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Initially American schools were held as mainly essential to the preparation of men as leaders and practitioners in the professions. Secondary education was maintained principally to prepare a chosen few for higher education wherein they could obtain the training necessary to carry them into professional life. Elementary schools were training grounds for those who would eventually be professionals to pass into academic secondary schools and hence to mastery of college and university curriculum. Only those families of higher social and economic position whose sons were expected to pursue a professional career were able to avail themselves of this schooling. Tutors working in these privileged homes taught the fundamental elementary subjects or they were studied in cooperatively run small private schools. This concept of education for the privileged few was generally accepted; however, Thomas Jefferson, though himself a patrician, gave impetus to a move toward education for all under the banner and ideals of a true democracy.

2Ibid., p. 2.
As the country expanded under democratic principles, schools became public and were taken from private control and brought under control of the selectmen of the separate political entities.  In those early days of public education teacher evaluation was quite unstructured.

The town's selectmen visited schools to make sure a teacher was carrying out the wishes of the community in teaching reading, ciphering, and writing. Criteria used for judging teacher performance varied from one official to another, but they usually centered upon the degree of pupil 'discipline' and the smoothness of recitation of subject matter during the time of the visitation.

Burton and Brueckner suggest that this early supervision was initially conceived of as a form of inspection. Its earliest beginnings were probably in Boston, when in 1709 a group of citizens was appointed to inspect pupil achievement as well as the physical facilities of the school. This arrangement of selectmen as inspectors continued until the field of educational administration began to evolve at which time the responsibility gradually shifted

---


from lay people to the newly created positions of Principal and Superintendent. While the responsibility may have shifted, evidently the method did not; for Burton and Brueckner contend that the inspection approach to supervision was carried forward until the 1920's when it finally began to change to one of democratic leadership.

McGaughy concluded in his work on the evaluation of the elementary school in 1937 that: "It is entirely impossible to even list all of the important changes which have taken place in elementary education in so short a period of time since 1900." His implication was that changes had taken place in all areas, however, McCartha found in a survey of ten southeastern states conducted in 1947-1948 that only 170, or 21.9 percent of the 778 administrative units that responded to his inquiry, used formal evaluation plans at all. The literature is replete with changes that have been manifest in all phases of elementary school organization since its early beginnings, but the popular notion

7Ibid.
10Carl W. McCartha, An Evaluation of Teacher Merit as it is Conducted in a Selected Group of Southeastern States, 1947-1948, Bulletin No. 73 (Gainsville, Florida: Bureau of Educational Research, University of Florida, 1949).
that little change has been made in procedures or criteria for evaluation of teachers seems to be supported. Chandler and Petty imply further verification of this notion by stating: "Logically some definite type of evaluation should\textsuperscript{11} be established in order to judge the effectiveness of the teaching process."\textsuperscript{12}

As recently as 1974 the writings of Lipham and Hoeh reflect the same ambiguous criteria of "teaching effectiveness (however defined) . . . personal qualities, nature of interpersonal involvement, and (the) extent of professional growth. . . ."\textsuperscript{13} The question of what to evaluate is a perennial problem to which educators have directed sustained research efforts without reaching a satisfactory consensus.\textsuperscript{14} For example, Morch and Wilder concluded after reviewing research on teaching effectiveness published between 1900 and 1952, "No single, specific, observable teacher act has yet been found whose frequency or percent of occurrence is invariably (and) significantly correlated

\textsuperscript{11}underline added


with student achievement." In a 1974 presentation about
the work of the Ohio State Department of Education,
G. Robert Bowers, Assistant Superintendent of Instruction
for Ohio stated:

The dynamics of quantitative growth in education
have been stilled for the moment. In large measure,
except to provide for balances of an ever-increasing
mobile society, the struggle for enough classrooms has
been met. The fight for a sufficient number of teachers
has been won. The challenge today is to tackle the
elusive qualitative aspects of improving education for
all youngsters.

Though his remarks were keyed to improvement of educational
programs, inherent in that improvement is the upgrading of
teacher performance. For the beginning teacher, this chal­
lenge is made to the teacher training institutions within
whose cloistered walls the novice is to learn effective
techniques and methodologies. For the teachers already on
the job, this challenge is made to their supervisors and
principals who work with them on a day-to-day basis and who
are responsible for rating and reporting their strengths
and weaknesses. Robert B. Howsan contends: "Wherever there

15 J. E. Morch and E. W. Wilder, Identifying the
Effective Instructor: A Review of Quantitative Studies,
1900-1952, Research Bulletin No. APTRC-TR-54-55 (San

16 G. Robert Bowers, "An Overview of the State
Department of Education," Speech presented to a conference
of college professors and doctoral students, Columbus, Ohio,
22 November, 1974.
are human beings, there will be evaluation."\(^7\) This reference is speaking not of informal judgments made in daily contacts, rather of the formal processes and procedures of a systemized series of evaluations keyed toward improvement of the total instructional program.

The topic of teacher evaluation would certainly rank high on a list of topics that elicit opposing opinions of desirability, utility, positive or negative results and even ambivalence\(^8\) for evaluation is by its very nature a complex and difficult task. Within the educational community itself the elements upon which the evaluation should be based have not yet been clearly defined to the satisfaction of all concerned. Chandler supports this contention by arguing:

There is lack of agreement as to which teachers in service are successful. Superintendents, principals, supervisors and others who evaluate teaching differ in their judgments as to what the successful teacher does. There is no uniformity in the rating of teachers as successful or unsuccessful. Some administrators and supervisors talk about teaching efficiency in terms of personal qualities, some in terms of performance or ability to do, and others in terms of behavioristic controls such as attitudes, ideals, and knowledges.\(^19\)

---


\(^{19}\)Chandler and Petty, Personnel Management in School Administration, p. 84.
Although agencies proclaim the essential purpose of evaluation is to assist all persons in doing a better job and to continuously improve the educational program, the operation of evaluational procedures has led many, if not most, teachers to conclude that the primary purpose is to eliminate those who do not play the game or act in the image held by the administrator.\textsuperscript{20} From his review of teacher evaluation systems Harsch concluded, "There are reasons for support of the contention that a host of administrative barbarities have been perpetrated in its application."\textsuperscript{21} Not all school districts and administrators can be characterized as barbaric in this sense for some are continually seeking a better way, however, agreement on issues is far from universal. Castetter rather succinctly sums up these efforts:

For more than half a century school systems across the nation have been experimenting with performance appraisals. From this experience the only consensus that has developed is that performance appraisal is not a matter of choice. It must be carried out in every organization.\textsuperscript{22}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{20}Harsch, "A Look at Teacher Evaluation," p. 4.
  \item \textsuperscript{21}Ibid.
\end{itemize}
No one can argue the worth of evaluation as a determiner for new directions and goals, however, it must be considered in both the broad context of the total educational program and in more specific terms pertaining to the individual teacher and student. Both of these must in some way be related to performance of individuals within the system as perceived by those outside of that system. With the advent of community involvement, the public is becoming increasingly concerned about the schools and is demanding accountability which is closely related to if not the basis for the evaluation process.23 Schooling is more and more a matter of broad societal concern: today the specification of educational objectives include references to wider social, political, and economic problems than ever before in history. The schoolhouse is no longer an isolated establishment holding interest only for its students and their parents. The issues which arise there cause excitement and concern in many sectors of society.24


The recently emerging public concern for accountability in public education has brought with it a reemphasis on the evaluation of all phases of the educational environment. Though the professionals in the field have devised a great many ways to evaluate a great many aspects of education, there is a decided lack of concurrence on any single evaluative measure to determine if teachers are really doing a "good job" of teaching. It is this lack of concurrence which has brought about frustration and confusion within the profession and has led to an overemphasis on personnel supervision in some areas and a complete lack of supervision in others. Within a single state one may find a district where supervisory visits are required in each classroom at least once a week while in a neighboring district teachers may look forward to a supervisory visit for evaluative purposes once a year at best.

State Departments of Education and State Legislatures nationwide have been pressed on the accountability issue in education to the point that some have taken legislative action in the form of legislative mandates.


to insure that personnel evaluation and accountability is carried out throughout their areas of jurisdiction. Some of the legislation is broad and general; some rather detailed and specific. It is these legislative mandates and, more specifically, the changes that have been wrought in teacher practices and relationships in one state, California, as a result of a state legislative mandate for evaluation, that this study examined.

**Statement of the Problem**

The purpose of this study was to determine the perceived changes in and influence on selected aspects of elementary teacher behavior as a result of the requirements of the Stull Act. The unstated rationale behind the Stull Act was to bring about improvement of instruction in the California public schools. Among the many changes considered essential to this improvement were the following: imposition of various new teaching methods, modification of existing teaching methods, possible alteration of aspects of teacher relationships with pupils and administrators, and variation in the allocation of teacher time to certain areas. Specifically, this study identified, delineated, and examined changes and the positive or negative influence of those changes as perceived by elementary teachers and principals in the following major areas of teacher behavior:
1. Teaching methods and practices
2. Teacher-pupil relationships
3. Teacher-principal relationships
4. Allocation of teacher time to:
   a. Subject matter areas
   b. Interpersonal contacts
   c. Other activities

**Significance of the Problem**

Historically, state legislative bodies have not dealt directly with specific procedures and criteria for evaluation of public school personnel. They have instead provided broad and permissive guidelines under which evaluative procedures were to be developed locally by the professionals in the field. The apparent lack of acceptance of this responsibility, or the poor results in teacher evaluation by many school administrators and districts throughout the nation, has prompted state governments to intervene with legislation requiring personnel evaluation. This intervention has far-reaching implications for local administrators in that it constricts local autonomy in an area which has historically been their prerogative.

This study is of significance to educators and state legislators concerned with public educational policy in several ways. First, it contributes to the extremely
limited body of literature focusing on legislatively mandated evaluation of professional educators. Second, it provides an analysis of the effects of such legislative action on teaching practices and on personal relationships between teachers and pupils and between teachers and principals. Third, the study provides a framework for similar studies in other states to evaluate the effectiveness of legislatively mandated evaluation programs. Fourth, based on conclusions drawn from this and subsequent studies, inferences can be made by state legislators for revision of existing legislation to make it more relevant to its purpose, and guidelines can be drawn from which states can decide the viability of legislation in this area.

Only after a number of exploratory studies of this nature have been conducted can it be decided that a comprehensive set of guidelines can be developed and applied on a statewide basis for fair and definitive evaluation of teachers.

**Methodology**

This study was designed as an ex post facto exploratory field study based upon similarity of conditions cited by several authoritative authors. Kerlinger defines field studies as ex post facto inquiries which discover the relations and interactions among variables
in real social structures. He further limits the scope of field studies by stating that the independent variables are not ordinarily manipulated by the investigator. In his discussion of the types of field studies, Katz defines the exploratory type as seeking what is rather than predicting what will be. He further contends that exploratory field studies have three purposes: (1) to discover significant variables in the field situation; (2) to discover relations among variables; and (3) to lay significant groundwork for later, more systematic, and rigorous testing of hypotheses.

The prime consideration in the selection of a research methodology for this study was that the conclusions drawn from the data have pragmatic significance for those in the field and that they be realistically reflective of the actual state of affairs as they existed. Kerlinger cites realism and significance as the most dominant strengths of the field study technique and

---


28Ibid.


30Ibid., p. 75.

that: "The realism of field studies is obvious. Of all types of studies, they are closest to real life. There can be no complaint of artificiality."\textsuperscript{32}

A secondary consideration, but of equal importance, was that the capacity for scientific relevance be reflected in the analysis. Wiersma states that in ex post facto studies "a structure which resembles an experimental design may be superimposed upon the data, primarily for analysis purposes."\textsuperscript{33} Travers supports the contention that clear cut lines between the many research designs are not always apparent by arguing that:

Just as there is no clear cut line of demarcation between the carefully planned laboratory experiment and the demonstration or exploration, so too is there none between field studies and laboratory experiments.\textsuperscript{34}

The study was conducted in the non-clinical field situation of the California elementary educational system and was concerned with assessing the degree of change brought about in certain teaching practices and teacher relationships by imposition of the Stull Act on that system. Because it was conducted with educators actively involved in the business of education and the variables

\textsuperscript{32}Ibid., p. 407.


were not manipulated in any way, it met the criteria of a field study. Although the variables were specifically identified in advance by the investigator and not discovered in the field situation, the study met the remaining criteria for the exploratory type as designated by Katz\textsuperscript{35} in that it sought to discover the relationships between variables and provided groundwork for later studies. The study met the final criteria of ex post facto in identifying and assessing the degree of change that had occurred as a result of the relationships of the variables and did not attempt to predict outcomes resulting from variable manipulation.

A mail survey questionnaire was employed to gather data relative to subject perceptions of change in teacher behavior brought about by imposition of the Stull Act. Two separate instruments were developed; one for responses by teachers and one for responses by principals. The item content of both instruments was identical, however, the teacher's instrument elicited self-perceptions of change and the principal's instrument sought their perceptions of teacher change.

A Likert type scale was selected for use as a measure of perception in that it provided for flexibility

in the respondents' reaction to each item. For the determination of Means, the greatest decrease in action and/or the greatest negative influence response in each category was assigned a value of one point. A value of five points was assigned to the greatest increase in action and/or the greatest positive influence response category.

The questionnaire items were developed in the non-disguised structure to yield data in each of six major areas. The response to each item was comprised of two separate but related parts. The first part elicited a perception of direction and degree of change. The second part elicited a perception of direction and degree of influence as a result of the change.

An item analysis was obtained for each of the following populations which yielded frequency distributions and Means for each item:

1. Total population of the sample
2. Teacher sub-group
3. Principal sub-group

A data display reflecting the item analysis was included as appendices to the study. There existed no justification for assuming that the data were normally distributed, therefore, only nonparametric statistical methods were employed.

The questionnaire items were grouped into the two categories of (1) perception of degree of change; and
(2) perception of degree of influence as a result of that change. Kendall's tau was used to determine the correspondence of the perceptions of change to the perceptions of influence within each item. Specifically, the form of Kendall's tau employed for this determination utilized the formula:

\[ \tau(r) = \frac{S}{\frac{1}{2} N(N-1)} \]

with a significance level set at .05.

The data produced by the individual items were combined within each of the major areas designated for study. Within each major area they were separated into responses (1) reflecting change; and (2) reflecting influence. They were then manipulated to produce readings of perceptions for each of the following groups:

1. Total sample population
2. Teacher sub-group
3. Principal sub-group
4. S.E.S. Sub-groups.

The Mann-Whitney U test was employed for comparison of perceptions of teacher and principal sub-groups. This test was constructed for use with uncorrelated data from samples with varying size and to determine if two independent sample groups have been drawn from the same
population. It is considered by Seigel\(^{36}\) and by Downie and Heath\(^{37}\) to be the most powerful of the nonparametric tests. The computations were made according to the following:

Let \( R \) = the sum of ranks in the lower group, then

\[
U + R - \frac{M(M+1)}{2}
\]

where

\( M \) = the number of observations in the lower group.

The Kruskal-Wallis test was employed to determine the differences between samples grouped according to the three categories of socioeconomic status. It is a one-way analysis of variance by ranks used to determine whether \( k \) independent samples are from different populations. Sample values usually differ somewhat, and this test answers the question of whether differences among samples signify genuine population differences or not. A \( \chi^2 \) value was obtained to determine significance levels.

The Kruskal-Wallis formula employed was:

\[
H = \frac{12}{N(N+1)} \sum_{j=1}^{k} M_j(R_j - R..)^2
\]


Where there existed a significant difference in the average rankings between the three groups according to the Kruskal-Wallis test, the Dunn Multiple Comparison test was employed to determine where the difference existed between the three groups. The Dunn Multiple Comparison formula employed was:

\[ (Z) \left( \sqrt{\frac{N(N+1)}{12}} \right) \left( \sqrt{\frac{1}{M_2} + \frac{1}{M_3}} \right) = \]

Limitations of the Study

As stated previously, the central focus of this study was upon elementary teacher and principal perceptions of change as a result of an intervening influence from outside the system. The intervening influence was the Stull Act which required alterations in existing procedures for teacher evaluation. While the rationale for the legislation contended that the experience of working through the alterations in evaluation procedures would result in positive change in teacher behavior, it remained to be determined if that experience held real meaning for those involved. Allport contended that "experiences almost always have a meaning," however, he qualified this contention by further stating: "The meaning seems to derive from the fact that experience-elements do not come as single unrelated items; there is a complex or aggregate
of elements having a certain interrelationship." It is also recognized that in most instances of human endeavor and interaction that actual knowledge is a less significant factor than the individuals' perceptions of the existing conditions. Lindzey and Aronson support these contentions by cautioning that:

One of the major limitations on control which concerns us is the extent to which unmeasured individual differences may obscure the results. . . . Our subjects differ from each other genetically, in learned personality characteristics, in values and attitudes, and in immediate past experiences. Any and all of these differences may have a large impact on the way in which subjects respond.

It is therefore recognized that individual reflection upon changes taking place over a three-year period may have been influenced by a great many external non-related factors and herein lies a critical limitation of the study. Despite this limitation, however, Babbe argues:

Respondents can be asked to report on their past behavior. Such questions are subject to problems of recall and honesty, of course . . . and he may let his memory play tricks on his candor, especially if

---


behavior in question is currently regarded as either good or bad. Despite these shortcomings reports of past behavior can often be very useful.41

While personal bias could not be eliminated from the data, wording of the response items and diversity of the sample tended to neutralize individual bias to a great degree.42

The legislation under study contained two distinct divisions. The first dealt primarily with dismissal criteria and procedures. The second established criteria and procedures for evaluation and assessment of certificated employees. The study was limited to the change brought about as a result of the provisions contained in the second division, specifically California Education Code, Article 5.5, Section 13487 (see appendix A).

The third limitation concerns the use of the questionnaire approach for data collection. The lack of flexibility in a structured questionnaire prohibits in-depth questioning and the opportunity for clarification and feedback.

Although the legislation concerned all certificated employees, the sample population of the study was limited to elementary teachers of Kindergarten through


42Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research, pp. 118-120, 412.
sixth grades and those principals by whom they were supervised. Although the methods of teaching are commonly felt to be different between the primary and upper elementary grades and therefore difficult to equate, basic generalizations concerning teacher behavior were drawn from the total responses of the population sub-group of teachers combined and applied to implications for the controlling legislation.

The study did not attempt to assess change in all areas of elementary teacher behavior. Those areas selected for the study were selected as representative of the areas implied and explicitly stated by provisions of the legislation.

**Definition of Terms**

There were several terms utilized in this study in need of definition not because of their inherent uniqueness but because of their ambiguity within the profession. The definitions were offered to provide an understanding of their use within the context of this study.

**Adjunct duties**

Those activities in addition to the primary duties and responsibilities as defined in the job description for each class of employee.
Assessment

The act of determining the degree or amount of; a determination resulting from the evaluation process.

Assessment criteria

Demonstrable levels of performance upon which a determination or decision may be based.

Certificated employees or personnel

Those employees of school districts whose positions require credentials or certification requirements.

Counseling

A conference between the evaluator and the evaluatee in which recommendations and resources are suggested for improving performance. The conference or counseling may be in addition to formal observation and evaluation conferences.

Evaluatee

One who is evaluated.

Evaluation

The process of making assessments concerning the professional accomplishments and competencies of a certificated employee based on broad knowledge of the area of performance involved, the characteristics of the situation of
the individual being evaluated, and the specific standards of performance pre-established for the position.

Evaluator

One who evaluates or assesses the performance of another.

Goal

A statement of broad direction or intent which is general and timeless and is not concerned with particular achievement within a specified period of time.

Learning climate

A physical and psychological environment that motivates learning.

Objective

A devised accomplishment that can be verified within a given time and under specifiable conditions which, if attained, advances the system toward a corresponding goal.

Other duties

See adjunct duties.

Professional educator

Synonymous with certificated employee.
Proper control

An exercise of influence over an individual or a group in order to facilitate learning opportunities.

Socioeconomic status

On the California Assessment Program Report, classroom teachers were asked to indicate the occupation of the principal bread winner of the family for each individual child. For its computations the State Department of Education grouped the occupations into three income groups and assigned numerical values of 1, 2, or 3 to each of the groups to designate income levels. The numerical designation corresponded to the three major socioeconomic levels commonly used in sociological studies; 1 = low, 2 = middle, 3 = high. The unweighted numerical values were then averaged to obtain a S.E.S. reading for individual schools and individual school districts. These readings were then ranked on the state level to determine the percentile ranking by school and by district. The State print-out utilized in this study did not report the findings by socioeconomic levels as indicated above, only by percentile ranking. The numerical values were utilized for computational purposes only.

Verification by the Office of Program Evaluation and Research, California State Department of Education
supported the definition of Socioeconomic Status by percentile ranking as follows:

- **Low S.E.S.** : 1st to 30th percentile inclusive
- **Middle S.E.S.** : 31st to 69th percentile inclusive
- **High S.E.S.** : 70th to 99th percentile inclusive.

---

**Standard**

That which is set up and established by authority or mutual acceptance as a basis for the measure of quantity, value, or quality.

**Standard of performance**

An authoritative or mutually established level of accomplishment.

**Student progress**

Demonstrated mastery of new and/or additional material over previously determined levels of competency.

**Stull Act**

California Assembly Bill 293 (1971) authored by Senator John Stull (D) San Diego, California.

---

Suitable learning environment

An adequate or proper set of conditions which facilitate opportunities for learning. (see also Learning climate)

Teacher behavior

Those actions taken by teachers having a direct relationship to on-the-job functions and relationships affected by provisions and requirements of the Stull Act and specified in the questionnaire.

Teacher competency

The criteria contained in the guidelines for objective evaluation and assessment of teacher performance as developed by individual school districts as required by provisions of the Stull Act.

Uniform evaluation system

A system of evaluation that applies the same guidelines and standards in a consistent manner to all employees of each type or class of certificated employee.

Organization of the Study

The study was organized into five chapters as follows:
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

a. Statement of the Problem
b. Significance of the Problem
c. Methodology
d. Limitations of the Study
e. Definition of Terms

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

a. Design of the Study
b. Data Collection Procedures
c. The Sample Selection
d. The Research Instrument
e. Data Analysis Procedures

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The first section of the literature review was concerned with general background information on state legislation for mandated teacher evaluation. This included a review of the legislation passed by several of the states enumerating the general provisions and specific details. The final section was concerned specifically with the legislation enacted in California.

In order to establish a rationale for this type of legislation, the following question must be addressed: On what basis and under what legal right do the states dictate policy and more importantly procedures to local school districts?

Education, or the establishment of educational systems, is not one of the rights reserved to or designated responsibilities of the Federal Government under the United States Constitution, nor is it assigned to or forbidden to the separate states. Therefore, the establishment and governance of education falls to the separate states under provisions of the Tenth Amendment which reads: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor
prohibited by it to the states are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people." Although the Federal and State governments interact on policies, only the constitutions and statutes of the states provide for and give details as to educational governance. They are held inviolate so long as they are not in conflict with the Federal Constitution. It can be concluded then that the separate states have plenary power and jurisdiction over educational policy within their political boundaries.

With the possible exception of teacher certification requirements, the states have generally left the policy decisions of actual operation of the educational systems to local school districts within broadly established precepts. According to Rourke, the way policy decisions are made within a democracy has traditionally been designed in terms of two criteria, (1) the responsiveness of the system; and (2) the effectiveness of the system. It obviously has become apparent to some state legislatures that the local educational systems have not been "responsive" or "effective" in the area of personnel evaluation and have taken legislative action to correct this deficiency.

---

In 1967, in an effort to provide some continuity to educator evaluation throughout their state, the Florida Legislature passed a mandate governing the evaluation of all instructional, administrative, and supervisorial personnel. This was the earliest of such mandates made by a state legislative body and marked the beginning of what may prove to be a nationwide trend. Since that time, either legislatures or state departments of education have effected similar mandates in the following states: South Dakota (1969); Hawaii (1969); Washington (1970); Oregon (1971); California (1971); Virginia (1972); Alabama (1972); Kansas (1973); Nevada (1973); Arizona (1974); and Connecticut (1974). Most of the legislation or department of education mandates center around dismissal procedures for certificated personnel; however, of necessity they also set guidelines, specific and general, for personnel evaluation. Table 1 showed the major comparable provisions of the twelve states' mandated statutes except for the "Basis for Evaluation" criteria which were not provided for in some of the legislation. The information was


3Ibid., p. 48.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAWAII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD. DAKOTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OREGON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRGINIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALABAMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KANSAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVADA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIZONA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNECTICUT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1**

**Mandated Evaluation Provisions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANDATED BY</th>
<th>TYPE OF MANDATE</th>
<th>PROCEDURAL DEVELOPMENT BY</th>
<th>PERSONNEL TO BE EVALUATED</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF EVALUATION</th>
<th>BASIS FOR EVALUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislature</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>County Office</td>
<td>All Certified Employees</td>
<td>At least annually</td>
<td>Objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Dept of Educ</td>
<td>Regulation</td>
<td>State Dept of Educ</td>
<td>All Educational Personnel</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Subjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>State Commission</td>
<td>Classroom Teachers</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>District Administration</td>
<td>All Certified Personnel</td>
<td>At least annually</td>
<td>Open for district development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>State Dept of Educ</td>
<td>All Certificated Personnel</td>
<td>At least annually</td>
<td>Competency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature</td>
<td>Regulation</td>
<td>District Certificated Employees</td>
<td>All Certificated Personnel</td>
<td>At least annually for probationary; biannually for perm.</td>
<td>Evaluation by objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature</td>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>District Administrators and State Dept of Educ</td>
<td>All School Personnel</td>
<td>Annually continuous and periodically</td>
<td>Testing and subje ctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Individual Schools</td>
<td>All Professional Personnel</td>
<td>Semiannual for years 1-2; annual for years 3-4; tri-annually thereafter</td>
<td>Developed by each school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Teachers and Administrators separately</td>
<td>All Certificated Personnel</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Competency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Consortium of 20 districts</td>
<td>All Certified Personnel</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Competency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>District Administrators</td>
<td>All Certificated Personnel</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Competency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ascertained from Redfern,⁵ the Education Commission of the States,⁶ and data collected from a telephone survey of State Departments of Education.⁷ Samplings by Redfern⁸ in Florida, Washington, and Hawaii indicated that traditional subjective criteria were being utilized in teacher evaluation in those states. The remainder of the states either stated explicitly the basis for evaluation, or implied it in the wording of the law.

