

Student Work

4-1-1988

Developing a Replacement System for Evaluation of a High School Faculty

James W. Rouse
University of Nebraska at Omaha

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork>

Recommended Citation

Rouse, James W., "Developing a Replacement System for Evaluation of a High School Faculty" (1988).
Student Work. 2587.

<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/2587>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.

DEVELOPING A REPLACEMENT SYSTEM
FOR EVALUATION OF A HIGH SCHOOL FACULTY

Presented to

Dr. Robert C. O'Reilly

Department of Educational
Administration and Supervision

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Education Specialist Degree

University of Nebraska at Omaha

by

James W. Rouse

April 1988

UMI Number: EP74131

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP74131

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

FIELD PROJECT ACCEPTANCE

Acceptance for the faculty of the Graduate College, University of Nebraska, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Education Specialist Degree, University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Committee

Darrell Keenan Ed Ad
Name Department

Raymond A Zibant Teacher Ed
Name Department

F. Coxing
Chairman

April 6, 1988
Date

Table of Contents

Chapter

1. Introduction.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	3
Significance of the Study.....	5
Methodology.....	6
Delimitations.....	7
Organization of the Project.....	7
2. Review of Literature.....	10
Theme of Research-based Approach.....	10
Theme of Participatory Planning.....	15
Theme of Teacher/Supervisor Relationship.....	18
Theme of the Planning Process.....	22
3. Methodology.....	27
Validation of the Problem Statement.....	27
Description of the Project.....	27
Personnel Decisions Tangential to the Project Methodology...	28
4. Presentation of Findings.....	29
Phase One: Omaha Public School Consultant and Materials....	29
Phase Two: University Coursework.....	30
Phase Three: Literature Search.....	31
Phase Four: Survey of Teachers on Early Progress of the Revised Evaluation Plan.....	35
5. Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations.....	37
Restatement of the Problem.....	37
Description of the Procedure Used.....	38

Conclusions in the Form of a Program Design or Outline.....	38
Outline of the Replacement Program for Teacher Evaluation in Timeline Format.....	39
Cross-section of the Plan As It Responds to Guideline Themes from the Literature Search.....	44
Research-based Theme.....	44
Participatory Planning Theme.....	47
Teacher/Supervisor Relationship Theme.....	48
The Planning Process Theme.....	50
Recommendations.....	53
Bibliography.....	55
Appendixes.....	59
A. SUMA Sample Form for Evaluation of Teachers by Students	
B. SUMA Sample Form for Reporting Feedback to Teachers	
C. Outline of Teacher Evaluation Program to Replace Previous Program	
D. Teacher Survey to Monitor Early Progress of the Replacement Evaluation Plan	
E. Details of Responses by Teachers to the Evaluation Plan Survey	

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

This study addresses a problem of developing a replacement system for teacher evaluation in a senior high school. The study falls within an action research approach, the findings of which become the basis for an outline of a proposed plan of action. The study also includes among its findings a report of early results of the plan's implementation.

The effort to change a major procedure in an organization deserves extraordinary attention by those responsible for the proposed change. Cooley and Bickel (1986) portray as a pessimistic process the usual attempt to introduce change into an educational system:

One does not have to be in education very long before noticing how a well-intentioned change within the system can "backfire." This is because the tendency in education is to try to solve an educational problem in isolation, without taking into account the context in which the problem is immersed.

After spending the same relatively short time in education, one also realizes it is a person-oriented service enterprise, so that failures to introduce change successfully should not lead observers to simplistic conclusions that professional educators must be characteristically incompetent or ignorant but should lead them instead to search for more complex rather than mechanical combinations of causes. More than likely it will be found that the shortfalls are created by a pressurized complex of system limitations, internal needs, and external expectations. The financial restrictions common to most schools leave them typically understaffed for attempting much more than program maintenance; the

infusion of extra personnel or other resources as a catalyst to desired change is quite often an elusive dream. Conscientious education professionals trying to respond to internal needs often find the most massive force is the time-consuming involvement of staff in the governance of the system; this desirable allowance necessarily slows down reaching the intended point of change and pushes against the expectations of those who are impatient for change to occur. Zumwalt (1986) describes this internal need for involvement in a text based on research and experience that has shown teachers to be resistant to having other people in charge of their professional diagnosis and prescriptions "because they are adults and because they are professional teachers who know that they, too, should have some power in determining the professional development topics and activities which they need and in which they will participate."

In recent years external pressure on education has increased in a recurring cycle of urgent reform. Wuhs and Manatt (1983) point to a greater than four-fold increase since 1971 in the number of states mandating teacher evaluation systems, with emphasis on related issues of merit pay, career ladders, and due process as part of dismissal. McGreal (1983) encourages education's recently strengthened association with systems analysis in the business environment as he promotes the outlining of complete program concepts from basic philosophy through minimum performance expectations to goal setting and monitoring processes. Doing the job right by developing a performance context obviously pushes more forcefully against personnel and time constraints.

Regardless of actual and potential problems, it is clear from logic, experience, and professional literature that a priority for any school seeking to provide quality education is a well-conceived and functioning system of teacher performance evaluation. In establishing the complete performance context espoused by McGreal, the practical researcher needs to analyze the current situation, explore the advice available from professional colleagues through journals and consultation, and brainstorm the options within and outside the system that would allow recommendations for change to have a better opportunity for acceptance and implementation.

Statement of the Problem

After about a two-year trial period, the system for evaluation of teacher performance ceased functioning in a senior high school. The process had proven burdensome to teacher time when, for example, large quantities of data supplied by students could not be compiled by manual methods so were handed over in raw form to teachers in late May for self-analysis over the summer. In addition to this type of setback, the system also suffered when the continuity in application of the procedures was seriously interrupted shortly afterward by a transition to a new principal and a new academic assistant principal within the same year. Assessment of the problem took place during the first months of the new principal's assignment from questions asked of the academic department chairpersons. In a series of meetings with this advisory council, the principal determined that the recently developed evaluation plan was unwelcome and unmanageable, involving time-consuming paperwork, excessive bureaucracy, and a lack of faculty participation

in the formation of the system. During those same early months, the school entered into a scheduled self-evaluation process for renewing regional North Central Association accreditation; as the self-study proceeded, an emerging priority for improvement was the redevelopment of the teacher evaluation system.

