts. One of these district's regulations stated: "Not more than 1.5 days annually, with full pay, shall be provided within the school calendar for the purposes of in-service education." The second district indicated that in-service courses are held between 4:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m., one day a week, for five or ten weeks.

Teachers' Signatures on Appraisal Forms

The most uniform practice or procedure of programs for appraising teacher performance, found in the twenty-three school districts, was the teacher signature on the appraisal form or instrument. Only one school district did not follow this practice. That particular school district's procedures called for the teacher to receive a copy of the appraisal, but there were no provisions for the teacher to sign the form.

In general, the teachers' signatures did not signify concurrence with the appraisal, but rather that the teacher had an opportunity to read the appraisal.

Several of the school districts' policies were quite complete concerning what information could be filed in the professional
personnel files. An example of one district's policies in this area is as follows:

I. Upon request by the certificated person, he shall be given immediate access to the contents of his file or, if he so desires, the certified personnel will be furnished a reproduction of the contents of his file with the exception of letters of recommendation. All recommendations will be considered confidential and unavailable to the certified personnel.

II. No material derogatory to a certified personnel's conduct, service, character, or personality shall be placed in the files unless the teacher has had an opportunity to read the material. The certified personnel shall acknowledge that he has read such material by affixing his signature on the actual copy to be filed, with the understanding that such signature merely signifies that he has read the material to be filed. Such signature does not necessarily indicate agreement with its content. In case of refusal to sign, the president of the local teachers association shall be notified in writing of the evaluation for reference. This will be kept in the record for future use.

III. The certified personnel shall have the right to answer any material filed, and his answer shall be reviewed by the Assistant Superintendent of the appropriate division and attached to the file copy.

Person(s) Responsible for Recommending to the Superintendent Retention, Promotion, or Dismissal of Teachers

It was found that the person(s) responsible for recommending to the superintendent of schools the retention, promotion, or dismissal of teachers were the principal and/or immediate supervisor.

The principal had the sole responsibility for this decision in more than one-half of the school districts (13 of 23). While the principal had the responsibility, several of these school districts indicated that recommendations by a coordinator(s), assistant
principal, and supervisor were to be taken into consideration by the principal in making his decision. One district's procedures indicated that when a teacher served in more than one building, there should be a consensus of the principals regarding the recommendation.

The principal or immediate supervisor was designated the responsibility by seven of the districts. Three of the major Ohio school districts did not specify who had the responsibility for recommending to the superintendent the retention, promotion, or dismissal of teachers.

No district indicated that the responsibility for the decision was a team approach or effort.

**Appeal Procedures Open to Teachers**

Table 7 denotes the appeal procedures that are available for teachers wishing to register dissent from the appraiser's assessment of his performance. While the formal policies or procedures from the respective districts indicated that only two school districts included provisions for teachers to initiate grievance procedures in the event that they had a dissenting opinion, it is the belief of the writer that the grievance route can be pursued in more than the two districts. The writer believes that if he had received detailed grievance procedures from all districts, the grievance procedures would have borne this out.

It is important to note that appeal procedures were not identified by eight of the twenty-three districts.
TABLE 7

APPEAL PROCEDURES OPEN TO TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appeal to personnel office, assistant</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>superintendent, or superintendent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No appeal procedures indicated</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiate grievance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File dissenting statement with review board</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attach dissenting statement to form</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signify dissent on form</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Informing new Teachers of the Appraisal Program

While it is reasonable to assume that many of the twenty-three school districts explain the appraisal program to new teachers, only two districts mentioned this condition in their procedures or teachers' handbook. One district's procedures stated:

Staff members, especially new teachers and non-tenure teachers, should be oriented to the philosophy, criteria and procedure of evaluation. The Teacher Evaluation Program of the "P" Public Schools should be included as part of the preschool workshop and during the early weeks of the school year. The principal of each building is responsible for presenting this program.

In addition to orienting new teachers to the purposes, objectives, and procedures of the appraisal program during the orientation program for new teachers, the second school district indicated that prospective teachers were informed of the appraisal program during the interview(s).
Periodic Evaluation of the Appraisal Program

Only one of the twenty-three school districts included references in its policies and procedures to the process which is followed in evaluating the effectiveness of its teacher appraisal program. This sole reference is as follows:

A review committee composed of representatives of the Association and representatives of the administrative staff shall meet periodically to make recommendations for the improvement of the evaluation procedure.

The fact that written policies or procedures regarding the evaluation of programs for appraising teacher performance, seemingly, do not exist in all but one school district, does not necessarily mean that such programs are not periodically evaluated. Rather, this is another indication of the incompleteness of existing policies and procedures pertaining to programs for appraising teacher performance.