Most of the states included specific provisions other than those reflected in table 1. These additional provisions and explanations for clarification of the various statutes were briefly summarized. The information cited for Florida, Hawaii, South Dakota, Washington, Oregon, California, and Virginia was garnered from Redfern's⁹ work with additional information for Virginia provided by Ross.¹⁰

⁶Ross, General Governance and Administration, Passim.
⁷Telephone surveys to Departments of Education of Arizona, Nevada, and Kansas, November, 1974.
¹⁰Ross, General Governance and Administration, Supplement, p. 14.
Florida

1. Evaluations must be made by the Superintendent, Principal or person who directly supervises the individual.

2. Evaluatee must be shown his written evaluation and have it discussed with him.

3. A copy of the completed evaluation form on each certificated employee must be on file in the county office.

Hawaii

Teachers in Hawaii will be rated on:

1. Ability to stimulate each student to achieve learning results commensurate with his or her ability.

2. Demonstration of a satisfactory level of ability to teach the subject matter in their fields of specialization.

3. Cooperation with their colleagues.

4. Acceptance of responsibility for making their particular school and the district as a whole successful institutions for learning.

5. Demonstration of professional standards of conduct.

Evaluation forms will include sections for assessing:

1. Instructional skills
2. Professional attitudes
3. Personal characteristics

Evaluators will assess each teacher on each section of the form by indicating either satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

Teacher observation sheets and conference work sheets are also provided by the state.
South Dakota

1. Every independent school board shall adopt a policy statement on supervision and evaluation.

2. A State Professional Practices Commission shall be established to develop criteria, standards, and procedures for evaluation and rating of teachers. This development shall include provisions for separate district flexibility.

3. It was recommended to the districts that Evaluation by Objectives be utilized in teacher ratings.

Washington

1. New employees shall be evaluated within the first ninety (90) days of employment.

2. Every employee whose work is judged unsatisfactory shall be notified in writing of stated areas of deficiency along with recommendations for improvement by February 1 of each year.

3. A probationary period of February 1 to April 15 shall be established for the employee to demonstrate improvement in the areas of noted deficiency.

Oregon

Evaluation forms must include but need not be limited to the following criteria:

1. Assessment of the teacher on meeting of his performance goals and objectives.

2. Assessment of the teacher on development and growth in the teaching profession.

3. Indication of areas in which the teacher needs to demonstrate additional development and growth.

4. Suggestions for improvement in the areas of noted deficiencies.
5. A section must be allotted for additional comments.

6. A recommendation section must be included for the following four (4) options:
   a. renewal of contract
   b. non-renewal of contract
   c. advancement in salary
   d. non-advancement in salary.

California

1. Districts must establish standards of expected student progress in each subject area.

2. Assessment of teacher competence must be based on attainment of expected student standards.

3. Assessment of teacher must be made in adjunct areas.

4. Teachers must be assessed on their degree of effectiveness in maintaining proper control and in preserving a suitable learning environment.

5. Follow-up counseling and assistance must be furnished for all personnel assessed at below satisfactory performance or competence.

6. The evaluatee has the right to file a written dissent to the evaluation which will become part of the permanent record along with the evaluation form.

7. Written guidelines for evaluation must be furnished to all certificated personnel each year.

8. All dismissals must be based on "evidence" produced by and through the evaluation process.

9. Evaluation forms must be in writing and given to the employee not later than sixty (60) days before the end of the school year.
10. An evaluation conference must be held with the employee to explain the completed evaluation before the end of the school year.

**Virginia**

1. Local schools may make adaptations in the district evaluation format to meet their local needs.

2. All evaluation plans must be completed and submitted to the State Department of Education by June 30, 1974. (This was included only to indicate that the State Department of Education gave the districts two full years to develop their programs.)

3. The evaluation plans submitted must also indicate the manner in which evaluation procedures were developed.

The following provisions were cited by Ross\(^\text{11}\) for Alabama, Kansas, Nevada, Arizona, and Connecticut.

**Alabama**

While the action of the Alabama Legislature was a resolution rather than a law, it nevertheless had the effect of law in that it requested the State Department of Education to require each school district in the State to develop a comprehensive plan for the continuous improvement of each professional employee.

1. Plans were to be submitted to the State Department of Education within twelve (12) months of the resolution.

2. Plans must be cooperatively developed by the district with the State Department of Education.

\(^{11}\text{Ibid.}, \text{pp. 78, 95-96, 103, 106-107, and Supplement, pp. 1-3, 13-14.}\)
3. Evaluation of each employee must be based on testing and personal evaluation by the local Board of Education.

Kansas

1. Procedures must be developed and submitted for review and approval to the State Department of Education by January 15, 1974, less than six months after passage of the legislation.

2. Procedures must include:
   a. Evaluation procedures applicable to all certificated employees.
   b. All evaluations must be made in writing and maintained in a personnel file for each employee for not less than three (3) years from the date of evaluation.

It is interesting to note that Kansas was the only state thus far that had relegated the total responsibility for development of procedures down to the individual school level.

3. Evaluation policies should reflect prevailing community attitudes toward educational programs.

4. Procedural development must include input from evaluators, evaluatees, and community interests.

5. Consideration should be given to professional and personal characteristics associated with the position.

6. Administrative staff will have primary responsibility for making the evaluation.

7. Each employee evaluated is required to sign the evaluation to show that he has seen it.

8. The employee may respond in writing to the evaluation within two (2) weeks of the time it is presented to him for his signature.
9. Evaluation documents and responses are available to the evaluated employee, members of the board, the administrative staff making the evaluation, the State Board of Education, the administrative staff of any school to which the employee applies for employment, and other persons specified by the employee in writing to his board.

10. State Board of Education enforcement of the requirements that local boards file a personnel evaluation policy is to be accomplished through the accreditation vehicle.

A second note of interest in the Kansas mandate is that it was the only state to explicitly define within the law the vehicle by which concurrence would be monitored.

Nevada

1. Nevada was the only state requiring teachers and administrators working separately but each with the local boards of trustees to develop the evaluation procedures.

2. The process of evaluation was left open for local district development, however, the legislation suggested that the evaluation may be self, student, peer, administrative, or any combination thereof.

3. A written copy of the evaluation must be given to the employee.

Arizona

1. Arizona elected to pursue somewhat unique methods of developing procedures and criteria for evaluation. They formed a consortium of twenty (20) districts who volunteered to cooperatively, yet independently, devise a total evaluation program for each of their individual districts. When they had been completed, they were all compiled into an evaluation model handbook from which the remaining districts in the state could choose the model with which they would like to work. Each district could modify the model chosen to fit local needs.
2. All districts were to have a plan completed and submitted to the State Department of Education by 1976.

3. Each district was expected to involve teaching staff in development of the evaluation system.

4. Factors of performance were to be considered in the guidelines for teacher evaluation.

Connecticut

1. Although the individual districts were charged with the responsibility for procedural development, it must have been accomplished within guidelines established by the State Board of Education.

2. Teacher contracts were renewed automatically for the second, third, and fourth years unless the employee was notified in writing of dismissal.

3. The law directed that district Superintendents of Schools were to make continuous evaluation of each teacher within his district which was to be reported to the local Board of Education before June 1 of each year. (Note: The researcher was unable to determine if the above requirement was open and should have read "provide for" or not. Also, the definition of competency was not included in the law.)

The data indicated surprisingly few points of concurrence between states in their separate provisions for personnel evaluation. This criterion was not meant to imply that all state's legislation should have made identical provisions; however, it did serve to reinforce the fact that agreement on the subject of personnel evaluation was far from concrete. Only two areas of total concurrence between the states was discernible from this investigation:
1. A legally mandated requirement for personnel evaluation was enacted in each case.

2. All states in this study included mandatory evaluation of all regular classroom teachers.

The variability between the states within each of the major areas chosen for comparison was noteworthy.

Mandated by.--The action taken by 75 percent of the official state agencies was in the form of law enacted by the state legislature. The remaining 25 percent of the actions were in the form of regulations or legislative resolution having the effect of law.

Procedural development.--The greatest divergence between the states fell in the area of responsibility for the actual procedural development of the evaluation system within each district. As a single method, administrators and teachers working jointly in the development of procedures was the most recommended or required. However, this method was specifically required in only 40 percent of the states. A development agency at the state level was the next most mandated, accounting for 25 percent of the states. The remainder of the states utilized other developmental procedures.

Personnel to be evaluated.--As was stated above, the greatest concurrence between the states' provisions was in the area of defining who was to be evaluated. All
states specifically designated regular classroom teachers; however, only South Dakota limited this criteria to only classroom teachers. The other eleven states either included all certificated/professional personnel in the school (66 percent) or all personnel regardless of certification (33 percent).

**Frequency of evaluation.**—Eight of the twelve states (66 percent) specified annual, or at least annual, evaluations for all personnel falling under the mandated criteria. Only one state, Alabama, was vague in this requirement as was evidenced by the provision for "continuous and periodical" evaluation.

**Basis for evaluation.**—In this area as well as most of the others there was not a preponderance of concurrence between the states. A third of them left the development of the criteria open for districts, presumably in order that they might meet local needs. Another third specifically stated that the local districts would develop the criteria upon which evaluations would be formed. The remaining third specified either evaluation by objectives or competency based criteria.

In the seven year period covered by this review, almost half the legislation dealing with personnel evaluation had occurred within the last two years and it appeared that some trends were emerging as additional states took
this kind of legislative action. (1) The most prominent trend was toward states taking issue with evaluative practices in their local school districts and resorting to legislative action to correct a situation seen as critical by the public and educators as well as by the legislators themselves. (2) There was a definite trend toward requiring administrators and teachers to work jointly to develop procedures for the evaluative process rather than having them imposed by administrators. (3) A small movement was developing to relieve staff and administrators from the requirement of annual evaluation for all personnel. The move maintained at least annual evaluation for the new personnel. However, it leaned toward less frequent formal evaluations for those having reached permanent, or tenure, status. (4) Legislation was allowing for greater latitude at local district levels to develop the criteria upon which evaluations were to be based and was moving away from the traditional subjective criteria that have for so long plagued the profession.

It is indeed unfortunate that educators have not fully met the responsibility to improve their evaluation systems but rather have waited to be prodded by law to correct deficiencies. We have worked extremely hard at devising educational systems that are viable and formative for children, yet, we have put forth seemingly little effort to fashion a developmental program for those upon
whom instruction depends. As Howsam so very aptly stated:

If progress is to be made, educators have no choice but to develop processes by which we redefine our own professional goals, identify our objectives, proceed toward them, and put into operation an evaluation system that is strongly formative in its effect.12

In recent years an effort has been made on a national level to assess educational output of the nation's schools. This effort is titled, most appropriately, The National Assessment of Educational Progress and is currently an activity of the Education Commission of the States.13 The NAEP project was designed to provide information about the performance of large, well-defined groups (regions, sex, etc.) but not to make state-to-state or district-to-district comparisons.14 The information is in the form of pupil achievement in specific curricular areas15 and may have implications for curriculum developers,16 but it does


not assess, except indirectly, quality teaching or competence of teachers. Additionally, it does not investigate specific hypotheses about causes and effects of pupil achievement; it simply reports where we stand so that users of the results can make informed judgments on how we came to where we are.\textsuperscript{17} It remains for each state to conduct its own assessment to determine shortcomings in its own educational system\textsuperscript{18} whether it be in curriculum offerings or teacher competence.

In the absence of effective assessment by educators, state legislatures have stepped into the void in an effort to force formative evaluation programs. One such effort was made in California in 1971. In a speech before elementary and secondary principals of the Los Angeles Unified School District, Senator John Stull gave the following background for this effort:

For a number of years there has been an increasing public inclination to tear the mystique from education. The long-held public attitude of complete faith in our schools seems to have changed to "show me." At the core of the American Dream is a strong belief that education is the key to the good life, and the people

\textsuperscript{17}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 119.

\textsuperscript{18}\textit{Tyler, "The National Assessment of Educational Progress,"} p. 18.
now actively feel this dream has been threatened. Mix all this dissatisfaction and unease with fast-rising taxes, and you've got a volatile, restive public.\(^{19}\)

Stull further contended that the major public concern about education was triggered by the Russian launching of Sputnik, accelerated by the furor over "Why Johnny Can't Read" and aggravated by the extensive numbers of children going into colleges who had to take remedial English after twelve years of school. They demanded accountability.\(^ {20} \)

Stull additionally concluded, "Now all of this had caused a definite mood among the people of California."\(^ {21} \) It was in reaction to this mood that the California Teachers Association helped to draft Assembly Bill 293 and supported it through the 1971 California Legislative Session. The bill additionally received broad support from the Association of California School Administrators, the California School Boards Association, the Professional Educators of California, the California State Chamber of Commerce, and the California Tax Payer's Association. Then Assemblyman John Stull, a conservative Republican, and Senator Albert Rodda, a liberal Democrat, co-authored the bill and carried it through both houses with a 33-0 vote in favor by the Senate and a 47-20 vote


\(^{20}\)Ibid.

\(^{21}\)Ibid.
in favor by the Assembly. This unlikely coalition of usually divergent organizations and individuals was indicative of an obvious need for reform.

On July 20, 1971, Governor Ronald Reagan signed into law Assembly Bill 293, referred to as the "Stull Bill." It, in effect, created an entirely new system of permanent certificated employee dismissal and evaluation. It was subsequently amended by Senate Bill 1286 in 1973 to exclude from evaluation and assessment those certificated employees on an hourly or temporary hourly basis. At present, Senate Bill 1616 which would repeal the Stull Act is in committee; however, no action has been taken.

One of the major changes brought about in the California Education Code by passage of Assembly Bill 293 required each school district to develop and adopt guidelines for evaluating the performance of certificated personnel (Education Code Sections 13485-13487, see appendix A). The initial legislation did not specify an implementation date; therefore, the Legislature passed a companion bill, Assembly Bill 2999 signed into law October 21, 1971, directing the State Board of Education to develop and disseminate guidelines which school districts "may"

22Ibid.

23Ross, General Governance and Administration, p. 103.

24Ibid., Supplement, p. 1.
use in development of their evaluation procedures.\textsuperscript{25} The State Board of Education directive stipulated:

The Education Code sections requiring the development and adoption of evaluation guidelines are effective as of March, 1972. Therefore, it was assumed that school districts would be developing such guidelines in the spring and summer of 1972.\textsuperscript{26} However, in Appendix A of the guidelines the effective date of implementation was interpreted "to mean that districts must begin to develop evaluation guidelines and systems . . . so that guidelines may be adopted by school district governing boards in time to be implemented during the 1972-1973 school year."\textsuperscript{27}

While the wording of \textbf{Assembly Bill 293} left no doubt that the new procedures would be implemented throughout the state and the State Board of Education Guidelines inferred they should have been implemented during the 1972-1973 school year, recent findings reflect it had not in fact been accomplished. The Educational Management and Evaluation Commission of the State Department of Education in their progress report to the State Department of Education on December 4, 1974, indicated that a survey

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
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\textsuperscript{26}Ibid.
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\textsuperscript{27}Ibid., p. 7.
\end{flushright}
taken in June of 1974 "revealed that about 20 percent of California's districts have not implemented the Act and that about 10 percent are still in the early stages of developing uniform guidelines." In keeping with a national trend to allow school districts flexibility in these matters as cited previously in this study, it appears that the legislation and/or guidelines were not nearly definitive enough in their time constraints. At the present time there exists no legislation or directives requiring punitive measures against districts that do not comply with the law.

Senator Stull has taken a firm stand against any form of punitive action against districts for non-compliance. In a letter to Dr. Harold F. Gortner of Indiana University Northwest in late 1974 he explained this position.

Another frequent suggestion is that some penalty be built into the law because there currently is no "punishment" if a district does not implement evaluation and assessment guidelines. To this, I again say no, believing that if local voters disapprove, then they may elect a new school board.

---


29John Stull, California State Senator, letter to Dr. Harold F. Gortner, Sacramento, September 26, 1974, personal files of John Stull (see appendix I).
If 100 percent compliance with the law is expected, and it is reasonable to assume that it is, contrary to Senator Stull's position a mandate setting a final implementation date may have to be enacted to include punitive measures for non-compliance. This is not to imply that the form or content of the procedures be dictated from the state level, only that compliance must be attained by a specified date. At present, only two legally based incentives can be implied from the law and directives for implementation of the Act. It is entirely possible that, if the certificated personnel requirements of Assembly Bill 293 are not implemented adequately at the local level, a district may not be able to invoke the provisions of the same bill dealing with dismissal of certificated personnel for reason of "incompetency." Secondly, a district may be subject to civil action in the courts for non-compliance with a legally enacted statute. Both of these issues remain to be tested in the courts.

Assembly Bill 293 has two distinct divisions. First, it deals with proceedings and criteria related to dismissal of permanent certificated employees. This first division of the bill is beyond the scope of this study except for Section 1 which amended the California Education Code, Section 13403, to include incompetency as an

---

a basis for dismissal. It was upon this single criteria that the second division of the bill was based which mandated the establishment of local criteria and methods for evaluation and assessment of all certificated personnel (teachers and administrators). This second division was related to the determination of competency in that the courts have held that before an employee may be dismissed for incompetency, there must exist a recognized definition of competency.

A precise definition of what constitutes teaching or teacher competency was not included as a part of the legislation, or of any State Department of Education documents. A review of those documents and the related correspondence available established the fact that the intent of the bill was to allow for maximum flexibility of the districts to develop their own measures of competency. It could, though somewhat facetiously, result in 1,055 different definitions of competence within the state educational system of 1,055 separate school districts. This was not construed to be a weakness but rather a strength of the legislation. Senator Stull very clearly defended this

---

31 Ibid., Sec. 1, Para. (d).
32 Ibid., Sec. 40.
33 Stull, letter to Gortner.
point in his letter to Dr. Harold Gortner by stating:

It has been suggested that more specific guidelines be specified in the law, to avoid confusion and misunderstanding by employees and district governing boards. To this I would say that AB 293 is perhaps the purest example of a "local control" measure that I have seen, and intentionally so. I do not want a statewide system of evaluation administered by the State Department of Education. Local residents, parents, voters, taxpayers, teachers, administrators, and students should work together to determine what is best for their particular school district, within the general framework of state educational requirements. 34

The bill represents an approach to personnel evaluation by the Legislature which requires that certificated personnel performance standards be developed by each school district on the basis of a uniform set of specific and definitive guidelines. The district adopted evaluation guidelines must have included but not necessarily be limited to the following elements:

1. Establishment of standards of expected student progress in each area of study and of techniques for assessment of that progress.

2. Assessment of certificated personnel competence as it relates to the standards which are established for individual certificated personnel.

3. Assessment of other duties normally required to be performed by certificated employees as adjunct to their regular assignments.

4. Establishment of procedures and techniques for ascertaining that the certificated employee is

34Ibid.
maintaining proper control and is preserving a suitable learning environment." 35

The first two points require school districts to establish an expected level of student progress over a given period of time and then adopt a system of evaluating his progress to see if he has achieved the expected level. The teacher's competency is then based upon how well his students did in achieving the established progress. The remaining two points involve judging a certificated employee's performance in professional work related to his primary assignments, and his ability to maintain discipline and good order among his students. In response to direct inquiry by this investigator, Senator Stull offered the following definitions of elements contained in point four above:

"Proper control" would relate to discipline and the demeanor of pupils, and how well each employee performs in maintaining a standard of behavior consistent with the policies and guidelines developed by the local school board. Is the employee able to maintain control of his or her class, or are there constant confrontations or challenges to authority? Is the employee capable of leading the class? Is the employee able to proceed along a given course of instruction, or are there constant detours?

"A suitable learning environment" is that which allows pupils to learn without distractions, interruptions, or altercations. It provides for give and take, free and open discussion, a proper mixture of talking and listening, and is similarly dependent upon

conformity and compliance with the rules, regulations, and guidelines established by the local board. It is deliberately vague, in that different periods of the school day (such as recess, lunch time, or classroom activity) require varying degrees of control, discipline and freedom.36

While the four sections cited above are the critical elements of the legislation in that they reflect its primary purpose, that of improvement of instruction, the remaining elements of the evaluation and assessment section are significant in their import to the development and conduct of evaluation procedures. The second most significant section of the bill requires school districts to avail themselves of advice from its certificated instructional personnel in developing and adopting evaluational guidelines.37 This requirement for involvement of instructional personnel in the development of the actual standards for professional evaluation should materially promote better understanding, acceptance, and enforcement of the adopted standards.38 As was evidenced in table 1 of this study, California's pioneer effort in this area signalled the beginning of what may become a nationally accepted norm in similar legislation throughout the states.

36John Stull, California State Senator, letter to Richard P. Shoemaker, Sacramento, April 3, 1975, personal files of Richard P. Shoemaker, Tustin, California (see appendix H).

37California, Assembly Bill 293, Sec. 40.

The remaining salient features of the legislation are:

1. Each school district governing board must adopt a uniform set of written guidelines for use in evaluating competencies of its certificated personnel.

2. The certificated employees of the district must be informed about the district's evaluation program in advance of its use for their personal assessment.

3. The Evaluation must be in writing and transmitted to the evaluatee not later than sixty days prior to the end of the school year followed by a discussion of the evaluation with the evaluator by the end of the school year.

4. In cases where an employee is found to have competency deficiencies that employee must be provided follow-up counselling and assistance to upgrade his performance. The deficiencies noted and recommendations for improvement of performance must be in writing and included as an integral part of the evaluation document.

5. The evaluatee has the right to append written statements concerning the evaluation report which, along with the report itself, become a permanent part of their personnel file.\textsuperscript{39}

On February 7, 1974, the Management and Evaluation Commission of the State Department of Education conducted an open hearing relative to the provisions of the Stull Act. One of the major issues of this hearing was in consonance with this study: Does the Stull Act provide a

\textsuperscript{39}California, \textit{Assembly Bill 293}, Sec. 40.
useful and practical management process for evaluating certificated employees? As a result of the testimony presented during that hearing, the commission offered the following answers to the question cited:

In spite of early confusion and misconceptions based upon stated implementation guidelines and "fear of dismissal," school districts have made progress in the development and implementation of guidelines for the evaluation of certificated personnel and the learning process.

Although the exact degree of statewide compliance with the Stull Act requirements cannot be ascertained without an in-depth survey, there is substantial evidence to indicate complete compliance within the author's stated expectations of three to five years.

The Stull Act evaluation requirements have encouraged establishment and coordination of district goals, school goals and objectives, and teacher objectives.

Certificated personnel have been able to focus on their expectations in regard to student progress and improving the learning climate.

In its overall assessment of the value of the legislation and the degree to which it had attained its goal of improvement of instruction, the commission offered the following conclusions:


41Ibid.
There are indications that the Stull Act properly implemented, provides for vast improvements over former practices in personnel evaluation. Problems do exist relevant to understanding the intent of the law, and there is need for assistance in developing skills and creative abilities in the entire area of personnel evaluation. The resolution of these problems does require considerable effort; however, despite initial confusion and controversy, a great many districts are implementing guidelines and have evaluation programs consistent with the concepts of the Stull Act.42

Evaluation of teacher effectiveness is an area of concern dealing with the relationships between the individual characteristics of teachers, the acts which compose teaching, and their interactive effects on educational outcomes of classroom teaching.43 In the past fifteen years research has begun to conclude that classroom climate and the achievement of children are related to certain teacher behaviors. As a direct result of these conclusions there has been a shift in teacher evaluation processes from utilization of subjective criteria to more objective accounting of teacher-pupil relationships, teacher-principal relationships, and the actual acts or behaviors of the teacher in the teaching/learning process.

If teacher effectiveness is to be determined, it follows logically that some method of appraising that effectiveness must be decided upon by those making such

42Ibid.

judgments. According to Flippo, the choice of method lies among the following three alternatives:

1. A casual, unsystematic, and often haphazard appraisal.

2. The traditional and highly systematic measurement of: (a) employee characteristics; (b) employee contributions; or (c) both.

3. The behavioral approach emphasizing mutual goal setting.44

Castetter contends that administrators have traditionally utilized the first two of the methods cited by Flippo and as a result "in the lexicon of the classroom teacher, appraisal has become synonymous with merit rating. As such, the concept (of evaluation) has acquired negative implications."45 In his discussion of the disagreements over both the nature and methodology of appraisals he cites the following objections:

Results of appraisals are not utilized to assist individual development.