Following the lead of this increasingly strong validation, the newly appointed administrative team made the decision to design a new approach, but also faced the problem of how to proceed during the interim months. While a one-year delay might not adversely affect experienced teachers, it would jeopardize the development of beginning teachers; so department chairpersons were assigned to continue application of the existing system for recently hired personnel.

As the statement of the problem is pursued for corroboration into the current professional literature, both major issues described above relating to teacher acceptance of the system and to supervisory posture in its design and implementation are prominent. Both Walberg (1974) and Witt (1986) emphasize the importance of attitude surveys to promote communication and to increase participation in the decisions that affect people's performance. Witt continues more specifically to discard the former assumption that teachers willingly accept intervention strategies on their apparent success; more important to teachers now, he says, are systems that respect time and personnel resources, have a sound theoretical orientation, and minimize "ecologically intrusive" elements. Put simply, Witt states that "available research supports the assumption that, all things being equal, teachers prefer interventions that require less time."

Sergiovanni (1979) insists that, as the beginning step in developing a system powerful enough to have realistic hopes of achieving significant improvements in the teachers' classroom performance, one must have cooperative, willing teachers; the supervisor, he says, does not change teachers but, instead, helps them to change. McGreal (1983) asserts the clinical supervision assumption that most teachers, given the benefit of essential data and freedom to respond, will "analyze, interpret, and decide in a self-directed and constructive manner."

Significance of the Study

As stated earlier, with or without the presence of any other form of pressure, any school intending to provide quality education must have a well-designed and integral system of teacher performance evaluation. In this particular situation there existed three additional reasons for above-average effort to redevelop the teacher evaluation system. Most important among the three was the need to establish quickly a process that would serve the self-growth needs of the teachers, especially those who were new to the school. Second, the new management team needed a process that would help them fulfill their primary role in coming to know the teachers and communicate with them about improvement of instruction. Third, the school had, through the North Central Association accreditation self-study, made a top priority commitment to development of a replacement system for teacher evaluation. These provide compelling reasons for a responsible study designed for a practical approach focused on a solution of the actual problem situation as described above.

Methodology

In the field of disciplined inquiry, this project could best be labeled as action research, with emphasis not on building theory but rather on developing an alternative approach to a solution that has direct, practical application to an actual problem situation.

The research methodology contains four phases: university coursework, professional consultation, literature search, and a progress questionnaire. Congruence of information is to be established among the first three phases, and the survey will enable the researcher to detect a need for revision of the plan in action as it follows the guidelines of the research. The university coursework includes a practicum in clinical supervision as part of an information-gathering and skill-development process. In the second, or consultative phase, Dr. Margaret Fitch, Assistant Superintendent for Staff Development Services for the Omaha Public Schools, suggested readings from several authors such as McGreal. She also recommended that the findings or outcome of this study be an outlined plan for the installation of the revised evaluation system, and she provided sample models of Omaha Public School staff development programs. This study is indebted to the generosity of Dr. Fitch in sharing her professional information resources and viewpoints. Her advice helped build confidence and validity into the literature search and increased assurance both that the search had tapped some of the appropriate current resources and that it had included the correct indicators in narrowing the computer categories for the search. By giving a direction and focus to the outcome, Dr. Fitch also narrowed the scope of the field project and enhanced the legitimacy of its

purpose and direction. The third phase of the methodology is a literature search focused on the task of designing a restoration plan for an acceptable and effective system of teacher performance evaluation in a senior high school setting. The literature helps to determine from other current statements of similar problems a number of themes that can be synthesized into operating guidelines, or at least parameters, for the design of an appropriate action plan. While the primary outcome of the methodology would be the installation of a system, a fourth phase of the study encompassing the early feedback on the new system's progress will also be included in the form of a faculty survey.

Delimitations

This study is intended as action research into solution of a particular, practical problem situation. It does not intend to build or prove theories or to assert general applicability of the findings. The scope of the study is deliberately narrow and the research is purposely focused on the assessed needs of a particular educational organization for whose benefit the field project was undertaken.

Organization of the Project

From a research viewpoint, organization of this study is intended to extend to the development of a plan which would outline an appropriate series of steps to be taken over a defined period of time adequate for a project of this type. The study is organized into five chapters:

Chapter One	Introduction
Chapter Two	Review of Literature
Chapter Three	Methodology
Chapter Four	Presentation of Findings
Chapter Five	Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

From a school management perspective, there are two additional, critical components to the organized approach to this project, critical because the project applies directly to, and therefore affects, an actual school organization and must, therefore, interface well with the school's current operating systems. Delays that building the plan cause to implementing the actual evaluation system are balanced by caution against forcing into action a system that has not been appropriately designed and introduced according to the best available professional advice.

The first critical consideration is the involvement of personnel who will be responsible for the success of the outlined plan. The academic department chairs, who provided the initial feedback on the need to revise the evaluation system, also became the steering committee for the replacement system. The approach to be outlined in Chapter Five uses the committee of chairpersons in three key roles of consultation, motivation, and leadership (including application, monitoring, and feedback). In the consultative role, the chairs provide a depth of experience and knowledge of previous evaluation efforts and of the personnel who had developed under their influence. In this role, the chairs insert concrete values in place of the generalizations gained from the literature search. As motivators, their second role, the chairs help eliminate any skepticism remaining from previous situations and help rekindle interest and momentum lost during the review process when evaluation was operating at a greatly reduced level. The chairs also provide motivation in leading by personal example toward acceptance and application of the revised system. Having been in the evaluation

role, the department chairpersons would be expected to share responsibility for helping the new system work. To be successful, the plan must rely on the chairs in this third role for its vitality and dynamism, finding encouragement to make necessary adjustments based on informed and involved feedback.