In an attempt to obtain data regarding policy positions held by certain national and state educational associations pertaining to programs for appraising teacher performance, the writer sought information from the Ohio Education Association, National Education Association, Ohio School Boards Association, National School Boards Association, Buckeye Association of School Administrators, and the American Association of School Administrators. The writer had intended to contrast the policy positions held by the aforementioned associations with the criteria developed in Chapter II of this study and prevalent practices found in twenty-three major public school districts, as reported in this chapter.

Of the above mentioned associations, only the Ohio Education
Association and the National Education Association had formal
resolutions or policy positions pertaining to teacher appraisal.

In an Ohio Education Association position paper on teacher
evaluation, the following guidelines were listed for the development
of personnel evaluation programs:

The development of staff evaluation programs must involve
representatives of the staff to be evaluated.

The program of staff evaluation must be consistent with
the stated philosophy of the school district.

The board of education, administration, and staff must,
in the early stages of development, come to agreement on
the purposes of evaluation.

The staff evaluation program should have as its primary
goal the improvement of the personnel evaluated.

Self-evaluation should be a part of the total program.

Follow-up activities must be an integral part of the
evaluation program.

The program should concentrate on performance and
not be reduced to rating scales of teacher personality.

A program of evaluation will require the commitment
resources of staff, funds, and time.\textsuperscript{117}

Further, the Ohio Education Association position is summarized
by the following statement:

The OEA position on staff evaluation is that evaluation
should be directed toward self-improvement of the employee;
therefore, we would recommend either the "job target" or
self-appraisal instrument" approach to evaluation with the
necessary concomitant commitment from the building admin-
istrators. These systems permit the teacher to take the

\textsuperscript{117}"Teacher Evaluation an OEA Position Paper" Prepared by
the Commission on the Improvement of Education in Ohio and the
Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards (Mimeo-
graphed) August 29, 1970, p. 3.
initiative for identifying the job targets and increases the likelihood that constructive actions on the part of the teacher will be forthcoming.

When using either the "job targets" or "self-appraisal instrument," there is the necessity of the teacher to become responsible for some improvement; however, it is totally unrealistic to believe that this will take place unless the building administrator allows and helps to support the teacher's personal commitment. It is not only highly desirable but absolutely necessary that each school system permit the local building principal to make this type of commitment by such activities as: released time for in-service work; to supply the necessary supportive services required; to provide the special counseling services required; and to provide the opportunities necessary for teachers to help one another. The OEA fully recognizes that one of the implications of such recommendations is that a good evaluation program would require the additional expenditure of funds to ensure its effectiveness. Also, any true process whereby individuals will be held responsible for self-improvement must be the result of some type of organizational structure in which they will have some real impact upon the decisions that will affect them. The staff must, therefore, be active participants in the school's evaluation process and the responsibilities for this function as they relate to their roles in the teaching-learning situation.\textsuperscript{118}

The National Education Association has adopted the following formal resolutions related to teacher appraisal:

\textbf{C-6. Evaluation and Subjective Ratings}

The National Education Association believes that it is a major responsibility of educators to participate in the evaluation of the quality of their services. To enable educators to meet this responsibility more effectively, the Association calls for continued research and experimentation to develop means of objective evaluation of the performance of all educators, including identification of (a) factors that determine professional competence; (b) factors that determine the effectiveness of competent professionals; (c) methods of evaluating effective professional service; and (d) methods of recognizing effective professional service through self-realization, personal status, and salary.

\textsuperscript{118}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 6-7.
The Association insists that each educator has access to all items in his personnel file, except privileged communications related to his initial employment, and shall have the right to attach a written response to any item. A procedure shall be established to remove inappropriate or unfounded material from personnel files. A copy of any evaluation report placed in the educator's file must be given to the educator.

The Association further believes that use of subjective methods of evaluating professional performance for the purpose of setting salaries has a deleterious effect on the educational process.

The Association believes that the use of examinations such as the National Teacher Examination is an undesirable method for evaluating educators in service for purposes such as salary, tenure, retention, or promotion. Such examinations should not be used as a condition of employment of an educator when the candidate is a graduate of an institution accredited by the National Council of Accreditation of Teacher Education.

C-28. Written Personnel Policies

The National Education Association insists that personnel policies be written and be developed cooperatively by local associations and boards of education where they are, at present, not subject to the negotiation process.

C-36. Continuing Employment and Fair Dismissal Practices

The National Education Association believes that laws in each state must provide for the continuing employment of educators.