Appraisal methodology does not provide an environment conducive to change of individual behavior.46

Redfern reinforces these objections by contending that performance cannot be changed by merely "refining


46Ibid., p. 235.
traditional rating scales and checklists to make post-performance assessment."\(^{47}\) He further concludes that: "The major pitfall has been an inability to devise a fool proof process of evaluation."\(^{48}\) Most authors, both past and present, agree that evaluation is necessary and in most cases desirable, however, until recent years the emphasis has not been on evaluation to bring about constructive change but rather just a report on past behavior.

Redfern contends that the concept of evaluation for the explicit purpose of bringing about change in teacher behavior seems to be fairly new and brought about by the current press for accountability.\(^{49}\) Castetter, in his discussion of personnel appraisal, lists several concepts which he feels comprise the modern theory of performance appraisal. Two of them are directly related to the idea of constructive change:

1. The primary purpose of performance appraisal is to facilitate change in individual behavior in order to achieve personal and organizational goals.

2. Performance strengths are recognized and weaknesses identified so that individual action plans can be developed to make necessary corrections.\(^{50}\)


\(^{48}\)Ibid., p. 8.

\(^{49}\)Ibid., p. 7.

\(^{50}\)Castetter, The Personnel Function in Educational Administration, p. 236.
Other current authors have voiced support of this point of view:

Redfern.--"When the purpose of evaluation becomes the improvement of teaching performance instead of merely rating it, results are more productive."\(^{51}\)

Lipham and Hoeh.--"As with program development, the improvement of the teaching staff comprises leadership techniques and procedures designed to change the teacher's role and performance."\(^{52}\)

Sergiovanni and Starratt.--"The act of supervision invariably involves a human interaction directed at improving and changing some aspect of (teacher) professional performance."\(^{53}\)

Although the major emphasis on the concept of evaluation for constructive change is fairly new, the difficulties involved in bringing about that change in teacher performance were recognized by Berne\(^{54}\) in his writings

---

\(^{51}\)Redfern, How to Evaluate Teaching, p. 8.


\(^{54}\)Kenneth D. Berne, "Democratic Ethics and Social Engineering," Progressive Education, XXVII (May, 1949), 204.
over twenty-five years ago. He implied that acceptance of the process of change was critical to the success of change endeavors and therefore proposed basic democratic action norms for supervisors which would assure that acceptance.\textsuperscript{55} The supervisors' dilemma in this area was later cited by McDonald in his discussion of the role of the supervisor in helping teachers to achieve change when he wrote: "We face the dilemma of deciding whether we should approach the changing of teacher behavior with some criterion which lies outside the person of the teacher as a basis for change."\textsuperscript{56}

The outside criterion concept mentioned by McDonald seemed to be the same theoretical basis upon which Redfern constructed his model for teacher evaluation. Redfern cites the following elements as being essential for systematic evaluation to stimulate improvement of teacher performance:

1. Understand more completely the scope of duties and responsibilities.

2. Establish long and short term goals.

3. Place priorities upon certain tasks which are more critical to work performance.

\textsuperscript{55}Ibid., pp. 205-206.

4. Clarify working relationships with peers, subordinates, and supervisors.

5. Improve day-to-day operational efficiency.

6. Understand better how those to whom the individual looks for advice, counsel, and guidance view the quality of his performance.  

Though these elements seem to be universal in scope, Redfern offers the following caution in their application:

It is well to remember the inadvisability of expecting a composite design of performance evaluation to satisfy every human need and the requirements of the school system. Variations in size and complexity of school systems, different leadership styles of principals and supervisors, and varying needs of individual teachers require flexibility in applying evaluation procedures.  

Redfern does not presume to offer "the" model for effective teacher evaluation, but rather suggests a model consisting of six basic components which he cites as essential to a performance-oriented procedure aimed toward improvement of teacher performance. The components cited are:

1. Performance Criteria (Standards)
2. Performance Objectives or Job Targets
3. Performance Activities
4. Monitoring Performance
5. Assessing Monitored Data
6. Conference and Follow-up.

---

57Redfern, How to Evaluate Teaching, pp. 8-9.
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It is interesting to note that a comparison of the provisions of the Stull Act with the above components reflects a striking similarity in organizing framework. Table 2 graphically coordinates Redfern's theoretical components with those sections of the Stull Act which apply to each.

An additional point of similarity exists between Redfern's caution quoted above concerning use of a single set of elements for teacher evaluation and the provisions of the Stull Act, Section 13485 which in part states: "The system shall involve development and adoption by each school district of objective evaluation and assessment guidelines."\(^60\)

**Summary**

The foregoing review indicated that until very recently the separate states provided for systems within which teachers were to educate children but that those systems did little by way of providing viable and comprehensive vehicles to insure teacher accountability for their product. Any efforts made to assess teacher competence were made at the local district levels under very broad and loosely defined state guidelines or permissive regulations.

---

\(^{60}\)Underline added

\(^{61}\)California, **Assembly Bill 293**, Sec. 13485.
Although some of these efforts were laudable, many of them did little more than pay lip service to the concept of evaluation as an instrument for constructive change and maintained merely the traditional report of past teacher actions and classroom behavior.

TABLE 2

REDFERN COMPONENTS AND COMPARABLE STULL ACT PROVISION SECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REDFERN COMPONENTS</th>
<th>STULL ACT SECTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Performance Criteria</td>
<td>13485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Standards)</td>
<td>13486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13587 (general)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Performance Objectives or Job Targets</td>
<td>13487 (a) and (d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Performance Activities</td>
<td>13486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13487 (general) and (d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Monitoring Performance</td>
<td>13487 (b) and (c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Assessing Monitored Data</td>
<td>13488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Conferences and Follow-up</td>
<td>13488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Russian launching of Sputnik marked the beginning of a public press for accountability in reaction to which state politicians began legislating for accountability in education through mandatory teacher evaluation. Most of the earlier legislation was not much more than a
restatement of then existing policies and practices and seemingly did little toward building viable programs for actual improvement of teaching practices and teacher classroom behavior. The earlier legislative efforts did, however, serve a purpose; that of opening the path for other states to develop more comprehensive mandates based on current personnel evaluation theory and more realistic approaches and guidelines for changing teacher behavior.

Between 1967 and 1974 twelve states had enacted legislation dealing with mandatory teacher evaluation. Indications were that many others were strongly considering similar actions. Because of the trend to legislate at the state level in an area heretofore a local prerogative, school administrators and school boards across the nation began reviewing their own procedures and practices with an eye toward improving them before enacting legislation became imminent. The extent of change taking place in those instances without mandating legislation forcing it, but having an influence upon it, was difficult to assess without further study beyond the scope of this investigation.

The following trends developing in state legislation in the area of personnel evaluation were discerned:

1. An increasing number of states were turning to mandating legislation in an attempt to improve teaching
practices through constructive personnel evaluation procedures.

2. Historically, evaluation philosophy, instruments, and procedures were developed by administrators with little or no input from those to be affected by them. The direction taken by the more recent legislation was that administrators were required to work jointly with teachers in development of the separate district evaluation procedures. While a definite trend developed in the last four years of the period covered by this review toward administrators and teachers working jointly in development of evaluation procedures, five of the earlier states to enact legislation excluded teachers from the process as follows:

- Washington: procedures to be developed by local district administrators
- Florida: procedures to be developed by county administrative units
- South Dakota: procedures to be developed by a state commission
- Hawaii and Oregon: procedures to be developed by the State Department of Education.

3. Although the mandates for personnel evaluation were enacted at the state level, most of the legislation was permissive enough to allow local district flexibility
in their procedural development to provide for local needs.

4. The criteria upon which personnel evaluation was to be based were moving away from the traditionally subjective pattern to a more goal and objectively oriented pattern. Most of the states allowed local entities flexibility in this area in order to decide the bases of the evaluation within broad guidelines. Three states specified that the basis was "open for district development": Kansas allowed each individual school to decide this critical issue; two states specified competency based criteria; two states indicated that evaluation by objectives would be utilized; and the remaining four states decreed that subjective data would be used.

5. A minor trend was developing to relieve staff and administrators from the requirement of annual evaluation of all certificated personnel. At least annual evaluation of all new personnel was maintained; however, evaluation of those having reached permanent or tenure status was required less frequently. Only one state did not specify a minimum frequency for evaluation.

The California Stull Act was the first of the states' legislation to incorporate competency as the basis for teacher evaluation. It also mandated that each district establish standards of student progress in each subject area and that teacher competency be assessed
against student attainment of those standards. Teachers were additionally assessed on their ability to maintain proper discipline and to provide a suitable learning environment. A stipulation in the California law which appeared in few of the other state statutes was that teacher performance would be rated in adjunct areas as well as primary duties. The law also required districts to seek the advice of and involve teachers in the development of all standards or performance and of all procedures for their own assessment. Of the twelve state statutes enacted thus far, it would appear that California's law was the most comprehensive and the one most soundly based in current evaluational theory. It very closely paralleled the theoretical model developed by George B. Redfern.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Both popular notion and the writings of the leaders in educational theory and practice contended that traditional methods of teacher evaluation had not attained the objective of improving teaching and consequently student achievement as noted in Chapter II. The subjective criteria upon which evaluations were based provided little incentive for teachers to seek alternative methods for those teaching practices which had not proven satisfactory. As a result of the furor brought about by the concerns over "Why Johnny Can't Read, Write, Compute or Spell," the public became restive and began to demand accountability in education.

Because of the elective nature of their positions, state legislators displayed a keen awareness of the adverse public opinion concerning education. In an attempt to provide their constituents with the accountability demanded, they stepped into the void with legislation which mandated teacher accountability through evaluation. Some of the early efforts were not especially fruitful; however, constructive trends began to emerge as more states studied...
the area, reviewed previous legislation, and developed their own. The later legislation required that objective criteria be used for teacher evaluation and that definitive performance standards for teachers be developed. As additional states enacted this type of legislation, more often than not the requirement was set that teachers be involved in development of performance standards, evaluation criteria, and evaluation procedures. The legislators' goal was clearly to provide a vehicle through which teaching practices and teacher behavior could be constructively changed.

In 1971, California enacted legislation mandating certificated employee evaluation throughout the state to determine educators' professional competency. Evaluations were to be based on locally derived standards of pupil achievement and performance standards for teachers in raising student achievement levels. The California Stull Act was in its third year of implementation in the school districts of the state at the time of this study. The primary focus of this investigation was on the degree of perceived change in certain elementary-level teaching practices and teacher relationships brought about as a direct result of the requirements and provisions of that legislation.
Design of the Study

This investigation could best be described as an ex post facto exploratory field study. The method of investigation was based upon reports of several authoritative sources who recommended its use when conditions for a study were found similar to those in this one.

In his definitive work on behavioral research, Kerlinger states that: "Field studies are ex post facto scientific inquiries aimed at discovering the relations and interactions among sociological, psychological, and educational variables in real social structures."¹ He further refined the scope of field studies in his discussion of the actions of the investigator in arguing that the investigator in a field study "ordinarily manipulates no independent variables."² Katz has divided field studies into two broad types: exploratory and hypothesis-testing. The exploratory type, according to Katz, seeks what is rather than predicts what will be.³ He further contends that exploratory field studies have three purposes: (1) to discover significant variables in the field situation;


²Ibid.

(2) to discover relations among variables; and (3) to lay significant groundwork for later, more systematic, and rigorous testing of hypotheses. 4

The prime consideration in selecting a research method for conducting this study was that it be realistically reflective of the actual state of affairs as they existed, and that the conclusions drawn from the data have pragmatic significance for those in the field. Among the strengths of the field study technique, Kerlinger cites realism and significance 5 among the most dominant and that:

The realism of field studies is obvious. Of all types of studies, they are closest to real life. There can be no complaint of artificiality. (The remarks about realism in field experiments apply, a fortiori, to the realism of the field studies.) 6

A secondary, but equally important, consideration was that the analysis possess the capacity of scientific relevance. Although this was an ex post facto study, Wiersma contends that in ex post facto studies "a structure which resembles an experimental design may be superimposed upon the data, primarily for analysis purposes." 7

4Ibid., p. 75.
6Ibid., p. 407.
The possibility of this type of superimposition of one design upon another serves to reinforce arguments that clear-cut lines between the many research designs are not always apparent. Travers posits an argument in support of this contention as:

Just as there is no clear-cut line of demarcation between the carefully planned laboratory experiment and the demonstration or exploration, so too is there none between field studies and laboratory experiments.\(^8\)

The study was conducted in the non-clinical, field situation of the California elementary educational system, and was concerned with assessing the degree of change brought about in certain teaching practices and teacher relationships by imposition of the Stull Act. Because it was conducted with educators actively involved in the business of education and the variables were not manipulated in any way, it met the criteria of a field study. Although the variables were specifically identified in advance by the investigator and not discovered in the field situation, the study met the remaining criteria for the exploratory type as designated by Katz\(^9\) in that it sought to discover the relationships between variables and provided groundwork for later studies. The study met the


\(^9\)Festinger and Katz, Research Methods, p. 75.
final criteria of ex post facto in identifying and assessing the degree of change that had occurred as a result of the relationship of the variables and did not attempt to predict outcomes resulting from variable manipulation.

The Sample

The California school districts from which the sample population was drawn were selected on the basis of their diversity of organizational pattern and tenure, and socioeconomic variables. The districts included one established rural elementary district, one established urban unified district, and one newly unified suburban district. Separate schools from within each district and from which the actual study population was drawn were selected on the basis of representativeness of socioeconomic variables, the years of administrative experience of the principal, and the availability of teachers who had worked there since the institutionalization of the Stull Act.

The actual population of the study included a sample of elementary teachers of Kindergarten through sixth grades and the principals by whom they were supervised. A single parameter was established for determination of individual teacher and principal participation in the study. The parameter established was that in order to qualify for participation in the study the individual must have completed a minimum of six consecutive years of
teaching or administrative experience within the California educational system and be presently employed in that capacity. This parameter was imposed in order that respondents would have at least three consecutive years of experience prior to implementation of the Stull Act on which to base perceptions of change in behavior brought about by the requirements and provisions of the legislation.

Descriptions of the school districts, schools, and the study population are as follows:

**Farm Elementary School District**

Farm Elementary School District was incorporated as a political entity by an act of the California Legislature in 1887. It was geographically located in the center of the Great Central Valley of the State of California. The district encompassed Farm City, the only city area in the county and which was the county seat of Rural County. Farm City contained a population of 16,500.

Rural County's principal employment and income source was agriculture. There was, however, one large manufacturing firm near Farm City which, as a single agency, provided the means of livelihood of the third largest number of persons from within the city. It was surprising to note that, according to the school district Superintendent, the school district accounted for the
largest single source of employment for residents of Farm City. The second highest source was a combination of city and county governmental agencies.

Of the fifty-eight counties in California, Rural County was among the bottom 9 percent in per capita income. In contrast, the Farm Elementary School District was rated at the 41st percentile of the state in socio-economic status according to the Spring 1974, California Assessment Program Report. The display in table 3 shows the demographic data of the Farm Elementary School District and its individual schools.

**TABLE 3**

**FARM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT DEMOGRAPHIC DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Enrollment</th>
<th>S.E.S.</th>
<th>Ethnic Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentile</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Null-1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>8%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Null indicates the school was not used in the study.
All schools within the Farm Elementary School District were used in this study except Null-1 which was of the 7-8 grade configuration. One school fell within the upper S.E.S., two in the middle S.E.S., and two in the lower S.E.S. Of the 5 principals and 100 teachers assigned to the schools used in this study, all 5 principals and 54 of the teachers met the requirement of six consecutive years of experience as defined earlier. The display in table 4 reflects the distribution of teachers used in the study by school.

### TABLE 4

DISTRIBUTION OF TEACHERS BY SCHOOL WITH SIX OR MORE YEARS CONSECUTIVE EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>61</th>
<th>62</th>
<th>63</th>
<th>64</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of teachers</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of teachers with six or more years experience</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suburbia Unified School District**

The Suburbia Unified School District became operational as a unified district in July of 1973 as a result of a unification election. The district was formed from portions of an existing high school district and an
existing elementary school district. At the time of unification, the teachers and building principals remained with the schools to which they were assigned and were incorporated into the new district.

The district was located in an area of Southern County and was originally agricultural, but experienced a very recent explosion of urban development. In the period since 1963, this growth was characterized by an average annual increase of 22 percent which compounds to over 1,000 percent in twelve years. At present, the population of the district exceeds 35,000.

The population of the district was characterized by middle and upper income families except for a small percentage who were connected with a nearby military installation. Some few homes retailed in the $30,000 category, while most ranged from $50,000 to $120,000. The S.E.S. for the district, as reported on the California Assessment Program Report, was at the 82nd percentile of the state.

The display in table 5 reflects the demographic data for the Elementary Division of the Suburbia Unified School District. The one school in the district which fell below the high S.E.S. indicator elected to not participate in the study. Of the remaining schools, only two were selected in order to avoid skewness toward the high S.E.S. in the total data of the study. School 70 was newly established and still in temporary structures while school
71 was well established and experimenting with Year-Round School. Both principals and 16 of the teachers of the schools selected met the requirements of the study.

**TABLE 5**

SUBURBIA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
DEMOGRAPHIC DATA: ELEMENTARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>S.E.S.</th>
<th>Ethnic Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null-3</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null-4</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null-5</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null-6</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4613</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Null indicates the school was not used in the study.

The display in table 6 reflects the distribution by school of the teachers used in the study.
TABLE 6
DISTRIBUTION OF TEACHERS BY SCHOOL WITH SIX OR MORE YEARS CONSECUTIVE EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>71</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of teachers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of teachers with six or more years experience</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Urbania Unified School District

The Urbania Unified School District became operational as a unified district in 1966. The unification was more of a structural realignment than a total reorganization for it was formed of the existing Urbania Elementary District and the Urbania High School District. The unification caused little disruption within the schools involved.

The district was located in the city of Urbania which was the county seat of Southern County. Southern County contained only 11 percent minority population; however, 90 percent of the total county minority population resided in Urbania City and hence attended the Urbania public schools.
The population of the district reflected a cross section of American ethnic groups and socioeconomic statuses. Some few families were characterized as wealthy and upper middle class, while the majority fell within the lower middle and low income brackets. There were five military installations within an hour's drive of the district, and it consequently contained a number of military families and civilian personnel employed by the Federal government. The S.E.S. of the district was rated at the 35th percentile of all California districts.

Until as recently as seven years before this study, Urbania was considered to be the conservative center of the very conservative Southern County. In 1968 the Board of Education, under extreme pressure from minority parent groups and the district administration, reversed its historical stand against acceptance of Federal monies and consented to apply for Title I funding. This action signalled the break in complete control of the district by conservatist elements; however, they remained very active and maintained a great deal of influence on board policies and decisions.

The display in table 7 reflects the demographic data of the Elementary Division of the Urbania Unified School District. The array of schools of the Urbania School District reflect that four fell in the range of upper S.E.S., four in the middle range of S.E.S., and
eleven in the lower range of S.E.S. Two schools were selected from each level on the basis of the parameters enumerated. Of the six schools selected, all 6 principals and 76 teachers met the necessary requirements of the study. The display in table 8 reflects the distribution of teachers used in the study by school.

The total sample population of the study consisted of 13 elementary principals and 146 elementary teachers of Kindergarten through sixth grade. For analysis of perceptions by socioeconomic status, the subjects were grouped according to the socioeconomic status of the individual attendance area in which they served. The grouping yielded the pattern displayed in table 9.

The individuals of the study population possessed two characteristics in common: (1) they were all involved with education in the elementary schools of California; and (2) they all had served in this capacity for a minimum of six consecutive years. The study population as a whole represented both administration and regular classroom teachers, differing geographical locales, diversified school district organizational structures, and varying district organizational tenure. The population served in schools with varying percentages of minority students and represented a cross section of schools serving all three defined socioeconomic levels. Of the thirteen schools used in the study; four schools served children from each of
### TABLE 7

URBANIA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
DEMOGRAPHIC DATA: ELEMENTARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>S.E.S. Percentile</th>
<th>Ethnic Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Null-7</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null-8</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null-9</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null-10</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null-11</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null-12</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null-13</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null-14</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null-15</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null-16</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null-17</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null-18</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null-19</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 13,527 35 8.5% 1.0% 47% 43.5%

*Null indicates the school was not used in the study.

the low and middle S.E.S. groups and five schools served children from the high S.E.S. group. In the geographically rural Farm Elementary School District 59 from a total of 106 possible participants were identified in five schools. One of the schools represented the high S.E.S. group with the middle and low S.E.S. groups being represented by two schools each. In the suburban Suburbia Unified School
District, 18 participants were identified from a total of 53 possible candidates. They represented two schools which both fell in the high S.E.S. group. In the urban Urbania Unified School District, a sample of 82 was taken from a total of 141 in six schools. The six schools were evenly distributed between the three levels of S.E.S. groups.

**TABLE 8**

DISTRIBUTION OF TEACHERS BY SCHOOL WITH SIX OR MORE YEARS CONSECUTIVE EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>81</th>
<th>82</th>
<th>83</th>
<th>84</th>
<th>85</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of teachers</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of teachers with six or more years experience</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 9**

GROUPINGS BY SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOW S.E.S.</th>
<th>MIDDLE S.E.S.</th>
<th>HIGH S.E.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 schools</td>
<td>4 schools</td>
<td>5 schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 subjects</td>
<td>62 subjects</td>
<td>59 subjects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Instrument

A mail survey questionnaire was employed to gather data relative to teacher and principal perception of change in teacher behavior wrought by the Stull Act. While Kerlinger\textsuperscript{10} cautions that mail questionnaires generally produce a low rate of return, it was felt that the method of distribution would insure a high enough rate of return to gain a valid degree of generalizability. Parten states that a mail survey must obtain a sufficient return "which will stand the test of scientific scrutiny--a survey in which the return tabulated will come from or be representative of the population solicited."\textsuperscript{11}

Due to the unique nature of the subject under study, the data collection instrument was necessarily developed by the investigator. Two separate questionnaires were developed; one for responses by teachers, and one for responses by principals. The item content of both instruments was identical; however, the teacher's questionnaire elicited self-perceptions of change and the principal's questionnaire sought their perceptions of teacher change. The instruments and accompanying letters and instructions were included as appendices B and C to this study.

\textsuperscript{10}Kerlinger, \textit{Foundations of Behavioral Research}, p. 414.

A Likert-type scale was selected for use as a measure of perception because it provided for flexibility in the respondents' reactions to each item. For the determination of the Means, the greatest decrease in action and/or the greatest negative influence response in each category was assigned a value of one point. A value of five points was assigned to the greatest increase in action and/or greatest positive influence response category.

The questionnaire items were determined to be non-disguised structure in the definition of Campbell. The respondent was given the correct information about the purpose of the study; however, the respondent was limited in response because of the Likert-type scale.

The individual items were developed to yield data in each of six major areas. The response to each item was comprised of two separate but related parts. The first part elicited a perception of direction and degree of change. The second part elicited a perception of direction and degree of influence as a result of the change. The major headings under which the items were grouped and representative items under each heading were as follows:

A. Imposed changes in teaching methods and practices:

9a. What change has the requirements of the Stull Act had on the amount of pre-testing you use?

9b. What influence has this change had on your teaching practices?

11a. What change in the variety of teaching approaches you use has been as a direct result of meeting the requirements of the Stull Act?

11b. What influence has this change had on your teaching practices?

B. Teacher-pupil relationships:

3a. As a direct result of the requirements of the Stull Act the degree to which I involve children in planning of classroom activities has------

3b. What influence has this change had on the children's acceptance of the subject matter to be covered?

13a. As a direct result of meeting the requirements of the Stull Act the amount of time you spend in maintaining proper control has------

13b. What influence has this change had on your relationships with the children?

C. Teacher-Principal relationships:

5a. What change has the requirements of the Stull Act had on the number of professional contacts you have with the building principal?

5b. What influence has this change had on the principal's understanding of what you are attempting to do with the children in your classroom?

21a. As a result of meeting the requirements of the Stull Act the general administrator support teachers receive has------

21b. What influence has this change had on teacher relationships with the principal?
D. Allocation of teacher time to subject matter areas:

2a. As a direct result 2b. What influence has
of meeting the this change had on
requirements of the your classroom
Stull Act the amount presentations?
of time I spend in
preparation for
classroom presenta-
tions has ------

E. Allocation of teacher time to interpersonal contacts:

16a. As a direct result 16b. What influence has
of meeting the this change had on
requirements of the your teaching
Stull Act the amount practices?
of time you spend
consulting individu-
dually with other
teachers not on your
grade level about
classroom subject
matter has ------

F. Allocation of teacher time to other activities:

20a. Generally the amount 20b. What influence has
of time I spend on this change had on
school related your teaching
matters to meet the practices?
requirements of the
Stull Act other
than actual teaching
time has ------

Items 1 through 19 were each developed to provide a response in a single subject area. Items 20 through 24 were developed to provide a more general response to areas from which the specific items were developed. The general response items and their correlated specific response items were as follows:
The general areas and the rationale for inclusion in the questionnaire were:

1. Teacher requirements in other than actual instructional areas.

Sections 13487 (c) and (d) of the legislation required that teacher performance be assessed in areas adjunct to their regular teaching assignments. Because performance would be formally evaluated in these areas, the items sought to discover the degree of change in emphasis placed on them by teachers and the change in teacher allotted time required to meet standards of expectation.

2. Teacher-principal relationships.

Under the traditional subjective criteria of personnel assessment principals enjoyed an amicable relationship with teachers under which the unwritten rule was that the formal written evaluation would contain only positive remarks, and the suggestions for improvement would be handled in a non-threatening informal atmosphere. The Stull Act required that teachers be assessed against a written set of objective performance standards, and that
areas of deficiency and suggestions for improvement would be duly noted on the evaluation form. Administrators were then charged with the responsibility to assist the employee to improve performance in deficient areas. The study sought to ascertain how the new requirements had affected the working relationship between teachers and principals.