The second key personnel component of the study involves finding sufficient leadership to coordinate, energize, and drive the mechanism as an additional level of activity beyond maintenance of already existing activities and processes. With a new management team, it became necessary to assign responsibility for the whole spectrum of administrative tasks within a program that was unfamiliar to both the principal and the academic assistant. A decision was made to assign, at least on a temporary basis, a second assistant principal from among the faculty membership; this new assistant needed to be someone who could relate the old evaluation system to the one that replaced it, who knew the personnel involved under the replaced system, and who could dedicate attention to the installation of the program. Installation would need to include orientation, inservice, applications, chairing the steering committee, preparing forms, interfacing the various elements of the plan as it developed, conducting follow-up conferences, and surveying the faculty to compile evaluation feedback.

CHAPTER TWO

Review of Literature

A computer search of the literature relating to setting up a program of teacher performance evaluation resulted in the usual number of articles that either could not be found or had nothing to offer the study. The fifty articles and books selected for use yielded an apparent pattern of four major themes which are each discussed individually in this second chapter of the study:

Theme of Research-based Approach
 Theme of Participatory Planning
 Theme of Teacher/Supervisor Relationship
 Theme of the Planning Process.

Theme of Research-based Approach

The most significant trend in teacher evaluation in recent years has been the heavy emphasis on the use of research in teaching as a focus for the criteria. (Brandt, McGreal Interview, 1987)

Within this theme of a research-based approach to evaluation of teachers, there are three subtopics identified in the discussion that follows: a complete-system context for evaluation, data orientation, and the applications of systems to teachers as professional people.

The total system of management is described by Walberg (1982) as a social process that pulls together personnel and other resources from both formal and informal structures within the organization to achieve predetermined agendas according to an integrated plan. Stallings (1983) similarly describes a psychological process by which people construct a framework to direct available resources toward a perception of the future. Wallace (1984) encourages construction of an "integrative,

data-based approach to program design and implementation" that would have a well-documented monitoring process. Both Wildman (1987) and Wichowski (1982) relate well to a 1903 statement by George E. Moore:

Difficulties and disagreements....are mainly due to a very simple cause, namely to attempt to answer questions without first discovering precisely what question it is which you desire to answer.

In this quest, Wichowski proposes to build a valid needs analysis through a nationwide survey to select the questions of importance; Wildman believes school administrators need to analyze the foundations of their school improvement plans to establish "a clear understanding of professional growth and how and under what conditions it occurs." Once the system is outlined, Bliss (1986) cautions against trying to make changes in any component of a school system if there is inertia in any other area and urges "rigorous interaction" of curriculum, inservice, and school organization for any school improvement to be effective. The effect is not unlike that described by Berliner when comparing effective teaching to music "in that the combination, sequence, and pacing of elements is as important as the quality and quantity of the elements." (Walberg, 1982) Before leaving this topic on that high note, however, Witt (1986) and Walberg (1982) prepare us for a long way to go in the research effort before classroom management advances as a science. Walberg asserts that, while overall the quality of educational research has increased over the last ten years, not much has happened in the area of strategy to improve school management.

Several authors introduce the second subtopic, data orientation, by stressing the need for shared goals and perceptions which are developed from a common data base (Bickel, 1984); followed through with observable data to review whether goals were met (Fitzpatrick, 1986); and communicated:

Current research gives us clues to behaviors....
 "criteria for high-gain teaching"....they should
 be taught to both teachers and teacher evaluators
 and used as a common language by all in the
 organization to describe the activities that are
 the basic mission of a school. Manatt (1980)

McGreal (1983) believes programs built on a foundation of current teaching research and accepted supervisory practices can bring together any staff "to at least a state of neutrality toward the new system." Mohan (1975) from an earlier decade keys on the assumptions inherent in the process of evaluating teaching - that it contains principles and order, that it is observable and yields distinctive differences - and he describes steps that would identify and operationally describe "agreed-upon, valued teacher behaviors," and then catalog them and subject them to monitoring scrutiny. Stallings (1979) closes this subtopic with an insistence on "predefined rules and established operational definitions" as the basis for objective, systematic observations.

The third subtopic of the research base theme deals with applications of gathered and analyzed data to teachers as people. Within this area there are innumerable articles treating segments of observable teaching behavior somewhat as if they were specimen slides that could be handed to the professional to be examined under a

microscope after they had been prepared by laboratory personnel. Fisher (1985) focuses on the use of instructional time to develop concepts that have "high face validity and are easily communicated to teachers....virtually all evaluators of teachers acknowledge the importance of this variable, though measurement techniques may vary." Townsend (1984) cites teacher rankings of the most recent models of supervision and evaluation which show the collection and feedback of data to be the most beneficial elements. Valentine (1978) claims the necessary data are available and that supervisors must assume the responsibility for learning to collect and package the information as "data-based suggestions for growth." Besides time-on-task studies, there are comments on the classroom benefits of a teacher's positive statements (Page, 1958); on breakdowns of the teaching act into a variety of outlines, such as the four stages of planning, interaction, analysis/evaluation, and application (Martin, 1983); on Madeline Hunter's objective processes for gathering longitudinal data (Skoglund, 1983); and on setting up and using cooperative goal structures which have a "powerful and positive effect on the classroom learning environment." Walberg (1979)

The relevance and interest of the literature in this application focus find representative expression in some powerful concluding statements. Walberg (1979) says "inoperative or invalid" evaluation systems, those not founded on a solid research data base, will likely contribute to a "continuation of ineffective teaching techniques" and make merit pay programs meaningless. In a similar statement, Manatt (1987) concludes an assurance that research data provide strong

discriminating lists of teacher behaviors by warning that "to omit certain behaviors probably constitutes malpractice."