The Association also believes that provisions in state laws and master contracts must afford educators, before demotion, dismissal, or nonrenewal of contract for good and just cause the following:

a. Timely and adequate notice of hearing, including a statement of charges.

b. A fair hearing with opportunity to confront and cross-examine witnesses and to present argument and evidence in defense.
c. Representation by legal counsel.

d. A decision based upon the evidence adduced at the hearing, with a statement of the reasons for the decision and evidence relied upon by an impartial decision-maker.

The Association urges its affiliates to seek the inclusion of these provisions in state laws and master contracts and will support its affiliates in such efforts.119

The Ohio Education Association's position paper on teacher evaluation concurs with the writer's criteria for teacher appraisal programs (as developed in Chapter II) on every point. While there seems to be complete concurrence, the Ohio Education Association's position paper is not as extensive or complete as the writer's criteria. Notable omissions are the lack of mention of standards of effective teaching, use of student "feedback instruments," use of systematic observations of classroom activities, and procedures for the internal evaluation of the appraisal program.

The position of the National Education Association is more concerned with procedures regarding information placed in personnel files; the opposition to use of subjective evaluation methods and the National Teacher Examination for salary, tenure, retention, or promotion decisions; the desirability of written personnel policies; and continuing employment and fair dismissal practices. The writer agrees with the National Education Association's position, however, he views the position of the Ohio Education Association as more positive, complete, and relevant to teacher appraisal programs.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this chapter, the writer summarizes the major conclusions of the study. These conclusions derived from the study are supported by the study's major findings. Recommendations which have developed out of the research are presented. Included in the recommendations are refined criteria for evaluating teacher appraisal programs.

General Summary

One purpose of the study was to develop criteria that can be used in the evaluation of programs for appraising teacher performance; a second purpose of the study was to assess the status of such programs as evidenced by the practices and procedures followed by selected Ohio city school districts. The latter purpose made possible the testing and application of the criteria in a field setting.

A jury of authorities in the field of teacher appraisal was utilized as a means of testing the appropriateness of the criteria developed by the writer. Inquiries were mailed to central office administrators in the twenty-five largest Ohio public school districts. The inquiries yielded information sufficient for the writer to report the significant characteristics of twenty-three of the twenty-five programs for appraising teacher performance.
Conclusions of the Study

The conclusions of the study, supported by the major findings, are presented in two different phases: the jury responses and the study of teacher appraisal programs and practices in twenty-three Ohio city school districts.

Conclusions Regarding Responses of the Jury

1. There was substantial agreement among the vast majority of the jurors regarding the many criteria for evaluating teacher appraisal programs, as developed by the writer. The majority of the jurors agreed with 17 of the 18 general criteria and 28 of the 29 procedural criteria. (Agreement consisted of a combination of both "strongly agree" and "agree" responses.) Ten of the eighteen general criteria received unanimous agreement by the jurors. Unanimous agreement was given by the jurors to 10 of the 29 procedural, or implementing, criteria.

2. The ratings of importance assigned by the jurors to the general and procedural, or implementing, criteria suggest that certain of the criteria may be regarded as being of greater value for a viable program for appraising teacher performance than are others.

The general criteria received ratings, which in turn were weighed, ranging from a low of 34 to a high of 47. The range of weighed ratings for the procedural, or implementing, criteria was from 20 to 46.
Conclusions Regarding Teacher Appraisal Programs and Practices in the Twenty-three Selected School Districts

1. The program for appraising teacher performance, as presented in the writer-developed criteria, was not practiced in any of the school districts. While certain features of the appraisal programs generally followed the criteria (e.g., establishment of goals for improvement, teacher self-appraisal, and confidentiality of appraisal data), the vast majority of the practices proposed by the criteria were not found in the twenty-three selected school districts.

2. Maintaining and improving the quality of instruction appeared to be the primary goal of the majority of the teacher appraisal programs, as opposed to professional growth and development of staff members or such administrative purposes as teacher dismissal, transfer, promotion, and the like.

More than one-half (13 of 23) of the school districts have as the primary goal of their appraisal program, "the maintaining and improving the quality of instruction." Five of the districts cited "the professional growth and development of staff members" as their primary goal. Two of these same five districts mentioned with equal importance the goal of "improving the quality of instruction." Four of the twenty-three Ohio public school districts did not identify any goals for their programs for appraising teacher performance.

3. In general, there was a distinct lack of cognizable purposes and objectives for the teacher appraisal programs.

Cognizable purposes and objectives for the teacher appraisal program did not exist in fifteen of the twenty-three city school districts. The cognizable purposes and objectives that were
established by eight school districts were so diverse that the writer was unable to discern any common characteristics among them.