3. Teacher-teacher relationships.

The mandate required that teachers be assessed against a uniform standard of performance. The induction of a uniform standard of performance into the system eliminated the possibility of rating one teacher's performance against that of another's and hence reduced the possibility of competition between staff members which often discouraged the sharing of resources. The questionnaire endeavored to determine how the provisions of the legislation had affected teacher-to-teacher relationships.

4. Teacher-pupil relationships.

The teacher and the teaching process are inextricably intertwined with children and anything that affects the teaching process must also affect the teacher and his or her relationship with the children. The investigation solicited perceptions of effect on teacher-pupil relationships as a direct result of the requirements of the mandate.
5. Teacher requirements in instructional areas.

Sections 13487 (a) and (b) of the legislation required that standards of expected student progress be established in each area of study and that teacher competence be assessed relative to student achievement of those standards. In order to meet those established standards, the legislation assumed that constructive alterations would necessarily be made in subject emphasis and in teaching practices. The items of the questionnaire sought to determine the degree of change that had taken place in those areas and the influence that the change had effected on teaching practices.

The following is an example of how the general response item and the comparable specific response items correlated:

Items 5a, 6a, and 7a asked for perceptions of change in the number of teacher-principal professional contacts and the amount of administrative assistance received with classroom discipline and classroom learning problems. Items 5b, 6b, and 7b solicited perceptions of influence that those changes had on the principals' understanding of the respondents' classroom efforts and of the influence on the specific teachers' relationship with the principal. Items 21a and 21b sought the perceived change
in the amount of general support received by teachers from the administrator and the influence on the teachers' relationship with their principal.

A panel of experts consisting of two elementary principals and two elementary teachers was employed to review the items for construction and clarity. Alterations were made according to their suggestions where refinement was necessary.

After the questionnaire was developed, it was field tested in three schools within the Urbania Unified School District. The field tests involved participation of twenty teachers and three principals who were selected within the parameters enumerated. To prevent sensitizing of the study subjects, field test schools and respondents were not included as part of the actual study population.

An examination of field test returns showed no apparent difficulty with any items. Initial screening of the field test returns by item displayed a definite response clustering toward the center of the scale and the No Change response category. An informal survey was made of several principals and teachers concerning this clustering to determine if it was peculiar to the field study population, or perhaps was characteristic of the population at large. The results of the informal survey indicated that the clustering may in fact have been a characteristic of the total
population; therefore, no alterations were made in the survey items to attempt to spread the responses.

A review of the questionnaire did determine that no item provided for input from respondents regarding impacts other than the Stull Act which may have affected change. A final item was developed and included for this purpose. The item asked for a narrative type of response as indicated:

25. There may have been impacts other than the Stull Act which may have caused or contributed to changes in your teaching practices and/or relationships with the children, other teachers, or the building principal. If there have been such impacts, would you briefly state what they were and how they affected aspects of your teaching practices and/or relationships.

The returns from item 25 were grouped and analyzed under categories of similar responses.

A concern also arose over the impacts that the requirements of the Stull Act might have had on negotiations at the district level concerning teacher working conditions. It was concluded that this question should not be included as part of the survey questionnaire, but that data could be better acquired through interviews with the district Superintendents, or their designated representatives. Exclusion of this item from the questionnaire was based on the assumption that teachers, as individuals, rely on elected or appointed representatives to handle negotiations with the local board. While they may be aware of
conditions and specific items under consideration, they would have no, or at best little, knowledge of how the negotiations' process was affected by provisions of the Stull Act. It was felt, therefore, that they would not possess the background to adequately respond to the question.

Data Analysis Procedures

The primary purpose of the study was to determine the perceptions of teachers and principals regarding the change and influence of the Stull Act on selected aspects of teacher behavior. An item analysis was obtained for each of the following groups which yielded frequency distributions and Means for each item:

1. Total population of the sample
2. Teacher sub-group
3. Principal sub-group.

A data display reflecting the item analysis was included as appendices D, E, and F to the study. There existed no justification for assuming that the data were normally distributed; therefore, only nonparametric statistical methods were employed.

The sixty-eight perception items were grouped into the two categories of (1) perception of degree of change; and (2) perception of degree of influence as a result of that change. Kendall's tau was used to determine the
correspondence of the perceptions of change to the perceptions of influence within each item. Specifically, the form of Kendall's tau employed for this determination utilized the formula:

$$\tau(r) = \frac{S}{\frac{1}{2} N(N-1)}$$

with a significance level set at .05.

The data produced by the individual items were combined within each of the major areas designated for study. Within each major area they were separated into responses (1) reflecting change; and (2) reflecting influence. They were then manipulated to produce readings of perceptions for each of the following groups:

1. Total sample population
2. Teacher sub-group
3. Principal sub-group
4. S.E.S. sub-groups

The data were reported according to the following format:

- **Teaching Methods and Practices**
  - Imposed Changes
  - Influence of Change

- **Teacher-Pupil Relationships**
  - Change
  - Influence of Change

- **Teacher-Principal Relationships**
  - Change
  - Influence of Change

- **Teacher Time in Subject Matter Areas**
  - Change
  - Influence of Change
Teacher Time in Interpersonal Contacts
Change Influence of Change

Teacher Time in Other Activities
Change Influence of Change

The following interpretation of Mean ranges was employed throughout the study to determine within which of the five possible response categories the Mean would be located:

### TABLE 10
**INTERPRETATION OF MEANS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Range</th>
<th>Response Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00 to 1.49</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50 to 2.49</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50 to 3.49</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50 to 4.49</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.50 to 5.00</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Mann-Whitney U test was employed for comparison of perceptions of teacher and principal sub-groups. This test was constructed for use with uncorrelated data from samples with varying size, and to determine if two independent sample groups have been drawn from the same population.
It is considered by Seigel\textsuperscript{13} and by Downie and Heath\textsuperscript{14} to be the most powerful of the nonparametric tests. The computations were made according to the following:

Let $R =$ the sum of ranks in the lower group then

$$U = R - \frac{M(M+1)}{2}$$

where

$M =$ the number of observations in the lower group.

The Kruskal-Wallis test was employed to determine the differences between samples grouped according to the three categories of socioeconomic status. It is a one-way analysis of variance by ranks used to determine whether $k$ independent samples are from different populations. Sample values usually differ somewhat, and this test answers the question of whether the differences among samples signify genuine population differences or not. A $\chi^2$ value was obtained to determine significance levels. The Kruskal-Wallis formula employed was:

$$H = \frac{12}{N(N+1)} \sum_{j=1}^{k} M_j (R_j - R..)^2$$


Where there existed a significant difference in the average rankings between the three groups according to the Kruskal-Wallis test, the Dunn Multiple Comparison test was employed to determine where the difference existed between the three groups. The Dunn Multiple Comparison formula employed was:

\[
(Z) \left( \sqrt{\frac{N(N+1)}{12}} \right) \left( \sqrt{\frac{1}{M_2} + \frac{1}{M_3}} \right)
\]
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This study was an attempt to determine the perceived changes and influence on selected aspects of elementary teacher behavior as a result of the requirements of the Stull Act in California. The study identified and examined changes and positive or negative influence of those changes as perceived by elementary teachers and principals in the following areas:

1. Imposed changes in teaching methods and practices
2. Teacher-pupil relationships
3. Teacher-principal relationships
4. Allocation of teacher time to:
   a. subject matter areas
   b. interpersonal contacts
   c. other activities

Survey questionnaires were sent to 13 principals and 146 teachers serving in three distinctly different school districts. The districts were separately located in rural, urban, and suburban population areas. The study population represented thirteen schools of varying size.
and serving various percentages of minority students. Four schools served children from the low socioeconomic level; four schools served children from the middle socioeconomic level; and five schools served children from the high socioeconomic level. The rate of questionnaire return was as presented in table 11.

**TABLE 11**

**RATE OF QUESTIONNAIRE RETURN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 of 13 principals</td>
<td>76.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 of 146 teachers</td>
<td>57.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94 of 159 subjects</td>
<td>59.12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to gain a gross overall indication of perceptions for the total sample population, the data were tabulated to provide total raw scores for each response category from which simple percentages of responses were calculated. The raw scores were then weighted to provide for an unequal N of responses and computed into overall Means of responses indicating total population perceptions of degrees of change and influence.

To provide overall indications of perceptions of each group in the study, the data were compiled into totals and Means for each item for each sub-group. The raw scores were tabulated into grand totals under each response
category and simple percentages of response were computed for each sub-group. Because the N of responses were not equal, the Means were weighted for compilation into Grand Means for each sub-group.

The data for the teacher and principal sub-groups were submitted to operations of the Mann-Whitney test to provide comparison of responses. The data for the separate S.E.S. sub-groups were compared using the Kruskal-Wallis test. The results of the above tests showing the degree of correlation between the comparative sub-groups were displayed graphically in tables 13 through 27.

It must be kept in mind that the questionnaire was composed of single items calling for two separate responses from each subject. The first response elicited a perception of decrease or increase in a designated activity which reflected change. The second response elicited a perception of the degree of negative or positive influence on the designated activity that the change had incurred. For purposes of comparison, the data indicating perceptions of change and of influence under each area of inquiry were presented in single tables. However, a note of explanation was necessary so that the tables might be more clearly understood. To provide clarity the perception factors were coded as follows:

AC Imposed changes in teaching methods and practices
AI Influence of imposed changes on teaching methods and practices

BC Change in teacher-pupil relationships

BI Influence of change on teacher-pupil relationships

CC Change in teacher-principal relationships

CI Influence of change on teacher-principal relationships

DC Change in allocation of teacher time to subject matter areas

DI Influence of change in allocation of teacher time to subject matter areas on teaching practices

EC Change in allocation of teacher time to interpersonal contacts

EI Influence of change on interpersonal relationships

FC Change in allocation of teacher time to other activities

FI Influence of change on teaching practices

Computations involving the data for the total sample population revealed that the Grand Mean for perception of change was 3.28 and the Grand Mean for perception of the influence of that change was 3.16. The criteria set forth in table 10 for determination of response category placement of Means indicated that both the Grand Means fell well within the response category of No Change. Indications were that, as a whole, the total population of the study perceived a small degree of increased activity in
the areas investigated due to the requirements of the Stull Act and a parallel small degree of positive influence as a result of that change in activity level.

In order to ascertain perceptions of the study population within the major areas examined, the item responses were regrouped to provide data for each major area. These data presented in the form of Means for the total sample population in each of the major areas can be found in table 12 and appendix G. Moreover, these support the earlier observation that the sample population as a whole perceived the Stull Act as effecting only a slight degree of change and influence in the areas examined. While all twelve of the area Means indicated a degree of change and influence, only two actually fell outside of the No Change response category. Both of these Means reflected perceptions in the area of change and both fell within the response category of Some Increase in Activity. The responses indicated that the Stull Act had imposed a degree of change in teaching methods and practices and that the positive influence of that change, though existing, was small.

The second area in which the total population perceived the Stull Act as causing change in teacher behavior was in the amount of time required of teachers in activities other than those directly related to teaching. It
can be noted that the degree of perceived influence of the change was virtually non-existent.

**TABLE 12**

GENERAL PERCEPTIONS BY MAJOR AREAS:
TOTAL POPULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR AREA</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imposed changes in teaching methods and practices</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of imposed changes on teaching methods and practices</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in teacher-pupil relationships</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of change on teacher-pupil relationships</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in teacher-principal relationships</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of change on teacher-principal relationships</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in allocation of teacher time to subject matter areas</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of change in allocation of teacher time to subject matter area on teaching practices</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in allocation of teacher time to interpersonal contacts</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of change in allocation of teacher time to interpersonal contacts on interpersonal relationships</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in allocation of teacher time to other activities</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of change in allocation of teacher time to other activities on teaching practices</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A comparison of overall perceptions by teacher and principal sub-groups can be found in table 13. The procedure of combining responses and weighting Means was employed in compilation of these scores.

**TABLE 13**
COMPARISON OF OVERALL PERCEPTIONS: TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-GROUP</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES</th>
<th>MEANS*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T**</td>
<td>1.2% 4.2% 66.1% 22.9% 5.6%</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5% 7.7% 69.7% 18.5% 2.6%</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P***</td>
<td>- 3.5% 58.8% 35.9% 1.8%</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 6.2% 53.8% 38.2% 1.8%</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Weighted Means  
** = Teachers  
*** = Principals

Data presented in table 13 indicated that principals on the whole saw the Stull Act as generally causing more of an activity increase in the areas explored with a consequent positive influence on that activity than did the teachers. Further, the principals generally did not see the legislation as having as great an influence at the extremes of the scale as did the teachers.

A comparison of perceptions of teachers and principals within each of the major areas is presented in the data displayed in tables 14 through 19.
The data displayed in table 14 showed that the perceptions of both sub-groups were in agreement that the Stull Act had imposed some changes in teaching methods and practices; however, there existed a significant difference in perceptions regarding the amount of positive influence the change had effectuated. The principals perceived the change to have a far more positive influence than did the teachers. The principals' Mean fell within the response category of Some Positive Influence while the teachers' Mean was less than .3 above the 3.0 central score of the No Change category.

**TABLE 14**

**COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS BY MAJOR AREA: TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS. TEACHING METHODS AND PRACTICES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR AREA*</th>
<th>GROUP HIGHER M</th>
<th>LOWER M</th>
<th>U FACTOR</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Principal 3.65</td>
<td>Teacher 3.50</td>
<td>310.0</td>
<td>.0939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>Principal 3.62</td>
<td>Teacher 3.29</td>
<td>277.0</td>
<td>.0404**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*AC = Imposed changes in teaching methods and practices  
AI = Influence of imposed changes on teaching methods and practices  
** = Significantly different at the .05 level

The greatest divergence of perceptions between teachers and principals in the study lay in the area of teacher-pupil relationships. Table 15 shows the U Factors
and levels of significance which resulted from this comparison. There existed a significant difference in both perceptions of change and of influence. Although Mean perceptions of both groups lay above the 3.0 level of No Change in this area, the teacher Means were less than .2 above while the principals' Means were at or greater than .45 above. The principals' Mean for degree of influence fell within the limits of the Some Positive Influence category. This single area reflected the greatest divergence of perceptions within the areas of examination with a difference of .38 points existing between teacher and principal perceptions of degree of influence. However, regardless of the degree of divergence of perceptions, the Stull Act was seen by both groups as having only a very nominal effect in changing teacher-pupil relationships.

TABLE 15
COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS BY MAJOR AREA: TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS. TEACHER-PUPIL RELATIONSHIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR AREA*</th>
<th>HIGHER GROUP</th>
<th>LOWER GROUP</th>
<th>U FACTOR</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>Principal 3.45</td>
<td>Teacher 3.19</td>
<td>238.5</td>
<td>.0102**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI</td>
<td>Principal 3.55</td>
<td>Teacher 3.17</td>
<td>194.0</td>
<td>.0020**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*BC = Change in teacher-pupil relationships

BI = Influence of change on teacher-pupil relationships

** = Significantly different at the .05 level
The data in tables 16 and 17 reflect the two major areas in which the perceptions of teachers and principals were most closely aligned. Both sub-groups saw the Stull Act as having a positive influence on teacher-principal relationships however not to the degree that it could be reported out of the No Change category. The closest agreement between the sub-groups in the study came in their perceptions of the amount of change in allocation of teacher time to subject matter areas. Both sub-groups saw little change in this regard with only .04 points separating the Means. Perceptions of the subjects indicated that the Stull Act had little or no effect on either of the two areas.

**TABLE 16**

**COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS BY MAJOR AREA: TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS. TEACHER-PRINCIPAL RELATIONSHIPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR AREA*</th>
<th>HIGHER GROUP</th>
<th>LOWER M</th>
<th>U FACTOR</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Principal 3.40 Teacher 3.22</td>
<td>350.0</td>
<td>.2025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>Principal 3.30 Teacher 3.17</td>
<td>382.5</td>
<td>.3387</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CC = Change in teacher-principal relationships
CI = Influence of change on teacher-principal relationships*
### TABLE 17

**COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS BY MAJOR AREA: TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS. ALLOCATION OF TEACHER TIME TO SUBJECT MATTER AREAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR AREA*</th>
<th>HIGHER GROUP</th>
<th>LOWER M</th>
<th>U FACTOR</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DC Principal</td>
<td>3.17 Teacher</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>381.0</td>
<td>.3316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI Principal</td>
<td>3.24 Teacher</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>336.0</td>
<td>.1565</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*DC = Change in allocation of teacher time to subject matter areas  
DI = Influence of change on teaching practices

The display of data in table 18 reflected that a significant difference existed between sub-group perceptions as to the degree of influence that an increase in the amount of teacher time spent in interpersonal contacts had caused. While both sub-groups felt the amount of interpersonal contacts had increased due to the requirements of the Stull Act, the principals felt it had a much greater positive influence on teacher interpersonal relationships than did the teachers themselves. It was again significant to note that perceptions for both groups in both categories of change and of influence fell within the No Change response limits.
TABLE 18
COMPARISON OF PERCEPTION BY MAJOR AREA: TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS. ALLOCATION OF TEACHER TIME TO INTERPERSONAL CONTACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR AREA*</th>
<th>HIGHER GROUP</th>
<th>LOWER GROUP</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE FACTOR</th>
<th>LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Principal 3.30</td>
<td>Teacher 3.11</td>
<td>309.5</td>
<td>.0824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>Principal 3.08</td>
<td>Teacher 3.05</td>
<td>275.0</td>
<td>.304**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*EC = Change in allocation of teacher time to interpersonal contacts
EI = Influence of change on interpersonal relationships
** = Significantly different at the .05 level

Two rather significant points were reflected in the data of table 19. The first was that this was the only area in the study in which the Mean of teacher responses was higher than that of the principals' responses. Secondly, it was the only area in the study in which a Mean fell below the 3.0 central point of the No Change category.

There existed a significant difference between the sub-groups in their perceptions of the degree of influence which the changes held. The teachers felt that the Stull Act had caused a decided increase in the amount of time necessarily allocated to activities other than actual teaching, and correspondingly felt this change to have a slightly negative influence on teaching practices. While
the principals felt there had been an increase in these activities, they did not see the change as having a negative influence, but rather a slightly positive influence on teaching practices.

**TABLE 19**

**COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS BY MAJOR AREAS: TEACHER AND PRINCIPALS. ALLOCATION OF TEACHER TIME TO OTHER ACTIVITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR AREA*</th>
<th>HIGHER GROUP</th>
<th>HIGHER M</th>
<th>LOWER GROUP</th>
<th>LOWER M</th>
<th>U FACTOR</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FC</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>306.0</td>
<td>.0785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>276.5</td>
<td>.0405**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*FC = Change in allocation of teacher time to other activities  
FI = Influence of change on teaching practices  
** = Significantly different at the .05 level

A cross tabulation of the related parts of each item using Kendall's tau showed a positive correlation between an increase in the designated activity being examined and a positive influence on that activity in all except two cases. The two exceptions were sub-sections of item 19 which dealt with allocation of teacher time to activities other than actual teaching.

Specifically, item 19b dealt with time spent on yard duty, hall duty, etc. and item 19d dealt with time spent in total staff meetings. A comparison of teacher
and principal responses to these items reflected somewhat divergent perceptions. The principals perceived no change and no influence in the area of monitoring type duties while teachers perceived an increase in these types of activities with a consequent negative influence on teaching practices. In the area of time spent in total staff meetings, principals perceived an increase with a perfectly correlated positive influence; however, teachers perceived less of an increase than did the principals but felt a negative influence from the change that had occurred.

In order to gain an indication of overall response by socioeconomic status group, the rankings produced by the Kruskal-Wallis test for each of the major areas were weighted with the results presented in table 20.

Of the two categories of change and of influence, the greatest spread in average rank positions between the three levels of socioeconomic status was in the area of perceived influence where a total spread of 6.73 positions was observed. A spread of 5.43 was observed in the positions under degrees of change. While some differences existed in overall perceptions, the differences were not such that they were significantly different in a statistical sense. However, these computations did indicate that subjects working in low S.E.S. schools generally perceived the Stull Act as causing a greater degree of change.
in and having a greater degree of influence upon their behavior than did subjects working in either middle or high S.E.S. schools. It must be noted that the middle S.E.S. group saw the Stull Act as having the least overall effect on their behavior. These findings seem to be in contradiction to the popular notion that more change generally takes place in schools serving a higher S.E.S. clientele.

**TABLE 20**

OVERALL PERCEPTIONS BY MAJOR AREA:
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>LOW S.E.S.</th>
<th>MIDDLE S.E.S.</th>
<th>HIGH S.E.S.</th>
<th>RANK SPAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>51.26</td>
<td>45.83</td>
<td>46.11</td>
<td>5.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFLUENCE</td>
<td>51.60</td>
<td>44.87</td>
<td>46.62</td>
<td>6.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The perceptions of teachers and principals combined and grouped by socioeconomic status of the schools in which they served are reflected in the data presented in tables 21 through 26. The data were interpreted under each of the major areas of the study.

The data in table 21 reflect no significant differences between the S.E.S. groups in their perceptions of Stull imposed changes in teaching methods and practices. This was the only major area in this part of the study in which an inverse correlation between the level of S.E.S.
and the rank order of the groups was maintained in both perceptions of change and of influence. The low S.E.S. group perceived the greatest change and influence and the high S.E.S. group perceived the least in both instances.

TABLE 21
COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS BY MAJOR AREA: SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS GROUPS. TEACHING METHODS AND PRACTICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR AREA*</th>
<th>SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS</th>
<th>AVERAGE RANKING</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>AVERAGE RANKING</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>AVERAGE RANKING</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SIG. LEVEL**</th>
<th>RANK SPAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>53.90</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>49.83</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39.39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.1073</td>
<td>14.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIDDLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td></td>
<td>55.58</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45.89</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43.06</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.2368</td>
<td>12.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*AC = Imposed changes in teaching methods and practices
AI = Influence of imposed changes on teaching methods and practices
** = Significance level was determined using $\chi^2$ with 2 df.

The most consistent pattern of response clustering between the S.E.S. groups in any of the major areas in this part of the study is reflected in the data of table 22. However, no significant differences in perception existed. The difference in span between change and influence covered only .03 positions. Although the low and middle S.E.S. groups exchanged relative positions of rank
order from that in table 21, the numerical weight was so small as to be negligible.

The low S.E.S. group perceived the Stull Act as causing the greatest degree of change in teacher-pupil relationships; however, the middle S.E.S. group perceived the greatest degree of positive influence as a result of that change. Once again, the high S.E.S. group perceived the least change and resultant influence among the three groups.

**TABLE 22**

COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS BY MAJOR AREA: SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS GROUPS. TEACHER-PUPIL RELATIONSHIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>MIDDLE</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>SIG. LEVEL**</th>
<th>RANK SPAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR AREA*</td>
<td>AVERAGE RANKING</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>AVERAGE RANKING</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>AVERAGE RANKING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>49.45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48.95</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI</td>
<td>47.75</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48.94</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*BC = Change in teacher-pupil relationships  
BI = Influence of change on teacher-pupil relationships  
** = Significance level was determined using $z^2$ with 2 df.

Reinforcement of the indication that the low S.E.S. group perceived the Stull Act as causing the greatest degree of change and having the greatest influence among the three socioeconomic groups was rendered by the results of the
computations displayed in table 23. However, the middle S.E.S. group perceived the mandates as having the least effect among the three groups in the area of teacher-principal relationships with the high S.E.S. group occupying the center position.

### TABLE 23

**COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS BY MAJOR AREA: SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS GROUPS, TEACHER-PRINCIPAL RELATIONSHIPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS</th>
<th>MAJOR AREA*</th>
<th>LOW AVERAGE RANKING N</th>
<th>MIDDLE AVERAGE RANKING N</th>
<th>HIGH AVERAGE RANKING N</th>
<th>SIG. LEVEL**</th>
<th>RANK SPAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>51.60 20</td>
<td>43.65 40</td>
<td>48.27 33</td>
<td>.5078</td>
<td>7.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>55.93 20</td>
<td>42.58 40</td>
<td>46.95 33</td>
<td>.1760</td>
<td>13.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CC = Change in teacher-principal relationships
CI = Influence of change on teacher-principal relationships
** = Significance level was determined using \( \chi^2 \) with 2 df.

The data displayed in tables 24 and 25 reflect the identical pattern established in table 23 with the low S.E.S. group occupying the position of greatest perception of change and influence, the middle S.E.S. group occupying the position of least perception of change and influence, and the high S.E.S. group in the moderate central position. No significant difference in perceptions of the Stull Act effects on allocation of teacher time to
subject matter areas was noted. However, a significant difference at the .05 level did exist in perception of its effect on the amount of time teachers spent in interpersonal contacts. The significant difference lay between the perceptions of the low and middle S.E.S. groups. The low group perceived the effects of the legislation as increasing the interpersonal contacts of teachers to a far greater degree than did those in the middle S.E.S. group. A corresponding difference in perceptions of the influence of that change in interpersonal contacts did not materialize. There were no significant differences between the groups throughout this section of the study in their perceptions of the influence of the Stull Act on teacher behavior.