Several authors close this research-based theme by noting the human mystery and character involved in the art of teaching. Some commentators on evaluation have used this human element as an excuse for the inability of educational research ever to become a science that could effectively describe or improve teaching behavior, but the more recent literature leaves a more encouraging impression based on the same human behavioral characteristics. Hosford (1984) believes we need to "transform our conception of teaching to encompass the dynamic interplay between mystical intuition and scientific analysis." Joyce (1980) assures logically that our efforts will lead us to "discover regularities in the teaching-learning process that have not been apparent before." Mosston (1985) believes the human decision-making capacity will help us shift our models away from an "idiosyncratic, fragmented, arbitrary concept of teaching behavior toward a universal, deliberate, and unified theory of teaching." Zumwalt (1986) also supports the human capacity for growth, declaring that the motivation behind the self-analytic approach in performance evaluation is that people do learn "from an analysis of their own behavior and the thoughtful application of ideas to their own situation." Finally, Brandt (1986) quotes David Berliner on a concept that gives significance and professional, human challenge to the whole process of evaluation:

Supervisors need to find out how their finest teachers operate and then try to unravel how teachers who are having difficulty think about the same phenomena. Part of supervision is

learning how to unpack behavior: to open it up and try to figure out what the thought processes were behind it.

As in the next three themes to follow, the operating guidelines distilled from this first literature theme are presented in Chapter Four among the presentation of the research findings. At this point, the literature search next leads into the wisdom of including teachers in the process of developing a performance evaluation plan.

Theme of Participatory Planning

This section of the literature review examines what happens when a teacher evaluation plan is developed without, and then with, the participation of the teachers. To open the discussion on the side of inadequate participation, Clark (1981) warns against issuing invitations to an event no one cares to attend. If the teachers sense that the planning they enter into will have no significant impact on the life of the organization, they will avoid the wasted effort. In the same arena, Knox (1972) asserts that people will put up resistance to change if their inner security feels threatened and they don't see any value in the process. Knox holds that people will commit themselves if they feel they have a stake in the outcome, especially when it affects them directly. Change that is self-directed has a greater chance of being effectively accepted. Schambier (1983) agrees that those who are involved in a process are the best ones to help develop plans for their own growth, and he ties faculty morale to finding ways of creating the conditions "that will induce personnel to set realistic goals and to take responsibility for the achievement of their goals." McGreal (1983)

echoes the resistance issue when he lists among planning practices that "dramatically hinder" improvement the existence of high supervisor/low teacher involvement in the process. He emphatically asserts that "teachers, particularly tenured teachers, change their behavior only when they want to do so. They must be partners in the system." While remaining in agreement with these conclusions, Townsend (1984) admits that formal evaluations based on a collaboration model often take much more time than people usually anticipate and schedule for the work.

Switching to the other side of the discussion emphasis, the reader finds a solid body of endorsement for the importance to any successful plan of including those whom it will affect. Cooke (1984) lists first under his researched criteria for effective staff development and instructional supervision that administrators and teachers should make joint decisions about needs and activities. Wildman (1987) cites the same collaboration as a condition to be taken seriously, under which teachers learn "about and from their teaching." Walberg (1982) also lists as a "necessary component" in trying to implement change "a shared decision-making structure," and claims teacher motivation and performance are typically greater in schools marked by a low level of centralization. Mohan (1975) thinks good teaching can be defined for a given group only to the extent that they "share in common certain expectancies and biases about teachers and teaching." In his summary of lessons learned from performance appraisal projects, Manatt (1987) emphasizes that teachers held the dominant representation on each committee and feedback flowed readily among everyone involved. In his

review of the literature on the components of effective staff development models, Fitzpatrick (1986) sees that giving teachers leeway to be part of the process is essential to improved instruction. Zumwalt (1986) also concludes there is no choice in the matter of involving teachers in the identification of professional skills that need to be improved and for involving them in the design of activities and programs to provide this skill development.

Several authors go beyond the involvement stage to speak in terms of responsibility for, and ownership of, the successful programs. Sergiovanni (1979) outlines an extensive chart of criteria in a supervision climate marked by openness, trust, and support; in such a climate, "personnel at all levels feel responsible for organizational goals and their achievement." Skoglund (1983) says a program of teacher evaluation must have teachers recognizing and taking responsibility for management of instruction. Harris (1987) makes perhaps the strongest statement in this position:

Many educators recognize that grassroots participation in staff appraisal is essential, but fewer would agree that staff should also be involved in system governance. When administrators and teachers share responsibility and authority for successful evaluation, however, the dynamics of staff evaluation change. Everyone becomes more accountable and the system becomes more responsive to the needs of all constituents.

This stronger challenge toward ownership is picked up also by Zumwalt (1986) and Walberg (1986). In the former, it is claimed that collaborative planning helps develop a sense of "support, ownership, and competence, as well as commitment" to the process. In the latter, it is emphasized

that "nobody supports what he does not own. Teachers must have ownership of improvement efforts for any lasting change to take place in a school." Walberg follows this unequivocal statement by pointing to collaborative staff development models to generate teacher ownership and the resultant improvement in school climate.

In closing the literature theme of participatory planning, Walberg (1979) dreamed ten years ago of schools as places where teachers share ideas, support one another, and work together to find workable solutions to their common problems. Success in this direction appears to be proportionally related to the levels of participation allowed and encouraged in the planning process.

Theme of Teacher/Supervisor Relationship

A third theme summarized from literature on planning staff evaluation programs is that of the teacher/supervisor relationship. By far the majority of the researched articles dealt with supervisory leadership, most often that of the principal, but there is strong emphasis also on the interaction of teacher and supervisor.

Walberg (1974) opens this latter topic with a discussion of the attitudes administrators sense in their staffs toward nearly every aspect of their professional assignment, and he relates the struggles some supervisors have in determining their own response attitudes (Walberg believes that work attitudes are most important to overall school performance). McGreal (1983), with a statement particularly appropriate to the focus of this section of the study, claims the relationship could well be the foundation of the program:

In developing or redesigning an evaluation system, a school district would do well to start with the contact between supervisor and teacher and build backward from that point. The systems that work best impose the fewest possible infringements upon that supervisor-teacher relationship.