4. Programs for appraising teacher performance were not considered a matter of high priority in many of the twenty-three school systems.

This conclusion was based on the findings which revealed a lack of information pertaining to: the specific financial resources being provided to support the programs, the opportunities for appraisers to gain special preparation in the application of appraisal techniques, and the in-service education opportunities for professional staff members. Further, the conclusion was based on the lack of: cognizable purposes and objectives, comprehensive board of education policies and administrative rules and regulations, and systematic classroom observation techniques for appraising teacher performance.

5. Comprehensive, written board of education policies and administrative rules and regulations pertaining to programs for appraising teacher performance were lacking in the vast majority of the school districts.

The board of education policies in fifteen school districts were judged to be extremely incomplete and somewhat void of administrative rules and regulations. Two other school districts did not have identifiable board of education policies pertaining to the teacher appraisal program.

6. In general, little reference was made to behavior indicators of teacher performance, and standards or norms for teacher effectiveness were nonexistent.

Factors used to appraise teacher performance were expressed
in behavioral terms by eight of the twenty-three school districts. No district identified standards or norms for their "so-called" criteria for teacher effectiveness.

7. There was some indication that the most prevalent factors used in the appraisal of teachers are those which relate to personal characteristics or interpersonal relationships.

"Personality" factors were found with greater frequency than any other category of factors except "teaching skills." The factor of "grooming and general appearance" was the most frequently-mentioned "personality" factor.

The combined frequency of "personality" and "interpersonal relationships" factors outranked the category of "teaching skills."

8. The teacher appraisal programs placed little emphasis on student growth and achievement when assessing teacher effectiveness.

Only five of the school districts identified "student growth and achievement" as a factor of effective teaching. No indications were found that pointed to the use of specific student growth and achievement instruments, tests, or records as one means of assessing teacher effectiveness.

9. The building principal was designated as having the primary responsibility for appraising teacher performance, although supervisors bore a joint responsibility with principals in a small percentage of the school districts.

In almost one-half of the systems (11 of 23), the principal was the sole person to evaluate teachers. Five other districts indicated that the principal, while having the responsibility for teacher appraisal, was assisted in the task by assistant principals,
unit principals, coordinators, or other supervisors.

Six more of the districts indicated that the principal or immediate supervisor was responsible for appraising teacher performance.

10. The involvement of more than one person in the appraisal process was a somewhat limited practice, except in cases where teachers are not achieving satisfactory or expected levels of performance.

In almost one-half of the systems (11 of 23), the principal was the sole person to evaluate teachers. Only one school district made provisions for formal appraisal by one of the teacher's peers. There was a widespread tendency toward involving a central office administrator, supervisor, or coordinator in cases where a teacher's performance was marginal.

11. The classroom observation techniques used do not allow for a consistently valid and reliable determination of a teacher's performance.

Twenty-one of the twenty-three districts specified the minimum of classroom observations to be conducted when appraising teacher performance. The most prevalent (5 of the 23 school districts) minimum frequency requirement was at least two classroom observations yearly of every teacher on a limited contract and at least one formal classroom observation of every teacher on tenure or a continuing contract. No school district required more than two classroom observations of a teacher. About 80 per cent of the systems evaluated beginning teachers or probationary teachers more frequently than continuing or tenure teachers.

There were no indications that video tape recorders were used
to record classroom proceedings, nor was there any indication that some form of systematic analysis of classroom interaction was being used by any of the districts.

12. The work of George B. Redfern, *(How to Appraise Teaching Performance)*, has made a considerable impact on appraisal programs in the selected school districts.

Ten of the twenty-three school districts combined teacher self-appraisal with the establishment of goals for improvement or "performance targets."

The procedures for establishing "performance targets" were essentially patterned after George B. Redfern's procedures, *How to Appraise Teaching Performance*. Most of the instruments and procedural statements used by the ten districts were identical to those developed by Redfern.

13. Student "feedback instruments" were not utilized in the appraisal process.

Only one school system developed a student "feedback instrument" and the use of this instrument was to be implemented starting with the 1971-72 school year at the option of the teacher.

14. The use of some type of teacher self-appraisal procedure was common practice in the school districts.

Eighteen of the twenty-three districts utilized some type of teacher self-appraisal procedure. Self-appraisal was optional at the choice of the teacher in two of these eighteen school districts.

15. In general, the Ohio Education Association's position on teacher appraisal is compatible with the criteria developed by the writer.
16. In general, the teacher appraisal programs of the school districts did not reflect the current concern for: accountability on the part of the public, usefulness and validity on the part of the teaching profession, and acceptability on the part of the school administration.