TABLE 24
COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS BY MAJOR AREA: SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS GROUPS.
ALLOCATION OF TEACHER TIME TO SUBJECT MATTER AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS</th>
<th>LOW MAJOR AREA</th>
<th>MIDDLE MAJOR AREA</th>
<th>HIGH MAJOR AREA</th>
<th>SIG. LEVEL**</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RANKING</td>
<td>RANKING</td>
<td>RANKING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>49.23</td>
<td>45.11</td>
<td>48.06</td>
<td>.4077</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI</td>
<td>52.96</td>
<td>41.90</td>
<td>49.56</td>
<td>.2381</td>
<td>11.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*DC = Change in allocation of teacher time to subject matter areas
DI = Influence of change on teaching practices
** = Significance level was determined using $\chi^2$ with 2 df.
TABLE 25

COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS BY MAJOR AREA: SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS GROUPS. ALLOCATION OF TEACHER TIME TO INTERPERSONAL CONTACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR AREA*</th>
<th>LOW AVERAGE RANKING</th>
<th>LOW N</th>
<th>MIDDLE AVERAGE RANKING</th>
<th>MIDDLE N</th>
<th>HIGH AVERAGE RANKING</th>
<th>HIGH N</th>
<th>SIG. LEVEL**</th>
<th>RANK SPAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>56.15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39.75</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50.24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.0412***</td>
<td>16.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>51.48</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44.05</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47.86</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.5389</td>
<td>7.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*EC = Change in allocation of teacher time to interpersonal contacts
EI = Influence of change on interpersonal relationships
** = Significance level was determined using $\chi^2$ with 2 df.
*** = Significantly different at the .05 level

The data in table 26 reflect the least spread between the socioeconomic groups in rank positions in any of the major areas explored in this section of the study. The spread was only .55 positions in the perception of change in allocation of teacher time to activities other than teaching and only 3.71 positions in perceptions of the influence of that change. Even though the spread in rank positions was small, it should be noted that the influence category of this area is the only place where the high S.E.S. group ranking was highest among the three separate groups in this section of the study.
TABLE 26

COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS BY MAJOR AREAS: SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS GROUPS. ALLOCATION OF TEACHER TIME TO OTHER ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>MIDDLE</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR AREA*</td>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC</td>
<td>47.10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>45.89</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*FC = Change in allocation of teacher time to activities other than teaching  
FI = Influence of change on teaching practices  
** = Significance level was determined using χ² with 2 df.

A recapitulation of the rank positions of the three socioeconomic groups is presented in table 27. The data in table 27 served to reinforce the point made above that the low socioeconomic group perceived more effect from the requirements of the Stull Act than did either the middle or high socioeconomic group. The ratio of placement of the low group in the highest ranking to a combination of both the remaining two groups' placement in that position was 3:1. In no category did the low group perceive the least effect.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.E.S. GROUP</th>
<th>HIGHEST RANKING</th>
<th>MIDDLE RANKING</th>
<th>LOWEST RANKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 25 asked subjects to indicate impacts other than the Stull Act which may have caused or contributed to changes in teaching practices and/or teacher relationships with children, other teachers, or the building principal. The rate of response to this item was considerably lower than the number of responses to the item-check portion of the questionnaire. Five of the ten responding principals and forty-five of the eighty-four responding teachers completed Item 25 which yielded a 53 percent return of those completing the survey questionnaire, and a 32 percent return of the total study population.

Although Item 25 asked only for impacts other than the Stull Act as indicated, many respondents utilized the opportunity to editorialize on their perceptions of the merits and demerits of the Stull Act. These responses were included as a part of this study because they provided invaluable insight into acceptance of the legislation and
its effect on teacher behavior. Most of the respondents indicated more than a single factor; therefore, the total number of combined responses far exceeded the total of fifty individual responses.

There existed no concurrence among the five principals responding pertaining to impacts other than the Stull Act on teaching practices or relationships. Individual responses indicated the following:

Parent pressures and demands for better educational programs which would result in higher pupil achievement provided an impetus for teachers to improve instructional methods.

Change in organizational structure such as open space, team teaching, non-graded classrooms, Year 'Round School, and administrative decentralization provided individual schools and teachers with the flexibility necessary to incorporate innovative programs.

Changes in curricular emphasis provided opportunities for expansion of teaching methods. (This was not explained by the respondent.)

Unionization of teachers had had a negative impact on teacher-principal relationships tending to place them on opposite sides of educational issues with the children caught in the middle. The tendency was for teacher unions and associations to fight against innovations under the guise that they caused more work for the teachers. Hence the status quo was maintained, whether it be educationally sound or not.

Indications by teachers of other impacts on their behavior were far more varied, which was to be expected, by virtue of the greater number of responses. Impacts other than the Stull Act which were cited by teachers were as follows:
Eleven teachers cited state and federally funded programs as having a decided impact on their teaching methods. Six of these indications of change were attributed to the California Early Childhood Education Program which provided additional funds in Kindergarten through third grade classrooms for additional supplies, instructional materials and teacher aides. Four respondents report the impact of federally funded E.S.A.A. programs as a strong factor. The remaining single respondent indicated that the California Miller-Unruh Reading Program provided an impetus for change in her teaching methods.

Ten teachers cited advanced college or university study in the area of alternative teaching methods as having a decided influence on their teaching practices. They cited as examples; training for individualization of instruction, training for team teaching, training in alternative methods of reading instruction, and classes on humanizing of instruction.

Seven teachers cited new organizational structures as having a positive impact on not only teaching methods but on pupil achievement as well. It is interesting to note that the new organizational structures cited as promoting positive change were not limited to individual classrooms. While team teaching, extended day reading, and alternative grouping methods were cited, so also were district reorganization to the Year 'Round School and the administrative change to a decentralized program or concept dealing with curriculum, program, budget, and localized decision making.

Four teachers indicated that district in-service training or staff development programs had brought about positive results in changing their teaching methods which resulted in acceleration of pupil achievement.

Three teachers indicated that the building principal had brought about positive changes in their teaching methods. All three cited that the openness, support, and positive leadership of the principal led them to try new methods and ideas. Two of the three respondents were from the same district, however, all were from separate schools.

Three teachers indicated a shift in the socio-economic status or ethnic composition of the student body caused a change in their teaching approaches.
Two cited the fact of bussing for integration purposes as the cause for the population shift, and the third cited a shift of ethnic composition of the neighborhood. All indicated that new methods had to be incorporated in order to meet the more diverse needs of the children.

Two teachers cited a negative shift in parent attitude toward the school and education in general as having caused them to alter teaching practices and methods. The implication being that they had to change their approaches with the children to compensate for lack of parent support and follow-through.

Only one teacher indicated that an interchange of ideas between staff members had prompted a change in her approaches to teaching. It was felt by the investigator that this influence might have been much more common than reported, however, the changes may have been so subtle as not to be considered in response to the wording of Item 25.

Many of the respondents took the opportunity of the open response nature of Item 25 to editorialize on or in essence to evaluate the Stull Act and its effects. By way of evaluation of the elements of the legislation, the principals offered the following:

Teachers resented having to write goals and objectives because they felt it unnecessary for good teaching and an affront to their professional status.

In order to insure attainment of objectives upon which they would be evaluated, teacher objectives were written to a level that would be at least attained but more commonly exceeded.

A breakdown in teacher-principal relationships was felt to have resulted from the principals' attempts to implement and enforce the provisions and requirements of the Stull Act.

The Stull Act had created an amount of paper work that was disproportionate to any small favorable results that may have been attained.
Good teachers will do a good job of teaching with or without the Stull Act. The Stull Act was therefore redundant so far as they were concerned.

The Stull Act had made dealing with a poor teacher more difficult in that it created an excess of forms, legal requirements and appeal levels.

To these indications of discontent with the Stull Act from principals the teachers' responses added the following rather impressive list:

Seventeen teachers felt that the Stull Act had created a disproportionate amount of paper work. Twelve of the teachers felt the chore of writing goals and objectives with the consequent record keeping actually detracted from their teaching performance. It must be noted that five of the teachers felt the added burden of paper work on the principal detracted from his leadership role in the school in that it made him a paper shuffler rather than an educational leader.

Twelve teachers indicated that the requirements of the Stull Act actually hindered them in their teaching practices. Among the feelings expressed was a restriction on trying new methods and ideas and staying with methods that had proven successful out of concern for attaining the stated objectives. Others stated that objectives were necessarily set low so that attaining or exceeding them could be realized and they get on with the job of teaching. Still another concern expressed was that the pressure of having to achieve a set of goals and objectives caused a less relaxed approach to teaching and consequently interfered with teacher-pupil relationships.

Nine teachers concluded that the Stull Act had no, or at least little, effect on upgrading performance of already average or good teachers. An additional two teachers stated that it had no effect on teachers whom they considered to be ineffective or marginal in upgrading their performance or eliminating them from the profession.

Two teachers stated that they felt the Stull Act had caused a breakdown in teacher-principal relationships because it too clearly put them on opposite
sides of issues. One teacher indicated a concern that principals and administrators used the Stull Act as an instrument to get rid of teachers they personally did not like.

One teacher felt that the requirement of the Stull Act for achievement caused a disproportionate amount of time to be spent with low achieving students at the expense of the remainder of the class.

Of the forty-five narrative responses by teachers only one indicated support of the Stull Act. The response indicated that meeting the requirements of the legislation provided a clear-cut goal and consequently eliminated the busy work from teaching. The implication being that all efforts would be narrowly channeled toward the goal.

**Changes in Evaluation Procedures**

The results of the data presented precipitated a review of the evaluation guidelines and procedures developed and adopted by the three districts involved in the study. The review was made to determine what changes had taken place in evaluation procedures as a result of the mandating legislation. Difficulty was encountered in all cases in locating procedures and forms used prior to implementation of the Stull Act requirements. Since the forms and procedures had been superseded many had been discarded. In some cases, in order to provide a comparison of documents, the investigator was furnished with completed evaluation forms from the district master personnel files. Teacher names were obliterated to provide anonymity of the evaluatee.
The Suburbia Unified School District was formed one year after enactment of the Stull Act, therefore, no documents from the district as constituted at the time of the study were available. However, documents were sought from the elementary district which became the elementary division of the newly unified district. Though a thorough search of files and records was made by district personnel, no copies of the written evaluation procedures could be located. Comments by officials in the district office indicated, however, that the former procedures were somewhat loosely defined and based on long standing, and for the most part, unwritten but accepted practices.

A review of the two and one-half page evaluation section of the Personnel Policies adopted for the 1974-1975 school year showed essentially a restatement and limited expansion of the provisions of the Stull Act and the guidelines provided by the Department of Education. However, two major deviations from the state guidelines were noted: (1) The district wrote into their procedures the provision for involvement of more than one evaluator for a single evaluatee though it specified that only one evaluator must carry the responsibility for the final evaluation. The state guidelines made no precise provision for this practice. (2) The State Department of Education
guidelines suggested establishment of a minimum number of observations by the evaluator of the evaluatee in work situations. The Suburbia procedure made no mention of the minimum number of observations required for evaluational purposes.

There existed considerable differences between the pre and post Stull Act evaluation forms. The pre Stull Act evaluation form called for a numerical rating of 1 (Meets or exceeds expectations) or 2 (Does not meet expectations) in each of twelve categories which were grouped under four major headings as follows:

Directs Learning:
- Plans for instruction
- Centers classroom control on pupil needs
- Uses appropriate instructional techniques
- Possesses adequate knowledge of subject matter
- Utilizes effective room environment

Evaluates Learning:
- Assesses pupils positively

Participates Professionally:
- Professionally involved in curriculum studies
- Professionally involved in college classes

Maintains Appropriate Relationships:
- Works effectively with staff
- Participates effectively with community
Relates well to parents

Observes administrative procedures.

The only narrative comment required was under the heading of "Evaluators Remarks." A space was also provided for teacher comments if they desired to offer them. Final disposition of the evaluation was carried out by checking one of the following recommendations:

- A contract for next year will be recommended
- Recommendation for a contract is possible but specified areas need improvement
- Other
- Reemployment will not be recommended.

The evaluation was based on an unspecified number of observations and no requirement existed for specifying teacher goals or objectives.

The post Stull Act procedure was far more detailed, extensive, and comprehensive. It began with a preliminary evaluation conference in which the teachers' goals and objectives were negotiated between the teacher and the evaluator and finalized in written form. Observations were recorded and must have included specific recommendations for improvement of noted deficiencies. The final evaluation form called for a rating of either effective or unsatisfactory supported by narrative comments in each of the four following areas:

- Achievement of stated and mutually derived objectives
Maintenance of proper control
Suitable learning environment
Performance of other duties

A section was provided to indicate areas of future expected growth and a section was also provided for evaluatees' comments if they desired to offer them. Final disposition of the evaluation was made by either an indication of recommendation for rehire or for dismissal. In the event the rating of unsatisfactory existed in any area an additional form was required which provided for the following:

- A description of areas of performance considered unsatisfactory.
- A description of the specific assistance that had been provided the evaluatee to include the dates of such assistance.
- A description of the results of that assistance to include dates.

The pre Stull Act evaluation procedure required only observation and a simple evaluation form. The post Stull Act procedure required evaluator-evaluatee communication to define goals and objectives upon which the evaluation would be based. It required narrative comments to support ratings and specific suggestions for improvement in areas of noted deficiency.
Changes in the Urbania Unified School District evaluation procedures and forms were found to be considerable as evidenced by a pre Stull Act procedural document of four pages as opposed to a post Stull Act procedural document of fifty-two pages. The pre Stull forms used for teacher evaluation consisted of the following:

- Classroom Observation Form (1 page, 2 copies)
- Probationary Teacher Appraisal Form (1 page, 3 copies)
- Professional Review for Tenured Teachers (1 page, 3 copies)

The post Stull Act forms for teacher evaluation consisted of the following:

- Initial Conference Agreement (1 page, 2 copies)
- Evaluator Check List for Assessing Physical Environment (1 page, 2 copies)
- Evaluatee Guidelines for Assessing Physical Environment (1 page, 2 copies)
- Classroom Observation Record (2 pages, 2 copies)
- Teacher Reaction to Classroom Observation (1 page, 2 copies)
- Certificated Employee Performance Appraisal (4 pages, 4 copies)

The pre Stull Act procedural regulations provided general guidance for evaluation, offered instructions for completing the required forms and set deadline dates for completion of each of the probationary evaluations and the
tenured teacher professional review. On the other hand the post Stull Act regulations explicitly defined the following:

- Job description position statements
- Job description format to include four job description models
- Prime evaluator designation for each position in the district from the Board of Education down
- Other designated evaluators and evaluation reviewers
- Guidelines for assessing student progress
- Evaluator/Evaluatee relationships defined
- Observation and evaluation procedures
- Evaluation sequence to include deadline dates
- Copies of the forms to be used in the evaluation process

The pre Stull Act probationary teacher appraisal forms provided a five point scale of performance from (1) outstanding to (5) unsatisfactory in each of three areas:

- Teaching Competence
- Personal Qualities
- Professional Characteristics

Printed on the back of the forms were indicators of what each of the five point ratings meant under each of the three areas. Spaces were provided for narrative acknowledgments, recommendations for improvement, and for teacher
comments. A simple Yes-No check was included for contract renewal and/or tenure recommendations. The pre Stull Professional Review for tenured teachers consisted of available space for only narrative comments under each of the separate headings of:

- Performance
- Personal Qualifications
- Suggestions
- Assignment Recommendations

A space was also provided for teacher comments if they should desire to make them.

By way of contrast, a single post Stull Act teacher evaluation form for both probationary and tenured teachers provided a four point scale from Exceeds Expectations to Does Not Meet Minimum Requirements to be marked for each of eleven areas under the following headings:

I. Teaching Competence

A. Conducts class effectively as evidenced by oral and written communication, presentation of lessons, use of a variety of methods and resources, classroom control.

B. Exhibits creativity as evidenced by flexibility, sensitivity, originality.

C. Plans and organizes work as evidenced by course plans, record keeping, reports to parents and pupils as formulated in goals and objectives.

D. Demonstrates adequate knowledge of the subject he/she teaches.
E. Promotes an effective balance of freedom and security in the classroom.

F. Accepts students as they are for the basis of teaching and guidance.

G. Conveys information and provides opportunities for students to achieve goals.

II. Professional Responsibilities

A. Assumes responsibility for records, materials, and equipment.

B. Seeks appropriate help when needed; accepts supervision in a positive manner.

C. Adheres to school and district policies and procedures; meets school responsibilities promptly; observes professional ethics.

D. Tries to understand all sides of a question; makes reliable decisions; exercises good judgment in discussing school problems.

The evaluation form required a restatement of the goals and objectives negotiated and written on the Initial Conference Agreement form and narrative comments to support any rating below a satisfactory level of attainment of those goals and objectives. Also required in these comments was a statement of extenuating circumstances which may have affected the teachers' performance as well as recommendations for improvement of any deficient areas. Included in a section for the evaluatee's comments were check items for the evaluatee to indicate a preference for further conferences, if sufficient time had been allotted
for the evaluation conference, and any area in which a disagreement with the evaluator existed. The forms included as appendices J and K were illustrative of the change that had taken place in the evaluation forms.

Additional factors which were required for consideration in development of the evaluation were the assessments of both parties of the physical environment and the teachers' written reactions to the classroom observations.

Farm Elementary School District

The pre Stull Act evaluation policy of the Farm Elementary School District consisted of five short paragraphs as opposed to a post Stull Act policy of twenty-two pages. The earlier document established responsibility for evaluation, set deadline dates for the completion of evaluation, offered some limited instructions to the evaluator and defined the tenure process. The latter policy explicitly defined and explained the following:

Evaluator Designation
Determination of Objectives and Standards
Rating Purposes
Standards for Evaluation
Interpreting the Evaluation Scale
Instructional Objectives
Instructional Objectives Procedures
Assessment Techniques
Formal Evaluation Conferences
Support Requirements and Constraints
Administrative Support
Unsatisfactory Performance
Calendar for Implementation
Glossary of Terms
Explanation of Evaluation Forms
Copies of Evaluation Forms

The pre Stull Act evaluation form consisted of a single sheet which provided a check space to designate probationary or tenured status, a check space for recommendation for re-employment or dismissal, a space for the evaluator's narrative comment, and spaces for both the evaluator and the evaluatee to sign. No observation form was available for review due to discontinuance of its use.

The post Stull Act evaluation form provided a three point scale from Professionally Competent to Unsatisfactory for twenty-two indicators grouped under the following major areas:

I. INSTRUCTIONAL PROCEDURES
   1. Works toward written goals and objectives
   2. Makes effective plans and preparation
   3. Shows skill in classroom organization and procedures
4. Shows skill in presenting subject material
5. Has knowledge in subject matter
6. Creates environment favorable to learning
7. Plans for individual differences
8. Develops student interest
9. Shows skill in developing study habits
10. Class time is efficiently utilized
11. Utilizes audio-visual teaching aids

II. TEACHER-PUPIL RELATIONSHIPS
1. Shows understanding for pupils with problems
2. Maintains an effective balance of freedom and security in classroom
3. Involves students in the learning process
4. Encourages student discussion

III. NON-INSTRUCTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS
1. Works well with fellow staff members
2. Achieves parent understanding and cooperation
3. Acceptable personality, appearance and health
4. Shows professional growth
5. Maintains a positive attitude
6. Keeps and submits accurate records and reports
7. Accepts and utilizes constructive suggestions
Spaces were allotted for the evaluator's narrative comments under each major area and for an overall comment from the teacher. A check system was provided to indicate probationary level or tenure status and a recommendation for re-employment or dismissal. The observation report form consisted of a space for narrative comments from the evaluator and the evaluatee.

The post Stull Act evaluation forms and documents for implementation appeared to have been far more comprehensive and to provide for a more adequate picture of the teacher's abilities and capabilities. Guidelines for the evaluation process were far more clearly defined for the evaluator and evaluatee to follow.

**Negotiations**

Provisions of the Stull Act required the separate Boards of Education to avail themselves of the advice of the certificated instructional personnel in the development of the individual district evaluation and assessment guidelines. All three districts surveyed in this study reported compliance with this requirement through appointment of development committees which worked during the summer months preceding actual Stull Act implementation within their districts. The Farm Elementary District and the Suburbia Unified District both appointed personnel to serve on the development committees to represent grade
levels and/or administrative areas. While this procedure of administrators and teachers meeting jointly to determine policy and procedures could be construed to be negotiations, this type of arrangement failed to fit the provisions of the California Winton Act in that no single organization within the districts represented the total teacher corps of the district as in the case of formal meet and confer sessions. However, some items contained in the originally adopted guidelines had subsequently been placed before the meet and confer bodies of the districts for formal negotiations.

*Farm Elementary School District*

The Superintendent of the Farm Elementary School District reported that only three items of those originally developed for the evaluation and assessment guidelines had been presented to the "meet and confer" body for negotiations. The teachers' association requested more explicit definition of what composed adjunct duties, teachers' professional responsibilities, and the length of the teachers' school day. These were apparently agreed upon without undue conflict.

The Superintendent also reported that he felt that the Stull Act had simplified some aspects of the negotiations process for two reasons. Initially the legislation had mandated that specific criteria be utilized for
assessment purposes which precluded further negotiations on those points. Secondly, the extensive and comprehensive nature of the developed guidelines had settled many issues pertaining to some working conditions and assessment procedures that would have had to have been dealt with singly and in a time-consuming manner.

**Suburbia Unified School District**

The Superintendent's representative of the Suburbia Unified School District reported that the evaluation and assessment guidelines development meetings were, in his estimation, so fruitful as to preclude further negotiation of the procedures agreed upon. At the time of this study, it was reported that no item previously adopted had subsequently been requested to be placed before the "meet and confer" body.

**Urbania Unified School District**

By way of contrast to the above districts, the Urbania Unified School District utilized a quite different approach to the process of development of the mandated guidelines. Anything having to do with the Stull Act implementation in the Urbania district was negotiated through the Certificated Employees Council. An actual contract for service on the development committee was negotiated through the C.E.C. to include rate of remuneration for services
rendered, working hours of the development committee, number of meetings to be held, and composition of the membership of the committee. Membership of the committee was composed of appointed representatives from the local teachers' association, the local teachers' union, the local administrator association, and the district administration. The appointments were made by the separate groups from their respective memberships roles.

Upon completion of the development process, the entire implementation package to include all forms was submitted to the C.E.C. for further negotiations. All items were negotiated to agreement with the single exception of the title of one committee. The entire development and negotiations process took in excess of six months. To preclude further delay of implementation, the Board of Education adopted the guidelines with the administration's recommended title for the committee in question.

Each year the total evaluation package and related forms were submitted to the C.E.C. for review and revision. This resulted in a great many minor changes in wording and definitions in the guidelines and some major changes in the evaluation forms which resulted in annual revision of the entire set of forms. The Superintendent's representative cited the following major changes over the three years since initial adoption of the guidelines:
1. Initially, only the designated prime evaluator was allowed to make formal observations for evaluation purposes. The change in this restriction provided that if the designated prime evaluator declared in writing to the evaluatee that extraordinary circumstances existed then, and only then, could other observers be utilized.

2. Initially, the minimum and maximum number of formal observations were set. The minimum was set at two and the maximum at five for each evaluation period. This was amended so that if the declaration cited above was made the maximum number of observations was nullified and an unlimited number could be made.

3. The initial guidelines did not include an evaluation form which provided for evaluation of specialist positions such as counsellor, librarian, nurse, therapist, etc., who were certificated but were not classed as regular classroom teachers. The forms were developed through the negotiations process and incorporated into the evaluation package.

4. The Board of Education in its original adoption of the evaluation package did not stipulate that the document was a guideline and not policy. This resulted in a great many grievances being filed because of missed deadlines and by-passed procedures. For the 1975-1976 school year the board declared by formal action that the evaluation document was a guideline only and not policy.

Findings

The analysis of the data collected in the study revealed ten findings of a general nature pertaining to effects of the Stull Act on teachers generally, and nineteen specific findings relative to the specifically defined areas of the study. While most of the data indicated a reinforcement of the rationale behind the law which was to
constructively change teacher behavior, that reinforcement was so small in most cases that it was classified as only nominal.

The findings which emerged indicated little discrepancy between the perceptions of teachers and principals insofar as they viewed the Stull Act as having an effect on teacher performance or teaching practices. That effect was seen as negligible. This same indication held consistent when the data were analyzed by socioeconomic status groups as well.

The findings that emerged from the examination of the data were grouped under areas of the study as follows:

**General**

**Finding 1.**--A positive relationship was observed between an increase in the activities examined and a positive degree of influence on teacher behavior. This positive relationship was observed in all except two minor areas dealing with activities other than actual teaching.

**Finding 2.**--The total population of the study perceived the Stull Act as causing only small increases in the activities investigated and as having a very slight positive influence on teacher behavior as a result of that change.
Finding 3.—The Means of the total population for the twelve major areas examined fell within the No Change category of response with two exceptions. The two exceptions reflected perceptions of Some Increase in the major areas of imposed changes in teaching methods and practices and in the amount of teacher time allocated to activities other than actual teaching.

Finding 4.—Principals perceived the Stull Act as causing more of a change in teacher behavior than did teachers.

Finding 5.—Principals perceived the Stull Act as having more of a positive influence on teacher behavior than did teachers.

Finding 6.—The three socioeconomic status groups were very similar in their overall perceptions of the amount of change brought about by the requirements of the Stull Act. Of a possible ninety-four rank positions, the span between the average rankings of the three groups covered only 5.43 rank positions. The average rankings were clustered around the central position of the scale.

Finding 7.—The three socioeconomic status groups were very similar in their overall perceptions of the degree of influence which the changes held. Of a possible ninety-four rank positions the span between the average
rankings of the three groups covered only 6.73 rank positions. The average rankings were clustered around the central position of the scale.