Sergiovanni (1979) places equal emphasis when he cites Cogan's eight steps in clinical supervision; the first step, said to be of "particular importance," is to establish the teacher-supervisor relationship, "for upon its success rests the whole concept of clinical supervision." A relationship of mutual trust and support, a co-supervisory role should be built up and "well advanced before the supervisor enters the teacher's classroom to observe teaching."

A few articles touched the subject of the additional evaluation relationship available through peer coaching. Jessel (1984) favors such a maximum-involvement plan for teachers who would train other teachers and conduct "collegial visitations" to reach the point of making reasonable judgments about their own performance and potential revisions. Mohan (1975) prefers employing teams of observers to enter schools for the single assignment of evaluating teacher performance. Walberg (1986) cites research on highly effective schools which shows evidence of teachers actively teaching and learning from one another, sharing information on teaching procedures and materials, and observing each other's classes. Brandt (1987) relates McGreal's interview comments that, while peer supervision has worked well in some cases, "for the near future the real hope of improving instruction is still going to come from improving the interaction between the supervisor

and the teacher." He goes on to express reservations about a peer model that would leave teachers in the formative role and the principal alone in the summative role. Finally, Zumwalt (1986) finds value in providing a peer support system because, by themselves, principals cannot come up with "the time, energy, and expertise needed for coaching and support of new skills and behaviors acquired by teachers."

On the other side of the relationship, a couple of comments came across strongly in the literature concerning the need for support structures. Townsend (1984) cites within teacher ratings of newer supervision models the benefits of receiving direct help, feedback of data, and increased communication with administrators; Townsend also summarizes research findings relating administrative support to successful program implementation. Fitzpatrick (1986) speaks about the bonds that form between administrators and teachers in a supportive environment that respects teachers, helps teachers assess themselves, and gives them a role in contributing to organizational goals and instructional processes.

The literature treating the principal or supervisor half of the relationship leaves no doubt that supervision/evaluation is the principal's most important job and that it is an essential ingredient of successful educational programs. Hosford (1984) quotes Madeline Hunter as saying a principal's most important function is to "nurture, develop, and escalate instructional excellence." Skoglund (1983) calls teacher evaluation the "most critical activity" of educational administrators who must develop and communicate a sound philosophy for the program to be successful; the priority goal shared with teachers

is to develop and strengthen skills needed to help each student achieve a good quality education. Suprina (1978) also considers staff supervision a principal's top priority and wants the principal involved in the system, along with department heads and aides, to the extent of full-period, personal classroom visits at least once each year and of working with other supervisors to complete annual evaluation forms. Walberg (1986) considers the principal's support and systematic implementation of staff development programs to be "one of the most important elements of instructional leadership."

From the program view, Wilson (1974) insists a successful program must have the principal's leadership helping teachers develop criteria for self-evaluation. To accomplish this, the principal must emphasize personal leadership self-evaluation as a role model in keeping updated. Fitzpatrick (1986) lists support structures that are "essential to improved instruction"; among these are active instructional leadership in planning and implementing the staff development program: "the greatest improvements in instructional behavior occurred in those schools where the principals provided assistance and support to the teachers." Walberg (1979) asserts the general hypothesis that behaviors initiated by the principal have "primary impact on teachers' perceptions, intentions, and behaviors within the school environment."

Role expectations of the principal form a third issue in the literature studying relationships of administrators and teachers. Brandt (1987) quotes Bruce Joyce on the necessity of active instructional leadership even in a coaching system of evaluation. The principal must unblock obstacles to help people work together. Hunter (1976) believes

the principal, by practicing what is preached at inservice meetings and using reinforcement theory to support teachers, can be a great morale booster. Schambier (1983) also sees the principal's job as that of defining role expectations for teachers and reducing "conflict between personality needs of the individual and the role expectations of the organization." He says the administrative understanding of human nature is a key to whether change comes about by force or by motivation. Walberg (1982 and 1986) reinforces the role of the principal as the one who sets the expectations for a successful program of teacher development; and he finds job satisfaction to be high in those schools where the principal "exhibited leadership behavior high in work facilitation support, interaction facilitation, and goal emphasis."

Cooley (1986) closes this teacher/supervisor relationship theme with a particularly appropriate comment:

Personnel evaluation was one of the most consistently mentioned problems by the people who worked in the district. Few seemed happy with the present procedures. Employees wanted their evaluations oriented toward improving job performance, and felt it was important to clarify who is responsible for evaluating whom and how these evaluations should be done.

Theme of the Planning Process

The literature commenting on the process of planning a teacher evaluation program can be separated into the three categories of conditions, consideration, and criteria. The first deals with some prerequisite conditions that create a vision or help the planner pay attention to the total system which is a context for teacher evaluation.

The second discusses some considerations that must be afforded to the teachers as the system is applied to their professional situation, and the last compares some of the criteria listed as the result of research and experience that characterize successful programs.

Bliss (1986) noted earlier that all components of a school work together, so program planners must not ignore either the effects of, nor the impact on, other system parts. Knox (1977) describes an organization as a process that determines the way personnel will relate to one another in their work; if the school is organized around goals, all can have a common focus without personal preferences becoming a distraction. Sergiovanni (1979) reinforces this thought as he calls upon personnel not to lose sight of the basic purpose of the organization, so that lesser purposes can be kept in proper perspective. Manatt (1980) supports, as another precondition for planning, the concept of a common language used by all personnel to communicate the accepted mission of the school. Clark (1981) suggests that the typical school has shown evidence under the scrutiny of research of being more an organized anarchy than a logical, systematic institution ready to mesh new concepts into a smoothly operating system. He says a school tends to discover "preferences through action more than it acts on the basis of preferences," often relying on trial-by-error accidents instead of well-planned improvements. McGreal (1983) adds that "in many cases the system is the problem," as faulty implementation detracts from an otherwise acceptable set of concepts and purposes; he cites failure to resolve attitudes toward evaluation, to develop reliable evaluation criteria, and to use reliable data-gathering procedures as reasons for

the system becoming the problem. Schambier (1983) relates a concept by M. L. Monette who tries to create, as a precondition for change, a "biopsychological state of deficiency," a tension that seeks fulfillment.