The status of programs for appraising teacher performance, as reflected by the practices followed in the selected Ohio city school districts, has not changed significantly from those practices reported by earlier studies and researchers. The findings of the study revealed a general lack of behavioral indicators of teacher performance and a void of standards or norms for teacher effectiveness. Further, systematic classroom observation techniques were generally lacking and teacher appraisal was still predominantly subjective in nature.

Recommendations for Further Study

Based upon the review of the literature and the findings of this study, the writer recommends for further study the following problems:

1. The effects of professional negotiations and/or collective bargaining upon programs for appraising teacher performance.

2. The development of standards of effective teaching that can be objectively employed in an appraisal program designed to identify staff development needs.

3. The validity of student growth and achievement results as an indication of teacher effectiveness.

4. The impact of in-service education programs and activities on teacher effectiveness.

5. The study of the nature and content of preparation and training needed by the appraisers.
6. The development of a program for inclusion in college and university teacher education experiences which is designed to provide future teachers with self-appraisal and goal-setting skills.

Criteria for Teacher Appraisal Programs

In Chapter II, the writer established certain general and procedural, or implementing, criteria which may be used to judge programs for appraising teacher performance. The responses of the jury of authorities, and to a lesser degree the practices found in the twenty-three Ohio city school districts, caused the writer to revise some of the criteria. Any revisions or additions to the criteria are underscored. The revised criteria are presented as follows:

1. The program should have as its primary goal the personal growth and development of each professional staff member.

2. There should be cognizable purposes and objectives for the teacher appraisal program.

   2.1. The purposes and objectives of the program for appraising teacher performance should be identified by a committee comprised of representatives from classroom teachers, building principals, central office administration, supervisors, laymen (including board of education), and students.

   2.2. Classroom teachers should constitute a majority of the membership on the committee.

   2.3. Consensus should be gained among the committee members on the purposes and objectives of the program for appraising teacher performance.

   2.4. The purposes and objectives of the program for appraising teacher performance should be explicit.
3. There should be a commitment by the board of education to the importance of the program for appraising teacher performance.

3.1. There should be financial resources provided to support adequately the program.

3.2. There should be some rational planning technique or approach, such as Planning-Programming-Budgeting-Systems (PPBS), for relating the board's commitment to the program to specific resources.

4. There should be wide, active involvement at all levels of the professional staff in the development of policies and procedures pertaining to teacher appraisal.

4.1. Classroom teachers should constitute a majority of the representatives on committees and other ad hoc bodies which are involved in developing policies and procedures pertaining to teacher appraisal.

5. The policies, rules, and regulations pertaining to the program for appraising teacher performances should be formalized.

5.1. Written policy statements should be adopted by the board of education which will provide a framework for the effective execution of the appraisal program.

5.2. Written administrative rules and regulations should be developed which enumerate and specify the procedures to be followed in implementing and administering the written policies.

6. Clear and meaningful criteria, standards, or principles of effective teaching should be developed and defined in terms that will insure a common meaning to all members of the professional staff.

6.1. The criteria, standards, or principles of effective teaching should be expressed in terms of observable teacher and student behavior.

6.2. Classroom teachers should constitute a majority of the representatives on committee and other ad hoc bodies which are involved in developing criteria, standards, or principles of effective teaching.
6.3. **Criteria, standards, or principles of effective teaching** should be **weighted in terms of their relevance or value.**

7. The actual appraisal of teacher performance should be a team effort.

7.1. An appraisal team consisting of the teacher himself, the building principal or assistant principal, and two "master" teachers at his grade level and/or subject area should serve as the appraisers.

7.2. The appraisers should serve as advisors to the teacher.

7.3. The emphasis should be on the performance and not on the personality of the teacher.

7.4. The appraiser-teacher relationship should be one of mutual trust and confidence, and non-threatening in nature.

7.5. Each teacher should develop a job description which is reviewed and mutually agreed upon by the appraisal team.

8. **Provisions should be made for special preparation and training for those personnel whose responsibility it is to carry out the appraisal function.**

8.1. The special preparation and training of personnel participating in the appraisal process should be initiated prior to their involvement in the actual appraisal.

9. Each teacher should establish **goals for improvement** or "performance targets" that clearly identify improvement to be achieved.

9.1. Goals for improvement or "performance targets" should be both short and long-term in nature.

9.2. The goals for improvement or "performance targets" should be limited to a reasonable number, meaning a number for an individual teacher which he sees as feasible and obtainable.