Finding 8.—The overall average rankings of the three socioeconomic status groups indicated that the low socioeconomic group perceived the greatest change in and influence on teacher behavior as a result of the requirements of the Stull Act.

Finding 9.—The overall average rankings of the three socioeconomic status groups indicated that the middle socioeconomic status group perceived the least change in and influence on teacher behavior resulting from the requirements of the Stull Act.

Finding 10.—The low S.E.S. group perceptions of the effect of the Stull Act on teacher behavior fell in the highest ranking position at a ratio of 3:1 over a combination of both remaining groups in this ranking position. In no major area did the low S.E.S. group perceive the Stull Act as having the least effect of the three groups.

Changes in teaching methods and practices

Finding 11.—There existed no significant difference in the perceptions of principals and teachers that
the Stull Act had imposed changes in teaching methods and practices.

Finding 12.--There existed a significant difference in the perceptions of principals and teachers as to the amount of positive influence the change in teaching methods and practices had effectuated. The principals felt the effect was far more positive than did the teachers.

Finding 13.--No significant difference existed between the perceptions of the three socioeconomic status groups in the major area of Stull Act imposed changes in teaching methods and practices and the resulting influence of that change. An inverse correlation existed between the socioeconomic status of the groups and their rank order. The low group perceived the greatest effects from the Stull Act, and the high group perceived the least.

Teacher-pupil relationships

Finding 14.--A significant difference was noted between perceptions of principals and teachers of the change that had taken place in teacher-pupil relationships and the resulting influence of that change. The principals perceived a greater increase in teacher-pupil contacts and a greater positive influence on teacher-pupil relationships from that increase than did the teachers.
Finding 15.--No significant difference existed between the socioeconomic status group perceptions in the major area of Stull Act effect on teacher-pupil relationships.

Teacher-principal relationships

Finding 16.--No significant difference was determined between perceptions of principals and teachers in the area of the Stull Act effects on teacher-principal relationships. Both groups perceived a limited increase in teacher-principal contacts with a resulting limited positive influence.

Finding 17.--No significant difference existed between the socioeconomic status group perceptions in the major area of Stull Act effect on principal-teacher relationships.

Allocation of teacher time to subject matter areas

Finding 18.--No significant difference was noted between perceptions of principals and teachers in the allocation of teacher time to subject matter areas. Both groups perceived a slight increase in the time spent in subject matter areas and a slightly positive influence as a result of that increased time.
Finding 19.—No significant difference existed between the socioeconomic status group perceptions in the major area of Stull Act effect on the allocation of teacher time to subject matter areas.

Allocation of teacher time to interpersonal contacts

Finding 20.—No significant difference was noted between perceptions of principals and teachers in the allocation of teacher time to interpersonal contacts. Both groups perceived an increase in this area. A significant difference was apparent in their perceptions of the degree of positive influence of the change. The principals perceived a greater positive influence than did the teachers.

Finding 21.—A significant difference was noted between the perceptions of the low and middle socioeconomic status groups as to the effect of the Stull Act on the amount of time teachers spent in interpersonal contacts. The low group perceived a greater degree of increase in contacts than did the middle group. A corresponding difference in perceptions of the influence of the change did not exist.

Allocation of teacher time to other activities

Finding 22.—Although teachers perceived a greater increase in the amount of teacher time allocated to
activities other than actual teaching than did the principals, no significant difference existed in this area. However, a significant difference was apparent between the groups in their perceptions of the influence that this change held. Principals perceived the influence as somewhat positive while teachers perceived it as somewhat negative.

Finding 23.--No significant difference existed between the socioeconomic status group perceptions in the major area of Stull Act effect on the allocation of teacher time to activities other than actual teaching.

Change from other impacts

Finding 24.--There existed no concurrence within the principal group in identifying impacts on teacher behavior which may have caused change other than the Stull Act. Among those impacts identified were parent pressures, changes in organizational structure, changes in curricular emphasis, and unionization of teachers.

Finding 25.--There was concurrence among teachers in identifying impacts on teacher behavior other than the Stull Act. The impacts receiving seven or more citations were: State and Federally funded programs, advanced college and university studies, and new organizational structures. Impacts receiving three or four citations
were: district in-service training, positive leadership from principals, and socioeconomic and ethnic shifts within the school neighborhood or attendance area.

**Effects on the evaluation process**

**Finding 26.**--Principals and teachers concurred in the following criticisms of the requirements of the Stull Act:

a. The Stull Act created a disproportionate amount of paper work to the benefits derived from the requirements.
b. Requirements of the Stull Act did not upgrade competent teacher performance.
c. Requirements of the Stull Act did not upgrade ineffective or marginal teacher performance and made dealing with them more difficult.
d. Because teachers would be rated on the attainment of stated goals and objectives, those goals and objectives were set low to insure attainment.
e. Requirements of the Stull Act detracted from the educational leadership role of the principal.

**Finding 27.**--Requirements of the Stull Act resulted in much clearer definition and delineation of the teacher evaluation process than previously noted in the districts involved in this study.
Finding 28.---Requirements of the Stull Act resulted in more numerous, more detailed, and lengthier evaluation documents and forms than previously utilized in the districts involved in this study.

Effects on the negotiations process

Finding 29.---No conclusive evidence was found pertaining to the effect of the Stull Act on the negotiations process. In one district the process had been simplified and in yet another the process had been complicated.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The intent of this study was to determine the perceived changes in and influence on selected aspects of elementary teacher behavior as a result of the requirements of the Stull Act in California. The study was conducted in the non-clinical field situation of the California public elementary educational system and involved principals and teachers actively involved in the business of educating children in the Kindergarten through sixth grades. This was an exploratory study and as in most exploration efforts the initial findings led beyond the original objective. The initial findings subsequently led into the areas of changes in teacher evaluation policies and procedures and into Board of Education-teacher negotiations.

The California school districts involved in the study were of diverse organizational structure and tenure. The districts were: one rural elementary district which had been incorporated in 1887; one urban unified school district which was established as a unified district in
1966; and one suburban unified school district which was organized into a unified district in 1973.

Within the districts the individual schools in the study represented the socioeconomic standing of the majority of its student clientele. There were four separate schools in each of the low and middle socioeconomic groups and five schools in the high socioeconomic group.

The individual subjects of the study population possessed two common characteristics. The first being that they were involved directly with children at the elementary school level. The second was that each had a minimum of six consecutive years of experience within the California elementary educational system which provided for at least three years of pre Stull Act service upon which to base comparison of three years of post Stull Act behavior. A total of 159 subjects received the survey questionnaire of which 59.12 percent responded.

**Conclusions**

The data reported by the respondents were submitted to analysis by application of Kendall's tau, the Mann-Whitney U, and the Kruskal-Wallis tests. The Kendall's tau test of correlation was used to determine the correspondence of the perception of change to the perception of influence within each item. The Mann-Whitney U test was employed for comparison of perceptions of the teacher and
principal sub-groups. The Kruskal-Wallis test of variance by ranks was applied to determine if differences existed between the data samples grouped according to the three levels of socioeconomic status.

An analysis of the data produced by the statistical tests resulted in a total of twenty-nine findings. Ten of the findings were of a general nature and the remaining nineteen were specific within the areas examined in the study. The ten general findings fell further into three distinct areas. The findings were categorized under the heading of:

**General findings**

- Relationship of change in activity level to direction of influence
- Relationship of teacher to principal perceptions
- Relationship between perceptions of the socioeconomic status groups

**Specific findings**

- Findings relative to changes in teaching methods and practices
- Findings relative to teacher-pupil relationships
- Findings relative to teacher-principal relationships
- Findings relative to allocation of teacher time subject matter areas
- Findings relative to allocation of teacher time to interpersonal contacts
Findings relative to allocation of teacher time to other activities

Findings relative to change from impacts other than the Stull Act

Findings relative to the effects on evaluation procedures and processes

Findings relative to the effects on the negotiation process.

The findings forced several conclusions which are listed below according to the categories assigned to the findings.

General

Findings one through three reflected perceptions regarding the relationship between a change in activity and its influence on teacher behavior and forced the following conclusion:

Though less than statistically significant, there were indications that an increase in activity level resulted in a positive influence on teacher behavior.

The range of Mean scores for the No Change response category was 2.50 to 3.49 inclusive with the central point of the category at 3.0. It was found that the overall perceptions of change fell within the above response category limits of No Change. It must be additionally concluded that an overall increase in the activities observed had taken place due to the fact that the overall Means of all major areas examined fell above the 3.0 central position of the category. This served to indicate that an increase in activities had taken place, but that it was
not great enough to extend into the next higher response category of Some Increase.

Using the defined limitations of scale it was found that the overall perceptions of the degree of influence of the change that had occurred also fell within the response category of No Change. It must be further concluded, however, that a slight overall positive influence was perceived in that the Means of perception of influence fell above the 3.0 central position of the scale although not sufficiently high enough to extend into the next higher category of Some Positive Influence.

Findings four and five came from a comparison of teacher and principal responses and resulted in the following conclusion:

The principals perceived the Stull Act as effecting a greater change in and greater influence upon teacher behavior than did the teachers.

In the twelve major areas examined in the study, only one Mean of teacher responses fell above a corresponding Mean of principal responses. In this case the teachers saw more of their time being utilized for non-teaching duties with a consequent minimally negative influence on their teaching practices. While the principals perceived an increase in these activities they did not feel the increase was as great as did the teachers. Correspondingly, the principals did not perceive the
increase to have a negative influence on teaching practices as did the teachers but rather a slightly positive influence. It is of interest to note that even with this somewhat philosophically based difference in perceptions, it was not this area in which the greatest divergence of perceptions existed.

The greatest divergence of perceptions existed in the area of influence of the Stull Act on teacher-pupil relationships. The principals felt that the requirements of the Stull Act had created decidedly better teacher-pupil relationships while the teachers felt only a small degree of improvement. This may be attributed to the fact that teachers did not see the positive influence on their relationships with children of what they were required to do because of their close proximity with the children day in and day out while the principals could view the relationship changes from periodic observations. To further reinforce this point, an examination of the separate sub-group Means in each of the twelve areas investigated revealed that four of the principal Means and only one of the teacher Means fell within the next higher response categories of change and influence.

The conclusion drawn from findings six through ten which were precipitated by analysis of the data grouped
by the socioeconomic status of the publics served was that:

The Stull Act more effectively changed and influenced behavior of teachers serving in low socioeconomic schools than of teachers serving in either middle or high socioeconomic schools.

In only one instance did the data computed on the basis of socioeconomic status of the schools served indicate a significant difference in perceptions between the three socioeconomic status sub-groups. This difference existed between the low and middle socioeconomic status groups in the area of allocation of teacher time to interpersonal contacts. Though an apparent difference existed between the middle and high socioeconomic status groups in the area it was not great enough to be of statistical significance.

Although the conclusion reached was that a significant difference existed in perceptions between the three socioeconomic status groups in only one area, indications were strong that the Stull Act had its greatest effect on changing teacher behavior in the low socioeconomic schools and the least effect in the middle socioeconomic schools. Throughout this section of the study, the teachers working in schools serving low socioeconomic children perceived the Stull Act as causing greater change in their behavior and as having more positive influence on their teaching practices than did teachers serving either middle or high
socioeconomic children. The teachers serving in the middle socioeconomic level schools generally perceived the least change and influence among the three sub-groups.

The underlying cause of the greater influence on teachers working in the low S.E.S. schools was not sought for in the data and remained a matter for conjecture. However, based on observation, two mutually supportive assumptions were made in an attempt to interpret the findings. (1) Teachers of low socioeconomic status children enjoy few contacts with and little direct support from parents; and (2) parents of the middle and high socioeconomic status schools maintain higher expectations for and have more contacts with the school and consequently demand more accountability of it. In essence, prior to the Stull Act mandate for accountability, the parents of the higher S.E.S. schools had acted as a force for teacher change to develop behavior that would provide higher pupil achievement. With those changes already in effect, the provisions of the Stull Act did little more than positively reinforce them. On the other hand, teachers in low S.E.S. areas had no such force upon them. Lack of parent contact and the consequent lack of overt support left those teachers without parent feedback on their efforts. The Stull Act then provided a vehicle for the necessary feedback to cause change in teacher behavior.
Changes in teaching methods and practices

The Stull Act had brought about only nominal change in the methods and practices that teachers employed in their daily teaching.

Principals and teachers alike expressed concern over teachers setting easily attainable objectives in order to insure a favorable evaluation by reaching and/or surpassing those objectives. The implication was that the major emphasis in the classroom was aimed at achieving a few stated objectives using teaching methods which had a proven degree of success in the past. This tended to preclude trying innovative or other creative methods out of concern that the alternate methods would not prove as successful as methods previously used and familiar to the teachers and the children. With the major emphasis toward a few stated objectives, extension of the children in areas not directly related to those objectives was curtailed. Results of the survey showed an actual increase in emphasis in the areas of reading, mathematics, and spelling; however, a decrease in emphasis was noted in the subjects of science, social studies, music, art, and physical education. A definite increase in the amount of pre and post testing used by teachers was evident; however, it was felt that this was in response to the requirement that gains in pupil achievement be proved by objective methods.
The study population perceived the Stull Act as having little effect on the performance of already competent or outstanding teachers. It offered no material or ethereal inducements to better performance, but rather placed an added burden of proof of competency on teachers by way of requiring attainment of derived goals and objectives which the competent teachers considered redundant.

Teachers considered to be incompetent or nominally effective were allotted what was considered by some of the study population to be undue guarantees of retention. Rather than allow the immediate release of incompetent or marginally effective teachers so that better qualified personnel could take their place, the Stull Act guidelines provided them with a guarantee of professional guidance and special assistance. It was the expressed concern of teachers that the required guidance and assistance had not effectively upgraded their performance.

**Teacher-pupil relationships**

The requirements of the Stull Act had not precipitated a change in teacher-pupil relationships.

It was felt that the requirement of the legislation mandating that teachers be assessed regarding maintenance of proper control in their classrooms might affect the relationship of teachers and pupils through imposition of stricter classroom control measures. This concern was not
reinforced by the findings. Virtually no change in teacher-pupil relationships was observed in the statistical data or was indicated in the narrative comments as a result of that requirement.

Teacher-principal relationships

The Stull Act had not incurred a statistically significant change in the relationships between teachers and principals.

An increase in the number of contacts between teachers and principals was indicated as a result of attempts to meet the requirements of the legislation. The increased contacts were in the form of additional staff meetings, more frequent classroom observations, and individual conferences to negotiate teacher goals and objectives and as follow-up to the classroom observations. While the principals felt that this enhanced their understandings of what teachers were attempting to do in their classrooms and had a positive influence on teacher-principal relationships, the teachers did not entirely share this view. The narrative comments by teachers gave an indication that the Stull Act requirements detracted from the relationship they felt with principals because they too clearly put teachers and principals on opposite sides of educational issues.
Change in allocation of teacher
time to subject matter areas

The requirements of the Stull Act had caused little perceptible change in the amount of teacher time spent on subject matter areas.

The requirement of the legislation to establish standards of student progress in each subject area seemed to have had little effect on teacher subject area preparation or teaching practices. Though the study population indicated that there had been an increase in the amount of teacher time allocated to the basic subject matter areas, that increase was not of sufficient magnitude to be significant. A barely perceptible positive influence was indicated as a result of what little change had been effected.

Change in allocation of teacher
time to interpersonal contacts

The Stull Act had caused no appreciable change in the amount of time teachers spent in interpersonal contacts.

While the data reflected that there was no statistically significant change in teacher interpersonal contacts resulting from the requirements of the mandate, it was significant to note that contacts regarding subject related matters increased slightly while social or informal contacts decreased slightly. This would seem to support the indication from the narrative responses that a greater
proportion of teacher time was being apportioned to Stull Act related clerical types of involvement hence allowing less time for informal contacts.

**Change in allocation of teacher time to activities other than teaching**

The Stull Act had caused an increase in the amount of activities in which teachers were involved outside of regular teaching.

No significant difference was apparent between the sub-groups' perceptions on this matter in that they agreed that the amount of time teachers were required to spend on activities that were school related but not direct instruction had increased. The narrative comments indicated that goal and objective writing and detailed monitoring of student progress took a greater amount of time under the Stull Act requirements than previously allotted. It was of interest to note that principals felt this resulted in a positive influence on teacher behavior while the teachers felt the influence was negative.

**Impacts other than the Stull Act on teacher change**

Changes in teacher evaluation procedures and policies were not as effective in bringing about change in teacher behavior as were retraining of teachers, new organizational structures, and infusion of additional financial support of programs.

The narrative responses of the study population indicated that impacts other than the Stull Act had caused
far greater change in teacher behavior and more positive influence on teaching practices than did the Stull Act itself. The legislation imposed only teacher evaluation procedural changes while the other outside influences and activities cited brought about change by infusion of funds for program support and additional programs, changes in teaching methods through retraining of teachers, and organizational restructuring of the teaching situation. Responses indicated that teachers did not perceive the evaluation procedures developed under the Stull Act as contributing to their professional growth or that of their colleagues.

This would seem to hold strong implications for administrators wishing to bring about change in teacher behavior. If positive changes are to be obtained, then it would appear that positive concrete inducements for change would produce greater results than the apparently questionable inducements of a revised evaluation system. This is not to imply that evaluation, per se, is of questionable value, only that the Stull Act system of evaluation did not seem to offer inducements necessary to bring about change under the circumstances of the system of teacher tenure.
Effects on evaluation procedures and policies

The requirements of the Stull Act had promoted a clearer understanding and statement of the functions and professional responsibilities of teachers and had affected a complete revision and redefinition of the evaluation process.

Prior to the Stull Act an individual was employed to teach with little or no written direction or definition of job functions or responsibilities. They were expected to teach within whatever meaning teaching held to the particular administrator with whom they came in contact. Their job parameters were in essence at the whim of the administrator. The Stull Act guidelines required that a complete job description be developed by each district for each certificated position within its organization to include conditions of employment, specific expectancies and responsibilities in the major area of employment, and in adjunct areas and duties as well. This proved to be one of the strong requirements of the legislation for it provided a clear-cut definition for teachers and administrators to follow and established parameters within which to operate.

Through requiring development of extensive guidelines for certificated personnel evaluation in every California school district, the Stull Act in essence precipitated an evaluation of the existing assessment processes. An additional positive stipulation of the legislation was
that in the development of evaluation guidelines the Boards of Education were required to actively seek the advice and involvement of those that were to be assessed within them. This provided an opportunity for the prospective evaluatees to make known their concerns regarding what they may have considered to be unfair or inequitable practices and to contribute to the development of sounder more objective procedures and criteria.

The review of the changes in procedures and policies reflected that in all cases the extent of the forms to be completed in the evaluation process had at least doubled and that the steps in the process of evaluation had been extended for administrators as well as including required written documents from teachers. If the gains in positive change had been in proportion to the increase in volume of paper flow, then it follows that the perceptions of the study population would have been much higher than the approximate 3.2 overall ranking that existed.

**Effects on the negotiation process**

No conclusive evidence was found to support the contention that the Stull Act had affected the negotiations process.

Although the Stull Act required that Boards of Education avail themselves of the advice of the certificated personnel of the districts in development of the
evaluation guidelines, this was not construed to require that negotiations, per se, be held between the two bodies within the definition of the "meet and confer" legislation existing in the state at that time. While some districts may have elected to use the negotiations process in the development of the evaluation guidelines, no definitive conclusions could be drawn from the data collected in this study as to the effect of the Stull Act on the actual negotiations process.

Indications existed that parts of the developed evaluation processes and procedures had subsequently come under negotiations since their initial adoption; however, this did not preclude the possibility that identical items would not have come under negotiation at a later time. While no conclusions were made as to the effect of the Stull Act on the negotiations process as such, it was concluded that the requirements of the Stull Act had effectively accelerated resolution of some matters which were likely to go before the negotiations bodies at a future time.

Recommendations

The direct involvement of state legislative bodies in education as reviewed in this exploration attests to the importance of education in the American way of life. Accountability, as distasteful as it appears to seem to
some professional educators, is not only essential to the success of the total educational establishment but desirable and needs to be more fully incorporated into the system at all levels from pre-school through the graduate universities.

This study was an attempt to determine in part some strengths and weaknesses of a legislative mandate for educator accountability. The investigation resulted in findings and conclusions upon which recommendations were based.

It is recommended that legislative bodies move with caution to mandate evaluation and accountability procedures in education. Authors of evaluation mandates will need to personally undertake exhaustive studies of past practices and the underlying philosophy of teacher evaluation in order that they might more clearly comprehend the impact that their legislation might wield. It is further recommended that any entity which contemplates such action should take as its guide a model for teacher evaluation, such as the Redfern model, which has been tested and found useful. Moreover, it seems critically important that if mandated evaluation and accountability procedures are to be effectively implemented, members of the educational establishment must be significantly involved in their development.

While state level associations and unions are construed to be representative of teacher concerns and are
able to provide valuable information to the effort, there is no greater source of pragmatic input than the practicing classroom teacher and/or principal who meets and works with children and other teachers on a daily basis. They need to be utilized in mandate development to the fullest degree possible.

According to the sample of this study, there was discontent on the part of teachers and principals with the results of the Stull Act. While the intent of the mandate was to improve teaching practices through establishment of sounder evaluation procedures, this study population did not perceive the Stull Act as having effected much more than a minimally positive change in teacher behavior. It seemingly had not accomplished its purpose on any grand scale but had rather created a nearly ineffective paper monster.

The findings that emerged from examination of the data were startling in regard to the blandness of impact on teacher behavior in the sample population. As stated, those findings indicated that the mandate had accomplished very little in the way of constructive change. This outcome was clearly not in keeping with the stated intent of the Stull Act. If perceptions of the study population were indicative of educator reaction to the mandate throughout the state, then the legislation should be amended. However, before any efforts are undertaken to amend the law, further
intensive study will need to be made to determine if the findings of this study are in fact representative of the larger population of the educational community of California. It is therefore recommended that this study be replicated on a statewide basis encompassing a much more extensive sampling of districts for this determination.

In the eventuality that the statewide replication study substantiate the findings presented herein, it is recommended that the California State Legislature take action to create a task force of practicing teachers and principals to be charged with the responsibility for revision of the provisions of the Stull Act in order that it might be amended to more nearly accomplish its goal.

One of the major criticisms of the Stull Act posited by the study population was that rather than induce teachers to try creative and innovative teaching methods in an attempt to provide for greater pupil achievement, it had effectively locked teachers into methods with an already proven degree of success out of teacher concern for attaining specified objectives of pupil performance. It is recommended that principals utilize sound leadership principles in encouraging and even insisting that teachers try new or different teaching strategies to reach their objectives while at the same time providing them with adequate resources to handle the job and sound professional and sincere moral support wherever possible. In so doing,
principals must be willing to provide teachers with a freedom to fail without fear of recrimination or an unsatisfactory evaluation under Stull Act guidelines.

Principals must be continually cognizant of the concerns of teachers for pupil achievement. In order to overcome these concerns which have apparently been intensified by the requirements of the Stull Act, it is recommended that principals work as closely as possible with teachers in all phases of educational objective development to insure that those objectives be realistic and challenging. Building principals and staffs need to spend additional time jointly reviewing the provisions of the act and their own district-developed guidelines so that complete understanding of the philosophy, policies, and procedures might be developed. Further, local school goals need to be developed cooperatively between teachers and principals so that individual teacher goals and objectives might be more congruent with them. Development of deeper understanding of the law and the pursuant district guidelines would help to dissolve the seemingly negative attitude of teachers toward the evaluation process.

The exploratory nature of this study opened many avenues to areas which need to be examined in greater depth to provide deeper understanding of the effects of the Stull Act on the total educational milieu in California. It is
recommended that in-depth studies be conducted in the areas touched upon in this investigation. Such areas for study may include but are not to be limited to:

1. Comparative effects of the Stull Act requirements on teachers serving in schools of differing socioeconomic status clientele to determine the underlying causes of the indicated greater change in teachers serving in low socioeconomic areas.

2. Relative effects of the Stull Act on teacher behavior in intermediate and/or secondary schools.

3. Comparative effects of the Stull Act on primary (K-3) and upper (4-6) elementary teacher behavior.

4. Direct effects of the Stull Act on the negotiations process.

5. Effects of the Stull Act on administrator behavior.

6. Changes in curricular emphasis brought about as a direct result of the requirements of the Stull Act.

While the dissimilar effect of the Stull Act on teachers serving in the various socioeconomic status schools was touched upon, it was beyond the parameters of the exploratory nature of the study to pursue the subject further. An in-depth inquiry and analysis to determine the underlying causes of the differences in degree of change and influence between the groups would provide valuable insight for administrators and teachers alike who must implement the mandate.
As children pass up through the grades and expand their knowledge and expertise the methods to teach them may necessarily change. However, the Stull Act had mandated a single set of guidelines and procedures under which all teachers at all levels would be evaluated. It needs to be determined if the requirements of the legislation were equally effective or ineffective at all levels so that amendments might be more realistically made to improve the provisions governing evaluation.

Although no definitive conclusion could be drawn from the data collected in this study on the relative effects of the Stull Act on the negotiations process, the broad implications of the legislation may have had effects heretofore undefined. The results of an in-depth investigation into this area could hold strong implications for negotiations on both the district and teacher sides of the negotiating table.