The second issue in this section of the literature review deals with considerations toward teachers being asked to plan and participate in performance evaluation systems. Such considerations include time and support (Brandt, 1987), (Cook, 1984), (Fitzpatrick, 1986) and opportunities for guided practice, feedback, and observation of another's class. Sergiovanni (1979) proposes a human resources plan which involves teachers in decision-making practices to increase school effectiveness, which in turn creates greater teacher satisfaction and growth. The author favors this approach over the human relations pattern which would increase teacher satisfaction in order to reach greater school effectiveness. Stallings (1983) summarizes the importance of appropriate treatment of teachers by stating that "what teachers do is directed in no small way by what they think," and that their behavior as professionals makes the difference between effective and non-effective schools.

The literature addressing the criteria for planning a teacher evaluation program was analyzed on a chart listing each author's variety of steps. Common traits in the lists became apparent, and it also appeared that each planning step answered one of a set of questions posed by Schambier on the same chart. To avoid lists of criteria narrated in sequential paragraphs, and to add emphasis to the

similarity of this information researched from the literature, this study presents the criteria in chart form, rearranged in some cases from the author's original sequence in order to fall within the columns of the proposed planning questions posed by Schambier. The chart appears on Page 26.

Schambier's (1983) four questions for staff development planners:

	1	2	3	4
Who can best perceive professional needs?	To what extent do selected individual, to system?	How do staff planners best prepare to deal with shifting needs?	What critical relationships exist between needs and the operational philosophy of the school?	
Georgia (1983) minimum activities	assign staff development to specific individuals	generate priorities, compare to other agencies	prioritize data, compare needs to resources	evaluate workshops with participants
Cook (1984) criteria for effective staff development and instructional supervision	joint teacher/administrator decision-making on needs, activities	aim inservice at teacher-identified needs, make voluntary, allow time	local personnel small groups, identify resources for timely response to needs	learn-by-doing theme, opportunities for informal peer interaction
Mohan (1975) necessary steps	research teacher behavior, specify value-system framework	identify situations to observe "valued" behaviors	descriptively catalog teacher classroom behaviors	
McGreal (1983) steps for implementing a new evaluation system	organize small, workable group of influentials, hire consultants for alternate viewpoints	supervision is a partnership inquiry that must respond to needs of the teacher	consultants offer options, summary of research, help focus and expedite	don't drag out the process-- Year 1 start, Year 2 implement
Townsend (1984) successful implementation may depend on extent to which these are done	committees plan and develop for 2 years, involve teachers	assess staff readiness and commitment, honor teacher worklife needs	training at all implementation stages, variety of resources, flexible time	administrative leadership, monitoring, purpose clear and compatible with evaluation

CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

Validation of the Problem Statement

As cited at the beginning of the literature search, the key to any study is a precise identification and statement of the question. The validation process leading to this project began with the newly appointed principal discussing priorities with the representative advisory council of academic department chairpersons. Following this period, the school completed an accreditation self-study and a site visit from the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, from which the priority of restoring an effective teacher evaluation system again surfaced with emphasis. The identified problem aspects included inheritance by a new administrative team of a previously installed teacher evaluation system that had lacked faculty participation in its design, that was burdensome to faculty time, and which had become single-faceted when evaluation by students had failed to materialize in manageable form. After a trial period, the system was brought to a virtual standstill while the new administrative team decided with the department chairs a new approach to evaluation. This field project study emerged as one element in the design of a replacement system for teacher evaluation, an element that would help focus information on the solution of the identified problem and immerse the management team in the process.

Description of the Project

It was decided that a four-part approach would be taken toward

a solution of the stated problem. First, the researcher completed university courses that provided updated skills and concepts and an accountable framework for gathering information. Next, within the coursework, a field project was undertaken providing two information-gathering sources: an interview with a professional consultant in the field of school personnel development, and a disciplined search of the current professional literature. Incorporating the advice gained in these three experiences, the researcher would direct the construction of an action plan for installing a replacement system of teacher evaluation in the high school. As a fourth step in the project methodology, the researcher monitored the early stages of the plan's acceptance and feasibility by surveying the faculty six months after installation.

Personnel Decisions Tangential to the Project Methodology

It is important to note that the methodology in isolation could not produce a real-world solution to the problem as stated. In order for the project to blossom systematically and for the findings to fall on tilled soil, two vital personnel assignments were decided. As described earlier, these decisions appointed the department chairs as a steering committee for the replacement plan and created a directorship for the extra time required in the initial year to coordinate the steering committee and the implementation phases of the plan, along with monitoring its progress. While the consensus in the research is that the principal is a key to any evaluation system, the director extended the reach of the principal during the start-up year which demands far more attention and time than during the maintenance years.

CHAPTER FOUR

Presentation of Findings

This fourth chapter of the study presents a summary distillation and points out the congruence among the various findings from the data-gathering methodology described in the previous chapter. Each source of data-gathering is summarized as a distinct phase in the study:

- Phase One: Omaha Public School Consultant and Materials
- Phase Two: University Coursework
- Phase Three: Literature Search (four themes)
- Phase Four: Survey of Teachers on Early Progress of the Revised Evaluation Plan.

Phase One: Omaha Public School Consultant and Materials

The Omaha Public School materials and consultation provided by Dr. Margaret Fitch foreshadowed several concepts that appeared in the later phases of the project.

1. Dr. Fitch's advice directed the outcome of the study toward an actual plan to be used as a solution to the stated problem. The sample materials she provided fit well with the program planning criteria (fourth literature theme) and emphasized the same updating of skills for administrators.
2. Dr. Fitch's overview of the professional literature helped direct the computer search and validate the selection of concepts and authors that resulted from the search.
3. The OPS materials contained other common themes later encountered in the literature search: concern for the total-system context,

relationship of program activities to district goals, and emphasis on a research-based approach.