10. **Systematic observations of the classroom activities**
of students and teachers should be one of the major sources of data concerning teacher performance.

10.1. Classroom observations should be mutually planned and agreed upon by the appraisers and the teacher.

10.2. Teacher members of the appraisal team should be given released time for classroom observations.

11. Student growth and achievement results should be analyzed by the appraisal team since such results may relate to teacher performance.

12. Student "feedback" instruments should be used to provide the appraisal team with additional insight regarding the teacher's performance.

13. Teacher self-appraisal should be one of the most important aspects of the program for appraising teacher performance.

13.1. Teachers should rate their own performance against standards or principles of effective teaching and their established "performance targets."

14. The appraisal of teacher performance should be a continuing process.

14.1. The appraisal team should meet periodically during the year to review the progress of the teacher.

14.2. A summary of each appraisal conference should be prepared and entered into the teacher's personnel file.

14.3. Teacher members of the appraisal team should be given released time for the conferences.

15. Extensive in-service opportunities should be available to teachers to enhance their personal growth and development.

16. All appraisal data should be kept confidential.

16.1. Only information signed by all members of the appraisal team should be placed in the teacher's personnel file.
17. The appraisal team should take part in decisions regarding the retention or dismissal of the teacher.

17.1. The building principal should retain the primary responsibility for retention or dismissal decisions.

18. There should be provisions in board of education policies, rules, and regulations which afford teachers procedural due process before demotion, dismissal, or nonrenewal of contract.

18.1. There should be opportunities for the teacher to have a fair hearing by the board of education.

18.2. The teacher should have the right to representation by legal counsel at such hearings.

19. The appraisal program should be fully explained to new teachers.

19.1. The purposes, objectives, practices, and procedures of the appraisal program should be explained to all teachers prior to employment, reviewed again during the orientation program for new teachers, and made available in written form for easy reference.

20. All aspects of the program for appraising teacher performance should be periodically evaluated.

20.1. Each year a permanent evaluation committee, including representatives from the original committees on purposes and objectives, policies and procedures, and standards should evaluate the effectiveness of the program for appraising teacher performance.

20.2. Revisions should be made in the program when deemed advisable in light of evaluation results.

The first revision was a minor word revision to criterion 2.1. Rather than listing separately the board of education and laymen, the two were combined since board of education members are laymen.

The overwhelming rejection by the jury of authorities of criteria, standards, or principles of effective teaching being
developed exclusively by classroom teachers was the basis of the writer's revision of criterion 6.2. After much reflection on the original criterion, the writer perceived that public school systems are not yet ready to accept this college or university-based procedure.

The findings from the review of the practices found in the twenty-three school districts' programs for appraising teacher performance prompted the writer to add criterion 6.3. It was evident from the practices that serious problems arise in setting "goals of performance" or "job targets" and, in turn, performing self-appraisal and other appraisal activities when standards or principles of effective teaching are not assigned weighted values. Certainly all the functions and activities and performance of a teacher are not of equal importance to the teaching-learning process. It is quite unfair to the teacher to assume that they are of equal importance.

Additional study by the writer and some of his more recent research experiences in performance contracting caused the writer to add criterion 11—"student growth and achievement results should be analyzed by the appraisal team since such results may relate to teacher performance." The findings of the study revealed that few of the twenty-three school districts took into consideration student growth and achievement when appraising teacher performance. The writer is of the opinion that teachers and school systems have a definite responsibility to measure and evaluate student growth and achievement and that differences in student growth and achievement may be related directly to teacher performance.
Criterion 17 was revised because the jury of authorities rejected somewhat strongly the proposition that the appraisal team should recommend a teacher to the superintendent for retention or dismissal. Criterion 17.1 was added as a means to define the role of the principal in retention or dismissal decisions.

Criterion 18 through 18.2 were added at the advice of one of the writer's reading committee members and the findings of the survey of practices of the twenty-three school districts. Generally, policies, rules, and regulations of the twenty-three school districts did not treat adequately provisions for procedural due process.

The minor revision to criterion 19.1 was due to an omission by the writer in the wording of the original criterion.

The writer believes that the above criteria and the findings and conclusions of the study should be of value to teachers, administrators, and laymen when they approach the task of developing, revising, or evaluating programs for appraising teacher performance.
APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER SENT TO THE 12-MEMBER JURY OF AUTHORITY

2675 Valley View Road, N.E.
Route #5
Lancaster, Ohio 43130

As part of a doctoral dissertation I have established certain criteria to judge programs for appraising teacher performance. These criteria have been developed, in part, from a survey of the literature. In order to secure some validation of these criteria, they are being subjected to the judgment of persons who have gained recognition in some phase of staff personnel work. Because of your work in this field, I am seeking your assistance in judging the worth of these criteria.