The intent of the legislation was to constructively change teacher behavior through the evaluation process. However, this purpose could not be attained without overt action on the part of administrators who must assess teacher competence. A determination of the kinds of change or lack of change in administrator behavior in meeting the intent of the mandate would provide insight into its
success or failure and would hold implications for administrator training and future administrative staff development.

Indications were that some changes in emphasis on various subject matter areas were made in the elementary schools surveyed in this study as a result of the requirement in the legislation that standards for student progress be established in each subject area. A study of those changes would provide curriculum developers with valuable information to assist them in development of programs and materials to meet the needs of students and teachers.

This study has not been nor was it intended to be totally conclusive but rather to provide insight into apparent strengths and weaknesses of the Stull Act as a viable alternative for improvement of teacher behavior in the teaching process.

The general tenor of the narrative responses was almost totally negative in nature with only one respondent attesting support of the mandate. The general negative tenor was best summed up by the editorial comment of a teacher from the Farm Elementary School District. She wrote: "Sorry, I'm not much help. I do the best job I know how, am usually at school 'till 5:00 and I just don't worry about the Stull Bill. I fit my objectives and evaluation into my regular program and then get on about my job."
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APPENDIX A

ASSEMBLY BILL 293, CHAPTER 361
Section 40. Article 5.5 (Commencing with Section 13485) is added to Chapter 2 Division 10 of the Education Code, to read:

Article 5.5 Evaluation and Assessment of Performance of Certificated Employees

13485. It is the intent of the legislature to establish a uniform system of evaluation and assessment of the performance of certificated personnel within each school district of the state. The system shall involve the development and adoption by each school district of objective evaluation and assessment guidelines.

13486. In the development and adoption of these guidelines and procedures, the governing board shall avail itself of the advice of the certificated instructional personnel in the district's organization of certificated personnel.

13487. The governing board of each school district shall develop and adopt specific evaluation and assessment guidelines which shall include but shall not necessarily be limited in content to the following elements:

(a) The establishment of standards of expected student progress in each area of study and of techniques for the assessment of that progress.

(b) Assessment of certificated personnel competence as it relates to the established standards.

(c) Assessment of other duties normally required to be performed by certificated employees as an adjunct to their regular assignments.

(d) The establishment of procedures and techniques for ascertaining that the certificated employee is maintaining proper control and is preserving a suitable learning environment.

13488. Evaluation and assessment made pursuant to this article shall be reduced to writing and a copy
thereof shall be transmitted to the certificated employee not later than 60 days before the end of each school year in which the evaluation takes place. The certificated employee shall have the right to initiate a written reaction or response to the evaluation. Such response shall become a permanent attachment to the employee's personnel file. Before the end of the school year, a meeting shall be held between the certificated personnel and the evaluator to discuss the evaluation.

13489. Evaluation and assessment of the performance of each certificated employee shall be made on a continuing basis, at least once each school year for probationary personnel, and at least every other year for personnel with permanent status. The evaluation shall include recommendations, if necessary, as to areas of improvement in the performance of the employee. In the event an employee is not performing his duties in a satisfactory manner according to the standards prescribed by the governing board, the employing authority shall notify the employee of such fact and describe such unsatisfactory performance. The employing authority shall thereafter confer with the employee making specific recommendations as to areas of improvement in the employee's performance and endeavor to assist him in such performance.
APPENDIX B

LETTERS, INSTRUCTIONS, AND QUESTIONNAIRE TO PRINCIPALS
Dear Principal,

Enclosed you will find the questionnaires which seek information regarding the effect of the Stull Act on selected teaching practices and teacher relationships. There is a single questionnaire worded especially for your completion with the remainder being identical in content and wording for the teachers in your building. Each questionnaire has attached a stamped return envelope to insure confidentiality for the respondents. Only the cumulative data from some 200 teachers and 15 principals will be released for information purposes.

The questionnaires are to be distributed to only those teachers in your building who have a minimum of six (6) years experience in the California school systems. This parameter is set so that a reflection can be made to experiences and relationships prior to passage of the Stull Act.

The code numbers in the upper right hand corner of the questionnaires identify geographical regions only so that a demographic variable may be employed with the data. It does NOT identify individual questionnaires. Please assure your teachers of this.

I sincerely appreciate your assistance in this endeavor and ask that you urge your teachers to complete and mail the questionnaire within the next two days. Thanks so very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Richard P. Shoemaker
Dear Principal,

Very little is known about the influence the Stull Act has had on education in California. As you and your teachers have worked through its implementation these past three years they may have had to alter some of their teaching practices and some of their relationships with the children, with fellow teachers and with you, the principal. My effort is to determine to what degree the Stull Act has contributed to these changes but more precisely by either increasing or decreasing certain teacher actions and what kind of influence it has had on those actions.

I seek your participation in this study through completion of the attached questionnaire. It will require some reflection on your part for I am asking you to project back to those school related experiences teachers had before the Stull Act came into being, in essence to "see it like it was." Then come back to the present and "see it like it is." Next, to decide if a change has taken place in that particular aspect of teacher experience and determine if the change, if any has occurred, is a direct result of the requirements of the Stull Act.

Secondly, if a change has taken place, please determine if the change has been a positive or negative influence on that teaching practice or relationship and to what degree. You may feel that a few of the items are asking you to make a judgment about the teachers' professional ability. This is certainly not the intent of any of the items for I am seeking only degrees of change and influence, not evaluation of teacher ability. At any rate, please be assured this survey is completely anonymous and confidential. To further insure this confidentiality you have been provided a stamped, addressed envelope in which to return the survey directly to me.

The reason for the code numbers was covered in the other letter so we won't need to go into that again here. I sincerely appreciate your assistance in this endeavor and ask that you complete this questionnaire and mail it within the next two days. Thank you for your time, effort and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Richard P. Shoemaker
**Example:** The first part of each item is followed by a series of boxes indicating a five-point scale of change. The second part is followed by a series of boxes indicating a five-point scale of influence. For each item simply place a check in the appropriate box for each part reflecting your perception on that particular issue. You are not asked to make a judgment of good or bad, right or wrong, only if a change has taken place that is directly attributable to the Stull Act and if that change has influenced teaching practices or relationships of teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Decreased Greatly</th>
<th>No Change</th>
<th>Increased Greatly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>la. As a direct result of the requirements of the Stull Act the number of contacts that teachers have with parents regarding pupil learning problems has</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Great Influence</th>
<th>Some Influence</th>
<th>No Influence</th>
<th>Great Positive Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lb. What influence has this change had on teacher-parent relationships?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1a. Think back to teacher-parent contacts 4 years ago regarding pupil learning problems. Did the teachers have many? How is it now? Do they have more or less contact with parents about pupil learning problems? In your judgment is the increase or decrease DIRECTLY AS A RESULT OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE STULL ACT? Has the change been great, some or has there been no change? Check the appropriate box. PLEASE NOTE: If there has been a change but it is not directly attributable to the Stull Act then report no change.

1b. For the second part of each item if there has been no change then there would of course be no influence. However, if there has been change, how has the change influenced that particular aspect of the teachers' school related experience? Has it been a negative or positive influence and to what degree? By positive influence is meant enhancement of that particular aspect for the teacher or for other individual(s) involved. Negative influence would then be just the opposite.
1. What change have the requirements of the Stull Act had on the amount of emphasis teachers place on each teaching area? By amount of emphasis is meant the amount of time actually allotted to it during a normal week.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Decreased Greatly</th>
<th>Decreased Some</th>
<th>Increased Some</th>
<th>Increased Greatly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The amount of emphasis on Reading has</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of emphasis on Mathematics has</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of emphasis on Spelling has</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of emphasis on Science has</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of emphasis on Social Studies has</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of emphasis on Music has</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of emphasis on Art has</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of emphasis on Physical Education has</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2a. As a direct result of meeting the requirements of the Stull Act the amount of time teachers spend in preparing for classroom presentations has——

2b. What influence has this change had on teacher classroom presentations?

3a. As a direct result of the requirements of the Stull Act the degree to which teachers involve children in planning classroom activities has——

3b. What influence has this change had on the children's acceptance of the subject matter to be covered?

4a. As a direct result of the requirements of the Stull Act the amount of time teachers spend working with individual students on academic matters has——

4b. What influence has this change had on the achievement levels of children?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a. What change in the variety of teaching approaches?</td>
<td>Increase, Decrease, No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. What influence has this change had on teaching practices?</td>
<td>Increase, Decrease, No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. What change has occurred in the amount of assistance you give teachers with classroom discipline problems?</td>
<td>Increase, Decrease, No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. What influence has this change had on your relationship with the teacher?</td>
<td>Increase, Decrease, No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. What change has occurred in the amount of time teachers spend on creating and maintaining the learning environment in their classrooms?</td>
<td>Increase, Decrease, No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. What influence has this change had on the quality of the classroom learning environment?</td>
<td>Increase, Decrease, No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. What change has occurred in the amount of pre-testing teachers use?</td>
<td>Increase, Decrease, No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. What influence has this change had on your understanding of what the teacher is trying to teach?</td>
<td>Increase, Decrease, No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a. What change has occurred in the amount of post-testing teachers use?</td>
<td>Increase, Decrease, No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. What influence has this change had on the teaching practices?</td>
<td>Increase, Decrease, No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a. What change has occurred in the amount of time teachers spend in individualizing instruction?</td>
<td>Increase, Decrease, No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. What influence has this change had on the teaching practices?</td>
<td>Increase, Decrease, No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a. What change in the variety of teaching approaches?</td>
<td>Increase, Decrease, No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. What influence has this change had on the teaching practices?</td>
<td>Increase, Decrease, No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a. What change has occurred in the amount of time teachers spend on creating and maintaining the learning environment in their classrooms?</td>
<td>Increase, Decrease, No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b. What influence has this change had on the quality of the classroom learning environment?</td>
<td>Increase, Decrease, No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a. What change has occurred in the amount of pre-testing teachers use?</td>
<td>Increase, Decrease, No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b. What influence has this change had on teaching practices?</td>
<td>Increase, Decrease, No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10a. What change has occurred in the amount of post-testing teachers use?</td>
<td>Increase, Decrease, No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10b. What influence has this change had on teaching practices?</td>
<td>Increase, Decrease, No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a. What change in the variety of teaching approaches?</td>
<td>Increase, Decrease, No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11b. What influence has this change had on teaching practices?</td>
<td>Increase, Decrease, No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12a. What change in the variety of teaching approaches?</td>
<td>Increase, Decrease, No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12b. What influence has this change had on teaching practices?</td>
<td>Increase, Decrease, No Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18a. What effect has meeting the requirements of the Staff Act had on the amount of time teachers are able to maintain "proper control"? Has there been an increase or decrease in the amount of time teachers are able to maintain "proper control"? How has this affected teaching practices and teacher relationships with children?

18b. What influence has this change had on teaching practices? Has there been an increase or decrease in the amount of time teachers are able to consult with other teachers on their own grade level about classroom subject matter? Has there been an increase or decrease in the amount of "outside" materials teachers use in their classrooms? This is in reference to materials procured by them from other than district sources. The amount has increased.

18c. What effect has meeting the requirements of the Staff Act had on the amount of time teachers are able to spend in social or informal contact with other teachers during school hours? The time has increased.
19a. What effect has meeting the requirements of the Stull Act had on the amount of teacher time required for the following activities?
19b. What influence has this change in time expended on each activity had on teaching practices?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activitiy</th>
<th>Decreased Greatly</th>
<th>No Change</th>
<th>Increased Greatly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing lesson plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time on adjunct duties (yard duty, halls, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in grade level meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in total staff meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20a. Generally the amount of time teachers spend on school related matters to meet the requirements of the Stull Act other than actual teaching time has
20b. What influence has this had on actual teaching practices?

21a. As a result of meeting the requirements of the Stull Act the general administrator support teachers receive has
21b. What influence has this change had on teacher relationships with the principal?

22a. As a result of meeting the requirements of the Stull Act coordination between teachers on different grade levels has
22b. What influence has this change had on teaching practices?

23a. As a direct result of meeting the requirements of the Stull Act the individual attention teachers give to children has
23b. What influence has this change had on teacher-pupil relationships?

24a. As a direct result of meeting the requirements of the Stull Act the amount of teacher time spent in lesson preparation has
24b. What influence has this change had on teaching practices?
25. There may have been major impacts other than the Stull Act which may have caused or contributed to changes in teaching practices and/or teacher relationships with the children, other teachers, or the building principal. If there have been such impacts, would you briefly state what they were and how they affected aspects of teaching practices and/or teacher relationships.
APPENDIX C

LETTER, INSTRUCTIONS, AND QUESTIONNAIRE TO TEACHERS
Dear Teacher,

Very little is known about the influence the Stull Act has had on education in California. As you and your fellow teachers and principal have worked through its implementation these past three years you may have had to alter some of your teaching practices and some of your relationships with the children, with fellow teachers and with the principal. My effort is to determine to what degree the Stull Act has contributed to these changes but more precisely by either increasing or decreasing certain teacher actions and what kind of influence it has had on those actions.

I seek your participation in this study through completion of the attached questionnaire. It will require some reflection on your part for I am asking you to project yourself back to those school related experiences you had before the Stull Act came into being, in essence to "see it like it was." Then come back to the present and "see it like it is." Next, to decide if a change has taken place in that particular aspect of your experience and determine if the change, if any has occurred, is a direct result of the requirements of the Stull Act.

Secondly, if a change has taken place, please determine if the change has been a positive or negative influence on that teaching practice or relationship and to what degree. You may feel that a few of the items are asking you to make a judgment about your professional ability as a teacher. This is certainly not the intent of any of the items for I am seeking only degrees of change and influence, not evaluation of your ability. At any rate, please be assured this survey is completely anonymous and confidential. To further insure this confidentiality you have been provided a stamped, addressed envelope in which to return the questionnaire directly to me.

The code numbers in the upper right hand corner of the questionnaires identify only geographical regions so that a demographic variable may be employed with the data. It does NOT identify individual questionnaires.

I sincerely appreciate your assistance in this endeavor and ask that you complete and mail the questionnaire to me within two days. Thanks so very much for your time, effort and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Richard P. Shoemaker
DIRECTIONS FOR QUESTIONNAIRE COMPLETION BY TEACHERS

EXAMPLE: The first part of each item is followed by a series of boxes indicating a five point scale of change. The second part is followed by a series of boxes indicating a five point scale of influence. For each item simply place a check in the appropriate box for each part reflecting your perception on that particular issue. You are not asked to make a judgment of good or bad, right or wrong, only if a change has taken place that is directly attributable to the Stull Act and if that change has influenced your teaching practices or relationships.

1a. As a direct result of the requirements of the Stull Act, the number of contacts I have with parents regarding pupil learning problems has ________

1b. What influence has this change had on your teacher-parent relationship?

1a. Think back to parent contacts 4 years ago regarding pupil learning problems. Did you have many? How is it now? Do you have more or less contact with parents about pupil learning problems? In your judgment is the increase or decrease DIRECTLY AS A RESULT OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE STULL ACT? Has the change been great, some or has there been no change? Check the appropriate box. PLEASE NOTE: If there has been a change but it is not directly attributable to the Stull Act, then report no change.

1b. For the second part of each item if there has been no change then there would, of course, be no influence. However, if there has been a change, how has the change influenced that particular aspect of your school related experience? Has it been a negative or positive influence and to what degree? By positive influence is meant enhancement of that particular aspect for yourself or for the other individual(s) involved. Negative influence would then be just the opposite.
1a. What change have the requirements of the Stull Act had on the amount of emphasis you place on each teaching area? By amount of emphasis is meant the amount of time actually allotted to it during a normal week.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Emphasis</th>
<th>Decreased Greatly</th>
<th>Decreased Sore</th>
<th>No Change</th>
<th>Increased Sore</th>
<th>Increased Greatly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1b. What influence has this change had on your teaching practices in each of the teaching areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>Decreased Greatly</th>
<th>Decreased Sore</th>
<th>No Change</th>
<th>Increased Sore</th>
<th>Increased Greatly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2a. As a direct result of meeting the requirements of the Stull Act the amount of time I spend in preparing for classroom presentations has

2b. What influence has this change had on your classroom presentations?

3a. As a direct result of the requirements of the Stull Act the degree to which I involve children in planning of classroom activities has

3b. What influence has this change had on the children's acceptance of the subject matter to be covered?

4a. As a direct result of the requirements of the Stull Act the amount of time I spend working with individual students on academic matters has

4b. What influence has this change had on the achievement levels of the children?

5a. What change have the requirements of the Stull Act had on the number of professional contacts you have with the building principal? The number of professional contacts has

5b. What influence has this change had on the principal's understanding of what you are attempting to do with the children in your classroom?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>No Change</th>
<th>Increased Time</th>
<th>Decreased Time</th>
<th>Great Positive Influence</th>
<th>Great Negative Influence</th>
<th>No Influence</th>
<th>Some Positive Influence</th>
<th>Some Negative Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. As a result of the requirements of the Sull Act, what change has occurred in the amount of administrator assistance you receive with classroom discipline problems? The amount has</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a. As a result of the requirements of the Sull Act, what change has occurred in the amount of administrator assistance you receive with classroom learning problems? The amount has</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a. What change have the requirements of the Sull Act had on the amount of time you spend on creating and maintaining the learning environment in your classroom? The amount of time has</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a. What change have the requirements of the Sull Act had on the amount of pre-testing you use? The amount of pre-testing has</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b. What influence has this change had on your relationships with the principal?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10a. What change have the requirements of the Sull Act had on the amount of post-testing you use? The amount of post-testing has</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10b. What influence has this change had on your teaching practices?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a. What change have the requirements of the Sull Act had on the amount of your individualizing of instruction? The amount has</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11b. What influence has this change had on your teaching practices?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12a. What change in the variety of teaching approaches you use has been as a direct result of meeting the requirements of the Sull Act?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12b. What influence has this change had on your teaching practices?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13a. As a direct result of meeting the requirements of the Sull Act the amount of time you spend in maintaining &quot;proper control&quot; has</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13b. What influence has this change had on your relationships with the children?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14a. What change have the requirements of the Stull Act caused in the amount of district furnished material you use other than what is provided on your grade level? By this is meant material from a higher or lower grade level available within the district. The amount has

15a. What change have the requirements of the Stull Act had in the amount of "outside" material you use in your classroom? This is in reference to materials you procure on your own from other than district sources. The amount has

16a. As a direct result of meeting the requirements of the Stull Act the amount of time you spend consulting individually with other teachers not on your grade level about classroom subject matter has

17a. As a direct result of meeting the requirements of the Stull Act the amount of time you spend consulting individually with teachers on your grade level about classroom subject matter has

18a. What effect has meeting the requirements of the Stull Act had on the amount of time you are able to spend in social or informal contacts with other teachers during school hours? The time has

19a. What effect has meeting the requirements of the Stull Act had on the amount of time required for the following activities?

- Time writing lesson plans has
- Time on adjunct duties (yard duty, halls, etc.)
- Time in grade level meetings has
- Time in total staff meetings has

14b. What influence has this change had on your teaching practices?

15b. What influence has this change had on your teaching practices?

16b. What influence has this change had on your teaching practices?

17b. What influence has this change had on your teaching practices?

18b. What influence has this change had on your relationships with other teachers?

19b. What influence has this change in time expended on each activity had on your teaching practices?
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APPENDIX D

PERCEPTIONS BY ITEM: TOTAL POPULATION
APPENDIX D

PERCEPTIONS BY ITEM: TOTAL POPULATION

N=94

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE BY DEGREE CATEGORY</th>
<th>MEANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)1(b)</td>
<td>(a)2(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(1)a %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(2)a %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(3)a %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(4)a %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(5)a %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(6)a %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(7)a %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(8)a %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE BY DEGREE CATEGORY</td>
<td>MEANS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)1(b)</td>
<td>(a)2(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX D - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE BY DEGREE CATEGORY</th>
<th>MEANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)1(b)</td>
<td>(a)2(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18a</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19(1)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19(2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19(3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19(4)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE BY DEGREE CATEGORY</th>
<th>MEANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)1(b)</td>
<td>(a)2(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total and Grand Mean* | 33 | 133 | 2082 | 775 | 165 | 3.28 | 3.14 |
| Absolute Frequency | 1.0% | 4.2% | 65.3% | 24.3% | 5.2% |
| Cumulative Frequency | 1.0% | 5.2% | 70.5% | 94.8% | 100% |

*Grand Mean = Weighted Mean

NOTE: The questionnaire was composed of single items calling for two separate responses from each subject. The first response elicited a perception of decrease or increase in a given activity which reflected change. The second response elicited a perception of the degree of negative or positive influence on that activity that the change had incurred. The numbers in the appendix indicate separate response categories and the letters indicate perceptions of (a) change and (b) influence as follows:

1(a) Great decrease in the designated activity
1(b) Great negative influence as a result of the change
2(a) Some decrease in the designated activity
2(b) Some negative influence as a result of the change

3(a) No change in the designated activity
3(b) No resulting influence

4(a) Some increase in designated activity
4(b) Some positive influence as a result of the change

5(a) Great increase in the designated activity
5(b) Great positive influence as a result of the change
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PERCEPTIONS BY ITEM: TEACHERS

\( N = 84 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES BY DEGREE CATEGORY</th>
<th>MEANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)1(b)</td>
<td>(a)2(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(1)a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(2)a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(3)a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(4)a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(5)a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(6)a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(7)a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(8)a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX E - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES BY DEGREE CATEGORY MEANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)1(b) (a)2(b) (a)3(b) (a)4(b) (a)5(b) (a) (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>1 1.2 6.0 5 75.0 67 14 1.2 16.7 14 1 3.11 3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>- - 3 6.6 5 79.8 10 2 11.9 2 2.4 - 3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>- - - 3.6 1 57 23 3 3.3 - 3.6 3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a</td>
<td>- - - - 4 32 40 8 2.4 - 3.6 3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a</td>
<td>- - - - 1.2 2.4 48 29 3 4.8 - 3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a</td>
<td>- - - - 3.6 7 70 4 3.6 - 4.8 4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a</td>
<td>- - - - 3 5 66 10 2 2 3 3.08 3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10a</td>
<td>- - - - 1.2 2.4 66.3 24.1 6 7.2 2.4 3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a</td>
<td>- - - - 2 2.4 56 33 4 1.2 1.2 3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12a</td>
<td>- - - - 2.4 2.4 66.7 26.2 2 2 3.43 3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13a</td>
<td>- - - - - - 24.1 58.3 14.3 3.31 3.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Means (a)**
### APPENDIX E - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES BY DEGREE CATEGORY</th>
<th>MEANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)1</td>
<td>(b)1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18a</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19(1)a</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19(2)a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19(3)a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19(4)a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX E - Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES BY DEGREE CATEGORY</th>
<th>MEANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)1(b) (a)2(b) (a)3(b) (a)4(b) (a)5(b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22a</td>
<td>1 1.2 3 3.6 63 75.9 14 16.9 2 2.4</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 4 4.8 77.1 13 15.7 1.2</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23a</td>
<td>1 1.2 5 5.0 24 4.8</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 6.0 6 59.5 21 4.8</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24a</td>
<td>1 1.2 2 4.4 31 6.9 6</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 2.4 9 52.4 17 7.1 5</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 10.2 61.4 20.5 6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total and Grand Mean* 33 321 1882 653 159 3.27
41 220 1984 526 75 3.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>1.2% 4.2% 66.1% 22.9% 5.6%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>1.2% 5.4% 71.5% 94.4% 100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**NOTE:** The questionnaire was composed of single items calling for two separate responses from each subject. The first response elicited a perception of decrease or increase in a given activity which reflected change. The second response elicited a perception of the degree of negative or positive influence on that activity that the change had incurred. The numbers in the appendix indicate separate response categories and the letters indicate the perceptions of (a) change and (b) influence as follows:

1(a) Great decrease in the designated activity
1(b) Great negative influence as a result of the change
2(a)  Some decrease in the designated activity  
2(b)  Some negative influence as a result of the change  

3(a)  No change in the designated activity  
3(b)  No resulting influence  

4(a)  Some increase in designated activity  
4(b)  Some positive influence as a result of the change  

5(a)  Great increase in the designated activity  
5(b)  Great positive influence as a result of the change
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### APPENDIX F

**PERCEPTIONS BY ITEM: PRINCIPALS**

\[ N = 10 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES BY DEGREE CATEGORY</th>
<th>MEANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)1(b)</td>
<td>(a)2(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(1)a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(1)b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(1)c</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(2)a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(2)b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(2)c</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(3)a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(3)b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(3)c</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(4)a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(4)b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(4)c</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(5)a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(5)b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(5)c</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(6)a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(6)b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(6)c</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(7)a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(7)b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(7)c</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(8)a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(8)b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES BY DEGREE CATEGORY</th>
<th>MEANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)1(b) (a)2(b) (a)3(b) (a)4(b) (a)5(b)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>- - - 7.00 3.00 -</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>- - - 5.00 5.00 -</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>- - - 3.00 2.00 8.00 -</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>- - - 2.00 8.00 8.00 -</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>- - - 3.00 6.00 -</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>- - - 2.00 8.00 -</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a</td>
<td>- - - 1.00 7.00 1.00 1.00</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>- - - 2.00 6.00 1.00 1.00</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a</td>
<td>- - - 2.00 6.00 4.00 -</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>- - - 2.00 5.00 2.00 1.00</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a</td>
<td>- - - 2.00 5.00 5.00 -</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>- - - 2.00 5.00 5.00 -</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a</td>
<td>- - - 2.00 5.00 3.00 -</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>- - - 2.00 5.00 3.00 -</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10a</td>
<td>- - - 1.00 2.00 7.00 -</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>- - - 1.00 2.00 6.00 1.00</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a</td>
<td>- - - 1.00 2.00 6.00 1.00</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>- - - 1.00 2.00 6.00 1.00</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12a</td>
<td>- - - 1.00 2.00 6.00 1.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>- - - 1.00 2.00 6.00 1.00</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13a</td>
<td>- - - 1.00 2.00 6.00 1.00</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>- - - 1.00 2.00 6.00 1.00</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX I - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES BY DEGREE CATEGORY MEANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)1(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14a</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15a</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16a</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17a</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18a</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19(2)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19(3)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19(4)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20a</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21a</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES BY DEGREE CATEGORY</th>
<th>MEANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)1(b)</td>
<td>(a)2(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22a</td>
<td>-  -  -</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-  -  -</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23a</td>
<td>-  -  -</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-  -  -</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24a</td>
<td>-  -  -</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-  -  -</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Mean*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute Frequency</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Frequency</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The questionnaire was composed of single items calling for two separate responses from each subject. The first response elicited a perception of decrease or increase in a given activity which reflected change. The second response elicited a perception of the degree of negative or positive influence on that activity that the change had incurred. The numbers in the appendix indicate separate response categories and the letters indicate the perceptions of (a) change and (b) influence as follows:

1(a) Great decrease in the designated activity
1(b) Great negative influence as a result of the change

2(a) Some decrease in the designated activity
2(b) Some negative influence as a result of the change
2(a) Some decrease in the designated activity
2(b) Some negative influence as a result of the change

3(a) No change in the designated activity
3(b) No resulting influence

4(a) Some increase in designated activity
4(b) Some positive influence as a result of the change

5(a) Great increase in the designated activity
5(b) Great positive influence as a result of the change
APPENDIX G

PERCEPTIONS BY MAJOR AREAS
### APPENDIX G

**PERCEPTIONS BY MAJOR AREAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR AREA</th>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
<th>MEANS</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imposed changes in teaching methods and practices</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of imposed changes on teaching methods and practices</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in teacher-pupil relationships</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of change on teacher-pupil relationships</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in teacher-principal relationships</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of change on teacher-principal relationships</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in allocation of teacher time to subject matter areas</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of change in allocation of teacher time to subject matter areas</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in allocation of teacher time to interpersonal contacts</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of change in allocation of teacher time to interpersonal contacts</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### APPENDIX G - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR AREA</th>
<th>MEANS</th>
<th>PRINCIPALS</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change in allocation of teacher time to other activities</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of allocation of teacher time to other activities on teaching</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

LETTER FROM SENATOR JOHN STULL TO RICHARD P. SHOEMAKER
Mr. Richard P. Shoemaker  
The Ohio State University  
Room 315 Ramseyer Hall  
29 West Woodruff Avenue  
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Dear Dick:

Thank you for your follow-up inquiry regarding more precise definitions of the terminology contained in Section 13487 (d) of Article 5.5 of the so-called Stull Act.