Phase Two: University Coursework

Concepts derived from university courses that related well to the research project and found support in the literature search are described below.

1. The clinical supervision process, properly carried out; builds shared experience which enhances the teacher/supervisor relationship that is an essential part of the evaluation system as outlined in the third thematic area of the literature survey. This process also improves communication between the teacher and the supervisor about teaching and learning; this exchange builds the common vocabulary and goals espoused by Manatt and others.
2. While it may not readily appear that there is time for the principal to be a primary evaluator of teachers, it is essential that the time be found, as this is the most important role of the principal. The third literature theme stresses this primary responsibility which is made more practical by clinical supervision techniques. Zumwalt adds the concept of peer coaching to help extend the time and reach of the principal.
3. Continuing inservice in evaluation skills and related research are an important part of a principal's development. Occasional courses help provide a framework for disciplined research from which the principal can help with faculty inservice. This

issue is the basis for the OPS materials and is stressed again in the fourth literature theme on program planning criteria.

4. Coursework opens up consultation contacts, as in the project leading to the discussion with Dr. Fitch and in subsequent visits by university personnel to the high school which is the beneficiary of this project.

Phase Three: Literature Search

From each of the four themes which emerged from the literature search, a set of findings was summarized which carry over as guiding principles for design of the action plan in Chapter Five.

1. Research-base Theme

- a. A teacher evaluation plan must interconnect with other systems governing the overall direction of the school. This theme was prominent as well in the fourth theme of the literature and in the OPS materials.
- b. There is valid, research-based information available, supported by growing confidence in its potential for improving education. There is a need and obligation to continue systematic progress in the development and application of this information base. This issue was emphasized in the OPS workshop materials which were designed to update administrators on current research and was also a major point in the university course on clinical supervision which led to additional study of Manatt's evaluation criteria.

- c. When applying data to teachers, it is important to recognize that teachers are human and professional. The communication skills for feedback of information to teachers were an important element of the clinical supervision practicum.

2. Participatory Planning Theme

- a. For teachers to become involved in the planning of an evaluation system, they need to see value in the process and believe that their efforts will affect the outcome. Teachers must feel responsible for setting and for contributing toward the achievement of the organization's goals.
- b. For change to occur within an organization, it is essential that the people who must make that change happen be involved in the design of activities and programs which will develop their skills. This issue pervades the university courses, corporate theory, the design of the OPS workshops, and the literature search categories.
- c. The participation model takes longer to develop, so time must be allotted in the planning for flexibility.

3. Teacher/Supervisor Relationship Theme

- a. There is essential value to be recognized and developed in the interaction between the supervisor and the teachers. The communication reduces barriers and gets those who are involved in the process talking to one another about

teaching. Besides being a dominant issue in the literature, this concept was also a major emphasis of the university practicum in clinical supervision.

- b. Peer coaching adds a dimension to the evaluation program by encouraging teachers to communicate with one another and by extending the occurrences of observation and communication well beyond what could be managed by the supervisor alone. Peer coaching has other magnification potential, in that teachers who are exposed to outside courses or workshops will also tend to share these new concepts in the communication with colleagues, so that not only the process but also the content quality of their communication is enhanced, and the investment in inservice gains greater distribution.
- c. Teachers must accept the new responsibilities of their role in the success of the evaluation system. If they are given access to the governance of the plan, they cannot expect the benefits and at the same time try to shift the blame for setbacks that might occur.
- d. Supervision for staff development is the principal's most important responsibility, and the principal's involvement is essential to the success of the process. If this role requires updating of skills, then the principal must acquire these. This summary area of the literature was also supported in the OPS materials and in the clinical supervision practicum.

4. Planning Process Theme

- a. An organization establishes a framework which influences the relationships personnel experience with the system and with one another. The planning process can be enhanced if, within this framework, the basic mission of the school is kept in priority focus. From this focal concentration, common experiences help to build common vocabulary and evaluation criteria which serve to improve attitudes toward evaluation and to minimize the impersonal aspects of the organization. This issue in the literature finds complementary treatment also from such authors as Manatt in the research-based criteria that need to be adapted by local experience.
- b. Supervisors need to give teachers adequate time and support for the changes that are expected to occur. Including teachers in the decision-making processes gives them greater satisfaction, and their resultant growth and professional behavior will make the difference in the effectiveness of the school programs. This issue was also prominent in university coursework dealing with Japanese corporate structure and processes, and in the OPS materials which included the principals in the design and conduct of the administrative workshops.
- c. Literature reports of successful program designs contained much similarity in characteristic criteria, and the OPS

models were patterned after a number of these criteria. Successful programs were marked by collaborative decision-making in small groups that availed themselves of the current research and were given a year or two to formulate a program design. Decisions were shared on the selection of valued teaching behaviors and on the inservice and evaluation system that would promote these behaviors in the classroom. The designs allowed teachers time and assistance for practice of new concepts. The designs were flexible to meet local conditions and to respond to needs recognized by the monitoring process. This section of the literature was in strong agreement within itself, as was demonstrated by the chart on Page 26, and also found support throughout the earlier themes in the literature and in the OPS materials which relied on local and external design consultation and were patterned according to these program criteria.

Phase Four: Survey of Teachers on Early Progress of the Revised Evaluation Plan

The scope of this research study does not include a full longitudinal monitoring of the replacement system for teacher evaluation, but rather was intended to design and install such a system. However, since the report of the planned project overlapped its actual installation, it was deemed appropriate at this point to include the results of a short-term monitoring survey of the plan's progress.

Seventy-five percent of the faculty surveys were returned. Weighted values (5-4-3-4-5) were assigned each column to assess the strength of response along the scale; the questions were then ranked by net positive strength.