Enclosed is a list of the criteria which you are requested to rate. The list includes both general and procedural, or implementing, criteria. The general criteria are numbered 1, 2, 3, etc. The implementing, or procedural, criteria are numbered 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, etc.

Two rating scales have been provided. An explanation of each scale appears at the beginning of the list. Space is provided at the bottom of each page for adding other criteria which you believe are important.

As I indicated during our recent telephone conversation, after you have completed the ratings, I would greatly appreciate the opportunity to discuss the criteria with you. I will be calling you within several days to establish a meeting time which is convenient for you. I can pick up your completed rating form when we meet.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

Stephen L. Stuart

Enclosure
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO THE 12-MEMBER JURY OF AUTHORITY
Please rate the criteria below on the two scales provided. The first scale is the Agreement Scale, which is represented by the letters "SA," "A," "U," "D," and "SD." The code for this scale is as follows:

SA. The respondent **strongly agrees** with the criterion.
A. The respondent **agrees** with the criterion.
U. The respondent **is undecided** about the criterion.
D. The respondent **disagrees** with the criterion.
SD. The respondent **strongly disagrees** with the criterion.

For each criterion, please **circle** the letter(s) which most accurately describe(s) your judgment.

The second scale is the Importance Scale, which is represented by the numbers 4, 3, 2, 1, and 0. The purpose of this scale is to determine your opinion of the importance of each criterion as related to the other criteria. The code for this second scale is as follows:

4. The criterion is of **great** importance.
3. The criterion is of **much** importance.
2. The criterion is of **some** importance.
1. The criterion is of **little** importance.
0. The criterion is of **no** importance.

For each criterion, please **circle** the number which most accurately describes your opinion.

You are encouraged to add criteria you consider important which were not included by the writer. Space is provided at the bottom of each page for this purpose.

1. **The program should have as its primary goal the personal growth and development of each professional staff member.**
   SA A U D SD
   4 3 2 1 0

2. **There should be cognizable purposes and objectives for the teacher appraisal program.**
   SA A U D SD
   4 3 2 1 0

2.1. **The purposes and objectives of the program for appraising teacher performance should be identified by a committee comprised of representatives from the board of education, central office administrative staff, building principals, supervisors, students, laymen, and classroom teachers.**
   SA A U D SD
   4 3 2 1 0

2.2. **Classroom teachers should constitute a majority of the membership on the committee.**
   SA A U D SD
   4 3 2 1 0
2.3. Consensus should be gained among the committee members on the purposes and objectives of the program for appraising teacher performance.

2.4. The purposes and objectives of the program for appraising teacher performance should be explicit.

3. There should be a commitment by the board of education to the importance of the program for appraising teacher performance.

3.1. There should be financial resources provided to support adequately the program.

3.2. There should be some rational planning technique or approach, such as Planning-Programming-Budgeting-Systems (PPBS), for relating the board's commitment to the program to specific resources.

4. There should be wide, active involvement at all levels of the professional staff in the development of policies and procedures pertaining to teacher appraisal.

4.1. Classroom teachers should constitute a majority of the representatives on committees and other ad hoc bodies which are involved in developing policies and procedures pertaining to teacher appraisal.

5. The policies, rules and regulations, pertaining to the program for appraising teacher performance, should be formalized.

5.1. Written policy statements should be adopted by the board of education which will provide a framework for the effective execution of the appraisal program.

5.2. Written administrative rules and regulations should be developed which enumerate and specify the procedures to be followed in implementing and administering the written policies.

6. Clear and meaningful criteria, standards, or principles of effective teaching should be developed and defined in terms that will insure a common meaning to all members of the professional staff.

6.1. The criteria, standards, or principles of effective teaching should be expressed in terms of observable teacher and student behavior.
6.2. The criteria, standards, or principles of effective teaching should be developed exclusively by classroom teachers.

7. The actual appraisal of teacher performance should be a team effort.

7.1. An appraisal team consisting of the teacher himself, the building principal or assistant principal, and two "master" teachers at his grade level and/or subject area should serve as the appraisers.

7.2. The appraisers should serve as advisors to the teacher.

7.3. The emphasis should be on the performance and not on the personality of the teacher.

7.4. The appraiser-teacher relationship should be one of mutual trust and confidence, and non-threatening in nature.

7.5. Each teacher should develop a job description which is reviewed and mutually agreed upon by the appraisal team.

8. Provisions should be made for special preparation and training for those personnel whose responsibility it is to carry out the appraisal function.