"Proper control" would relate to discipline and the demeanor of pupils, and how well each employee performs in maintaining a standard of student behavior consistent with the policies and guidelines developed by the local school board. Is the employee able to maintain control of his or her class, or are there constant confrontations or challenges to authority? Is the employee capable of leading the class? Is the employee able to proceed along a given course of instruction, or are there constant detours?

"A suitable learning environment" is that which allows pupils to learn without distractions, interruptions, or altercations. It provides for give and take, free and open discussions, a proper mixture of talking and listening, and is similarly dependent upon conformity and compliance with the rules, regulations and guidelines established by the local board. It is deliberately vague, in that different periods of the school day (such as recess, lunch time, or classroom activity) require varying degrees of control, discipline, or freedom. As you can imagine,
Mr. Richard P. Shoemaker

April 3, 1975

conduct during recess or during square dancing would be
governed by different criteria than during spelling lessons,
and thus a "suitable learning environment" would differ
from time to time, depending upon the nature of the
activity underway at any given period.

I hope this helps, and if I can be of further
assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

JOHN STULL
Senator, 38th District
APPENDIX I

LETTER FROM SENATOR JOHN STULL TO DR. HAROLD F. GORTNER
Dr. Harold F. Gortner  
Indiana University Northwest  
3400 Broadway  
Gary, Indiana 46408

Dear Dr. Gortner:

Thank you for your recent inquiry regarding my educator accountability measure, Assembly Bill 293 of 1971. I hope the information which I have enclosed, together with the remarks contained in this letter, will be helpful to you and your project. And, I certainly would appreciate receiving a copy of your research report.

With regard to the questions which you have raised, I will respond as to them individually, as follows:

1. "Do you believe that the original intent of the Stull Act has been achieved throughout the educational system of California?"

First, it is important to recognize that AB 293 had two distinct parts. First, it dealt with the dismissal proceedings related to permanent certificated employees, removing them from the jurisdiction of the Superior Court and placing them instead before either a hearing officer from the State Office of Administrative Hearings or a peer panel, a Commission on Professional Competence. Secondly, the bill mandated the establishment of local criteria and methods for the evaluation and assessment of all certificated personnel (teachers and administrators). This
second section was related to the determination of "competency," in that the courts have held that before an employee may be dismissed for "incompetency," there must exist a recognized definition of "competency."

As you know, the law has been in effect for slightly more than 18 months. Because the primary intent of the law was the improvement of education in California, hopefully related to increased concentration on the education of the individual pupil, it is as yet too early to attempt to evaluate the law's effectiveness. And, confusion with respect to implementation of the evaluation requirements, together with blatant obstructionism by certain employee organizations, has further muddied the waters, such that the bill's effectiveness in terms of improving the general quality of education still remains to be seen. On the other hand, there have been a few significant results which will be dealt with in relationship to your second question.

2. "What concrete results have occurred in the California educational system because of the implementation of the Stull Act?"

California's tenure laws prior to the enactment of AB 293 were formalized in 1935. Between 1935 and 1972, not one teacher or administrator was dismissed based on incompetency, and only a handful were dismissed for other reasons. As the enclosed material from the Office of Administrative Hearings and the San Diego County Counsel's office indicates, under the provisions of the so-called Stull Act, 64 dismissal actions have been initiated, with 21 employees being dismissed for one of the causes provided by law. Of cases specifically involving incompetency, 3 of 5 employees have been dismissed.

Thus, one "concrete result" of the Stull Act has been a significant increase in the number of permanent certificated employees who have been dismissed from service for reasons provided by law. Secondly, the time required for such dismissal proceedings has been reduced from an average of 2 years (when required to go to Superior Court) to about 6 months (when going through the complete hearing procedure).
3. "Do you see any modifications that could be made to the Stull Act that would improve the achievement of the original goal, or intent, of the Act (as you understand the intent)?"

Several changes in the original Act have been made. One deals with the rights of discovery, providing that they shall be the same as in civil cases. A second change exempted hourly employees in adult education from the evaluation requirements of the Act. A third change exempted substitute teachers from the once-every-two-years evaluation provisions. And a fourth change, made just this year, clarifies my intent that employees who serve on Commissions on Professional Competence shall not lose salary or benefits during such service.

There are several other changes in the law which have been suggested relative to the legal aspects of the dismissal proceedings. Perhaps of more relevance to your study, however, would be suggested changes in Article 5.5, dealing with evaluation and assessment guidelines. At this point I can foresee few, if any, changes which I would support.

For instance, it has been suggested that more specific guidelines be specified in the law, to avoid confusion and misunderstanding by employees and district governing boards. To this I would say that AB 293 is perhaps the purest example of a "local control" measure that I have seen, and intentionally so. I do not want a statewide system of evaluation administered by the State Department of Education. Local residents, parents, voters, taxpayers, teachers, administrators, and students should work together to determine what is best for their particular school district, within the general framework of state educational requirements.

Another frequent suggestion is that some penalty be built into the law because there currently is no "punishment" if a district does not implement evaluation and assessment guidelines. To this, I again say no, believing that if local voters disapprove, then they may elect a new school board. Also, if a district does not comply with the law, they are not only liable to a civil action, but, also, they will be unable to dismiss incompetent personnel. Local voters and local governing boards should not be satisfied with this, and I can see no reason for specifying penalties for noncompliance.
Dr. Harold F. Gortner  
Page Four  
September 25, 1974

A further suggestion is that specific means of measurement should be prescribed, so that districts will know what the law intends. However, I believe that districts should be able to utilize all accepted means of ascertaining student progress, as well as being given the latitude to experiment and innovate. And, the problems facing individual pupils, such as home environment, must be considered. As I have said, I believe there are dangers in being too specific when dealing with evaluation of personnel, and I prefer full flexibility.

Dr. Gortner, I hope this information is helpful to you. Should you have further specific questions, please let me know. And, as I have said, I look forward to reading your report.

Sincerely,

JOHN STULL  
Senator, 38th District

Enclosures
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PRE STULL ACT EVALUATION FORMS: URBANIA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
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**CLASSROOM OBSERVATION SHEET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Observed</th>
<th>Date of Observation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject Observed</td>
<td>Time of Observation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This observation sheet is to be completed by the observer immediately following the supervisory visit to a classroom. A copy should be given the teacher following a conference.

### CLASSROOM ATMOSPHERE

Attention to ventilation, lighting and seating; general room arrangement and environment; order and discipline, etc.

### ORGANIZATION AND PRESENTATION OF SUBJECT MATTER

Knowledge of subject matter; preparation for lesson; availability of materials and equipment; goals and objectives defined; clarity of directions; follow-up; consideration of individual differences; budgeting of class time, etc.

### PUPIL RESPONSE

Interest of pupils; opportunities for pupil participation; pupil-teacher rapport; pupil progress; work habits, etc.

### OTHER

Voice, speech and appearance; sense of humor; emotional stability; enthusiasm for teaching; judgment; creativity and resourcefulness; adaptability and flexibility, etc.

Suggestions:

---

Signature of Observer

Title of Observer

---
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# Probationary Teacher Appraisal Form

**Unified and Junior College Districts**

### Status:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>School or Department</th>
<th>Antecedent</th>
<th>Probationary Year</th>
<th>Period Covered By Appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Rating:

(See Reverse Side)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I Teaching Competence</th>
<th>II Personal Qualities</th>
<th>III Professional Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Acknowledgements:

**Recommendations:**

- Contract Recommended* Yes .... No ....
- Tenure Recommended Yes .... No ....

*To be checked on spring appraisal only.

**Evaluated:**

By ..........................................................

**Reviewed:**

Principal ..............................................

Division ............................................... 

Personnel ..............................................

Teacher's Comments:

**Teacher's Signature**

Signature indicates this appraisal has been discussed with the teacher and he/she has received a copy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Meets District Standards</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Balanced, accurate, positive, and productive instruction</td>
<td>Limited, inconsistent, ineffective instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning,</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Well-organized, efficient, and inclusive</td>
<td>Inefficient, disorganized, and ineffective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Well-maintained, appropriate, and conducive</td>
<td>Inadequate, uncomfortable, and distracting</td>
<td>Inadequate, uncomfortable, and distracting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Control</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Effective, firm, and consistent</td>
<td>Inconsistent, ineffective, and inappropriate</td>
<td>Ineffective, inconsistent, and inappropriate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Outstanding: Full credit, exceptional performance.
- Strong: Above average, meets expectations.
- Meets District Standards: Fulfillment of district requirements.
- Needs Improvement: Areas for development.
- Unsatisfactory: Below expectations, requires improvement.

**Consider:**
- The following phrases are interpreting a evaluation. However, any specific comments under the narrative portion of this evaluation are to be considered especially pertinent.
UNIFIED
and
JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICTS
PROFESSIONAL REVIEW

Name ................................................................. Date ........................................

School or Department ........................................ Assignment ................................

PERFORMANCE
Accomplishments, strengths and/or weaknesses that have been observed since last review.

PERSONAL QUALIFICATIONS
List only qualifications above or below satisfactory.

SUGGESTIONS
Recommendations which will strengthen this person or will prove beneficial to School, Department or District.

ASSIGNMENT RECOMMENDATIONS
Are there other assignments for which this person seems particularly well suited or for which he should be considered at this time.

By .................................................................

COMMENTS OF TEACHER

Signature of Teacher ........................................

Stock No. 1985

Principal .................................................................

Asst. Principal ........................................

Personnel ........................................
APPENDIX K

POST STULL ACT EVALUATION FORMS: URBANIA
UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
California

INITIAL CONFERENCE AGREEMENT

Name ___________________________________ Date ____________________
Position ___________________________________ Area of Evaluation:

[] Probationary — 1 2 3 year
[ ] Permanent

I. NEEDS ASSESSMENT:

II. GOALS:

III. OBJECTIVES OF PERFORMANCE:

IV. WORK PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTATION: as related to I, II, III, and Job Description:
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INITIAL CONFERENCE AGREEMENT (Continued)

V MONITORING, i.e., PERFORMANCE INDICATORS: (e.g. teacher-made tests, publisher's tests, skill performance criterion referenced tests)

VI EVALUATION OF ACHIEVEMENT: (e.g. test scores, final examination results, final grades)

VII CONSTRAINTS AND LIMITATIONS if any:

Signed: ________________________________________________  ____________________________

(Seal)  1 (Seal)

This agreement may be modified by mutual consent at any time during the school year
EVALUATEE'S GUIDELINES FOR ASSESSING PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

Complete two copies:
+ original for evaluatee's file
+ duplicate for evaluator

Evaluatee ________________________________
Date ________________________________

To be given to evaluator at goals and objectives conference

Has the evaluatee been provided with the proper physical facilities and equipment in the following areas? Check applicable items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Proper lighting</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Proper ventilation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Proper temperature control</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Room in proper repair</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Adequate provisions for the instructional needs of the traveling teacher or teacher on double sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Evaluatee desk work station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Student desks or work stations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Chairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bookcases sufficient for class office needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Storage sufficient for class office needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Bulletin boards and chalk boards adequate for subject needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Instructional supplies and equipment to meet class needs, i.e., sufficient textbooks, workbooks, furniture, etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Operational audio-visual equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Proper supplemental lab furniture and equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Adequate provisions for the equipment needs of the traveling teacher or teacher on double session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do the external influences promote a suitable physical environment in the following areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Limits to external noise level compatible to proper learning conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Minimal interruptions from outside sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adequate custodial services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Control and limitations of qualified visitors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written comments are required if any NO boxes are checked.

Signature ________________________________ Signature ________________________________
**EVALUATOR CHECK LIST FOR ASSESSING PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT**

Complete two copies:

- original for file
- duplicate for evaluatee

Evaluatee ___________________________

Date ___________________________

To be used with Observation Record — copy given to evaluatee at conference following observation

Has the evaluatee adequately utilized available facilities and equipment to establish and maintain a suitable physical environment in the following areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written comments are required if any NO boxes are checked.

---

Signature: ___________________________ 
Evaluator

Signature: ___________________________ 
Evaluatee

* N/A = Not Applicable

When: 5/5/55
UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
CALIFORNIA

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION RECORD

TEACHER'S NAME ____________________________

OBSERVER'S NAME ____________________________

Time of Observation Date ____________________________ From _______ To _________________

Was the observation announced in advance? Yes □ No □

Was a preconference held? Yes □ No □

Subject being taught ____________________________ Student Level ____________________________

In order to make an observation period as meaningful as possible, it is important to relate to the conditions present at the time of observation:

1. Were there any unusual conditions that would affect the teacher's performance?
   e.g. severe climatic conditions, preceding assembly, P.E., etc.
   Yes □ No □
   If yes — explain: ____________________________________________________________________

2. Was the observer aware of any personal stress that would affect the teacher's performance?
   Yes □ No □
   If Yes — explain: ____________________________________________________________________

3. Did the observer feel that the teacher was ill-at-ease because of this observation?
   Greatly □ Somewhat □ Very little □ Not at all □

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBSERVATION</th>
<th>Does Not Meet Minimum Requirements</th>
<th>Needs Some Improvement</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Shows evidence of planning and organization of learning activities geared to appropriate student needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Demonstrates effective instructional procedures Clear and motivational.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Maintains an effective balance of freedom and security in the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Uses facilities in an effective manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Provides activities for students related Instructional objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Shows evidence of interaction between teacher and students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Shows evidence of assessment of student progress.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A check in these columns require explanation and suggestions for improvement which may be the basis of a required conference.
Classroom Observation Record (Continued):

REMARKS concerning observation

SUGGESTIONS for improvement

COMMENTS

CONFERENCE WAIVED: EVALUATOR

YES [ ]

CONFERENCE WAIVED: EVALUATEE

YES [ ]

CONFERENCE DATE ________________ TIME ________________

Evaluator's Signature ____________________________ Date ________________

Evaluator's Signature ____________________________ Date ________________

Lower portion must be completed and returned to the evaluator.

Who filled out the form: [Name] Date: 23/03/22.
TEACHER REACTION TO CLASSROOM OBSERVATION

TEACHER'S NAME ____________________________________________________________

OBSERVER'S NAME __________________________________________________________

Time of Observation: Date _______________________ From __________ To __________

Was the time for the observation announced in advance? Yes ___ No ___

Subject being taught ___________________________ Student level _____________

Number of students at time of observation _________

Adequately trained to teach this subject: Yes ___ No ___

Ability level of students: Homogeneous (describe) _____________________________

Heterogeneous (describe) _____________________________

The student group was typical ___ atypical ___ of classes normally taught?

If atypical, explain _________________________________________________________

The room environment was normal ___ abnormal ___ If abnormal, explain___________

Were there any reason to feel that the students performed in a less satisfactory manner than is usual? Yes ___ No ___ Explain _________________________________________________________

Was there any personal reason to feel that you could not perform at peak capacity? Yes ___ No ___

Explain _________________________________________________________________

What factors may have helped you to improve your effectiveness? ________________

Would you requested any of the above? Yes ___ No ___

Does the presence of an evaluator in your class cause you to be ill at ease? Yes ___ No ___

COMMENTS:

Evaluator's Signature ___________________________ Date _______________________

Date of Conference ____________________________ Evaluator's Signature ___________________________
UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
CERTIFICATED EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

Name: _______________________________  Evaluation Period: From ___________ to ___________

School or Department: ___________________________  Assignment: ___________________________

The major purposes of performance evaluation are (1) to determine the individual's effectiveness in relation to the school's educational objective, (2) to determine the individual's performance in relation to the results of an individual's efforts as compared with the individual's education and training, and (3) to determine the individual's performance in relation to the requirements and objectives established for the period.

Each term in the form has its own objective. The following general points should be kept in mind:

- Describing the individual's performance in terms of education and training.
- Identifying the performance standards pertinent to the individual's efforts as compared with his education and training.
- Determining the individual's performance in relation to the objectives established for the period.

The individual's performance will be assessed in the areas in which the individual is most effective. The areas in which the individual's performance improvement could result in increased effectiveness, and specific actions for improvement will be assessed.

List objectives established for the evaluation period: (Note: If additional space is required, use plain bond paper and staple to this page)

1. School Department program goals (e.g., school has significant objectives for the year. Department of Anthropology will focus on objectives a, b, c for the period.)

2. Directed and mutually derived goals (e.g., Certificated employee Jane Doe will be involved in a member of the primary team, will implement objectives 1 & 2 for the period. Jane Doe will complete course work in site digging techniques by June)

3. Instructional goals (e.g., items specified on the initial Conference Agreement form)

[Prob. 1 2 3] [Contract Recommended: Yes No]
[Perm. ________] [Tenure Recommended: Yes No]

*To be checked on spring evaluation only
## PERFORMANCE FACTOR EVALUATIONS

Consider each factor separately by reading the factor detail description carefully, and by interpreting the performance degree description in the context of that factor. Evaluation on each factor should be made independently of other factors.

Indicate your approval in each factor by placing a check in the appropriate box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE DEGREES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEETS EXPECTATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALMOST MEETS EXPECTATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEETS SOME IMPROVEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOES NOT MEET MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### I. TEACHING COMPETENCE

A. Conducts class effectively as evidenced by oral and written communication, presentation of lesson, use of a variety of methods and resources.

B. Students creatively as evidenced by flexibility, initiative, originality.

C. Plans and organizes work as evidenced in clear plans, record keeping, reports prepared, and student progress and achievement.

D. Demonstrates adequate knowledge of the subject taught in the classroom.

E. Promotes an effective balance of discipline and respect in the classroom.

F. Accepts students as they are for basis of teaching and guidance.

G. Conveys information and provides opportunities for students to achieve goals.

H. INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS: Demonstrates responsibility for meeting needs, and influencing others.

I. PHYSICAL & FINANCIAL RESOURCES: Demonstrates competence in the utilization and control of physical and human resources.

J. PLANNING: Demonstrates competence in setting, implementing, and evaluating major programs and in anticipating and implementing changes at departmental and district levels.

K. PREFERENCES: Demonstrates adherence to the principles and practices of the profession.

L. CREATIVITY: Demonstrates originality and/or creative ability required in the administration of programs and the generation of solutions to administrative and/or academic problems.

### II. ADMINISTRATIVE COMPETENCE (For personnel assigned administrative responsibilities)

A. DECISION MAKING: Demonstrates knowledge and skill in the administration of programs, and ability in decision-making.

B. POLICIES, PRACTICES, AND PROCEDURES: Demonstrates competence in the implementation and evaluation of administrative programs, practices, and principles.

C. SUPERVISION: Demonstrates knowledge and skills of supervision to program and personnel.

D. PHYSICAL & FINANCIAL RESOURCES: Demonstrates competence in the utilization and control of physical and human resources.

E. PLANNING: Demonstrates competence in setting, implementing, and evaluating major programs and in anticipating and implementing changes at departmental and district levels.

F. INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS: Demonstrates responsibility for meeting needs, and influencing others.

G. PHYSICAL & FINANCIAL RESOURCES: Demonstrates competence in the utilization and control of physical and human resources.

H. CREATIVITY: Demonstrates originality and/or creative ability required in the administration of programs and the generation of solutions to administrative and/or academic problems.

### III. PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

A. Assumes responsibility for records, materials, and equipment.

B. Seeks appropriate help when needed, accepts supervision in a positive manner.

C. Adheres to school and district policies and procedures.

D. TRIMS TO UNPERFORMED ATTITUDES AND ACTIONS: Makes realistic decisions, exercise good judgment in resolving school problems.

Comments.
IV. EVALUATOR COMMENTS: Attach any comments needed to add to the meaning of the overall appraisal.  □ ATTACHED  □ NOT ATTACHED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V. Performance Factors Evaluation</th>
<th>Specific Objectives</th>
<th>EVALUATION OF SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To be used only if evaluator does not meet minimum requirements or needs some improvement. Be specific.</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Extenuating Circumstances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluated ___________________________  Evaluated ___________________________  Date ___________________________  Evaluator Name ___________________________  Type ___________________________

Prime Evaluator or Designee Signature ___________________________  Date Signed ___________________________

VI. EVALUATES COMMENTS: Please indicate with attached sheet(s) the sections of the report where a difference of opinion exists.

a. I have read the above report and discussed it with ___________________________.

b. I (would □ not □) like to have further conferences.

c. Adequate time was □ was not □ allotted for this conference

d. Evaluatee comments: Attached □ Not attached □

e. Difference of opinion exists in: Area I □ Area II □ Area III □ Area IV □ Area V □

Evaluatee comments removed from file

(Not to be disclosed to unauthorized persons)

Reviewed by
Division Supr ___________________________  Date ___________________________

Employee/Employee Relations ___________________________  Date ___________________________
Use Explanation For Performance Evaluation Form

Refer to Page 1 of Performance Evaluation Form

A full formal examination of this form is required at least once a year for all non-permanent employees, including a comprehensive discussion with the employee.

OBJECTIVES

On Page 1 of the form, objectives are specified. They are not to be assigned at random. Any significant changes during the evaluation period must be communicated to the Evaluator. The information contained in the form is then to be used by the evaluator to prepare a report on the employee's performance.

On Page 2 of the form, the Evaluator's assessment of "how well" the employee performed as compared to the requirements. This section of the form represents the "performance evaluation" of the entire Performance Evaluation Form.

Refer to Pages 2 and 3 of form

These performance degree designations reflect actual observed performance levels. Therefore, in a reasonably large group, the relationship between observed levels and actual performance will probably be such that the full range of degree determinations will be applicable.

Refer to Page 7

Part IV is self-explanatory.

The form on this page provides the evaluator's recommendations, which are based upon the individual's performance and the degree to which the performance requirements have been met. The Evaluator is to assess the individual's performance in each area and to recommend an overall evaluation of the employee. The form also provides space for the evaluator to make comments and suggestions for future performance improvement.

Refer to Page 9

These are the significant facts. The sequence heretofore is an analysis.

The evaluation notes a private interview with the individual. This interview will cover:

1. Review of goals and objectives and requirements for the performance period.
2. The evaluation statement at the individual's performance relative to those objectives and requirements.
3. The assessment of the performance in which the individual has been most effective and aspects of performance in which the need for improvement is indicated.
4. The development of a plan for performance improvement.
5. The development of work objectives and requirements for the future.
6. The performance of both the employee and the Evaluator.

The form and supplementary materials must be provided to the employee at least three (3) days prior to the evaluation conference. The evaluation may not result in an approval or rejection of the employee. In the event the evaluation is not completed, judgment may be removed at any future time by the evaluator.

The individual signs the form, thereby indicating that he has indeed seen it and that the information has been included as contents with him. This paragraph does not mean that he concurs with the evaluator's opinion on the form — only that he has been shown what they are.

Page 4
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