8.1. The special preparation and training of personnel participating in the appraisal process should be initiated prior to their involvement in the actual appraisal.

9. Each teacher should establish goals for improvement or "performance targets" that clearly identify improvements to be achieved.

9.1. Goals for improvement or "performance targets" should be both short and long-term in nature.

9.2. The goals for improvement or "performance targets" should be limited to a reasonable number, meaning a number for an individual teacher which he sees as feasible and obtainable.
10. Systematic observations of the classroom activities of students and teachers should be a major source of data concerning teacher performance.

10.1. Classroom observations should be mutually planned and agreed upon by the appraisers and the teacher.

10.2. Teacher members of the appraisal team should be given released time for classroom observations.

11. Student "feedback" instruments should be used to provide the appraisal team with additional insight regarding the teacher's performance.

12. Teacher self-appraisal should be one of the most important aspects of the program for appraising teacher performance.

12.1. Teachers should rate their own performance against standards or principles of effective teaching and their established "performance targets."

13. The appraisal of teacher performance should be a continuing process.

13.1. The appraisal team should meet periodically during the year to review the progress of the teacher.

13.2. A summary of each appraisal conference should be prepared and entered into the teacher's personnel file.

13.3. Teacher members of the appraisal team should be given released time for the conferences.

14. Extensive in-service opportunities should be available to teachers to enhance their personal growth and development.

15. All appraisal data should be kept confidential.

15.1. Only information signed by all members of the appraisal team should be placed in the teacher's personnel file.
16. The appraisal team should recommend a teacher to the superintendent for retention or dismissal.

17. The appraisal program should be fully explained to prospective teacher employees.

17.1. The purposes, objectives, practices, and procedures of the appraisal program should be explained to prospective teacher employees when they are interviewed for a position, and reviewed again during the orientation program for new teachers.

18. All aspects of the program for appraising teacher performance should be periodically evaluated.

18.1. Each year a permanent evaluation committee, including representatives from the original committees on purposes and objectives, policies and procedures, and standards should evaluate the effectiveness of the program for appraising teacher performance.

18.2. Revisions should be made in the program when deemed advisable in light of evaluation results.
APPENDIX C

LETTER SENT TO 25 OHIO CITY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

2675 Valley View Road, N.E.
Route #5
Lancaster, Ohio 43130
December 23, 1970

You are probably inundated with requests from doctoral candidates asking you to complete some type of survey instrument or questionnaire. I too am writing a dissertation; however, my request does not involve much of your valuable time.

Programs for appraising teacher performance is the thrust of my dissertation. One objective is to discern some of the current practices in Ohio. Any information requested will be kept in strict confidence and no mention of a specific school district will be made in the study.

I would be most indebted to you, if you would forward me a copy of the following information pertaining to your program for appraising teacher performance:

1. All board of education policy pertaining to your program.
2. All administrative rules and regulations pertaining to your program.
3. Any instruments you use to appraise teacher performance.
4. Any teacher manuals or orientation manuals pertaining to your program for appraising teacher performance.
5. Any other pertinent information regarding your program not included in items 1-4 above.

Again, as a school administrator with former responsibilities for staff personnel at Lancaster, Ohio, I realize the demands on your time. (This year I am working half-time at Battelle Memorial Institute as an Educational Researcher while attempting to complete the dissertation at The Ohio State University.)

Your prompt response to this request will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Stephen L. Stuart
APPENDIX D

THE TWENTY-FIVE LARGEST OHIO CITY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ohio City School District</th>
<th>Student Enrollment*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cleveland</td>
<td>153,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Columbus</td>
<td>113,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cincinnati</td>
<td>90,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Toledo</td>
<td>66,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dayton</td>
<td>57,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Akron</td>
<td>56,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Parma</td>
<td>26,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Youngstown</td>
<td>25,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Canton</td>
<td>22,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Springfield</td>
<td>18,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Lorain</td>
<td>17,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Berea</td>
<td>17,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Kettering</td>
<td>16,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Hamilton</td>
<td>16,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. South-Western</td>
<td>15,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Warren</td>
<td>14,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Willoughby-Eastlake</td>
<td>13,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Elyria</td>
<td>13,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Middletown</td>
<td>13,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Cleveland Heights-University Heights</td>
<td>13,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Mansfield</td>
<td>12,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Cuyahoga Falls</td>
<td>12,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Lima</td>
<td>11,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Euclid</td>
<td>11,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Lakewood</td>
<td>10,320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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