<u>Success of the system in meeting its objectives</u>	<u>(+)</u>	<u>(-)</u>	<u>Net</u>
1 Providing feedback.....	166	14	152
2 Opening communication between self and administration..	126	48	78
3 Encouraging me to develop professionally.....	117.5	50.5	67
4 Improving level of instruction in my classroom.....	89.5	63.5	26
5 Opening communication among teachers.....	87	73	14
<u>Strength of Helpfulness of Various Supervision Formats</u>			
1 Administrative visit #1 (general 30-minute overview)...	128.5	35.5	93
2 Administrative visit #2 (focus on student behaviors)...	108	53	55
3 Administrative visit #3 (10-minute class start-up).....	104	64	40
4 Department chair visit.....	71.5	41.5	30
5 Peer supervision.....	68.5	67.5	1
<u>Bottom Line: Should we continue the evaluation program?</u>	<u>Yes 80%</u>	<u>No 20%</u>	

These early findings indicate favorable teacher attitude toward, and acceptance of, the revised evaluation plan. In agreement with the earlier findings from other sources in the study, the aspects most favored by teachers are the feedback provided by the system and direct involvement of the administration in the support and success of the system; as a side benefit, the survey itself keeps teachers involved as partners in the progress of the plan. Another obvious finding is that the peer visitation aspect of the plan needs significant re-working. A more detailed summary of the survey responses, including teacher comments, is included in the Appendix to the study.

CHAPTER FIVE

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

This final chapter of the project will:

1. restate the problem,
2. summarize the procedure used,
3. present conclusions in the form of a program design,
4. offer some closing recommendations.

Restatement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to design a system for evaluation of teacher performance that would replace a prior system in a senior high school. After a short period of application, the former system had not been well accepted because it placed undue burdens on teacher time and had not succeeded as a collaborative effort in establishing a positive teacher/supervisor relationship. In addition, the system had been reduced to a single-faceted approach when evaluation by students was curtailed because the manual system was unwieldy and fell back upon teacher time for tabulation and analysis of their own data. Also, both the principal and primary academic assistant who had conducted the former teacher evaluations were both replaced in the same year by a new management team who perceived in the early months of their assignment that the evaluation system needed to be redesigned. Design of a new program required adequate time to gather information and to involve the teachers in the planning; while allowing for this time, the management team also had to provide some

continuation of the current system so that new personnel would not be left without a starting program of development.

Description of the Procedure Used

From discussion meetings with the chairpersons' advisory council who represented the teachers by academic departments, and using the results of a North Central Association accreditation self-study and site visit, the researcher validated the significance of the stated problem and directed a study toward its solution. From university coursework, consultation with a professional in the field of personnel development, and from a search of the current literature, the researcher gathered information, assessed congruence among the issues that surfaced, and extracted some operating guidelines for solving the stated problem of replacing a teacher evaluation system in a senior high school. As an additional step because the report of the study overlapped installation of the new system, the researcher also, from a survey of the faculty in the sixth month of the new program, gained an assessment of the program's early progress.

Conclusions in the Form of a Program Design or Outline

The consultant recommended as a target activity for the field project the layout of an action plan, emphasizing the importance of directing its impact toward servicing the actual on-site situation. Sample Omaha Public School materials were provided as models for development of a program scheduled over a period of time. In the fourth chapter, guidelines for program design were summarized as a

presentation of the research findings and congruence was indicated among the information gathered from the various sources. In this fifth and closing chapter, the conclusions of the study are presented, in accordance with consultant advice, as a program approach for on-site application to replace the teacher evaluation system. The program will be presented under two versions, first in a timeline format assigning activities and responsible personnel, and then cross-sectioned from the viewpoint of the program's response to guideline themes from the presentation of the findings.

1. Outline of the Replacement Program for Teacher Evaluation
in Timeline Format

YEAR 1 SPRING SEMESTER

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| March | principal negotiates to appoint a program director who will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - chair the steering committee of department chairs - assess feedback data as ideas are proposed and piloted - relate the former evaluation system to the revised plan - relate to the personnel developed under the former plan - implement the revised system during Year 1 - help determine the two-year timetable for the project |
| April/May | principal, director, department chairs meet weekly to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - establish working relationships among restructured steering committee members - reemphasize priority of teacher evaluation from the accreditation self-study |

- familiarize themselves with proposed activities and timeline
 - discuss evaluation in the context of the Mission Statement and the school's long-range plan
- Summer
- principal, director and chairs attend inservice sessions as needed to refine concepts and skills
 - principal and director meet as needed to plan school-opening and follow-up inservice activities introducing the new evaluation system
- August
- during inservice sessions opening the school year:
- redefine role of the department chairs, revise job descriptions as needed to reflect evaluation responsibility, expectations
 - present Manatt criteria for teacher behaviors, encourage feedback relating them to our Mission Statement
 - announce three-week period of principal/director observations to describe what is happening in the classrooms rather than what could or should be
- September
- steering committee meets weekly to:
- report and discuss feedback on early observations
 - identify and address any perceived skepticism attaching to the new plan, build confidence and morale

- develop year-long plan for allotment of approved inservice funds
 - plan faculty meeting which will include a report to the teachers on early observations; report will find if any pattern of criteria seems to be emerging and relate this to Manatt's list
 - present to faculty a full outline of the Year 1 formative evaluation plan developed through the steering committee (Appendix)
 - establish the process of peer visitations
 - review Student Council proposal for evaluation of faculty by students
 - schedule department chair visits to classrooms
- director begins first round of formal observation and conferences
- October
- principal to attend NASCD inservice workshop on cooperative learning, to offer workshop to teachers during following week
 - director to present learning styles workshop for teachers
 - principal to conduct faculty meeting which will include progress review and reminder of next steps in the plan; emphasis will be on teacher attitudes toward the early procedures and toward the upcoming steps
- November
- director to present inservice workshop on approaches to teaching analytical thinking skills

- director to begin second round of classroom visits and conferences--announces criteria, viewpoint, and forms to be used
 - steering committee to approve final plan for inservice attendance at outside workshops from faculty requests
 - pilot testing of computer forms and program for evaluation of faculty by students, adjustment of scanner and data reporting format
 - faculty meeting to review progress, obtain feedback
 - principal to report progress to Governing Board, relate process to self-study and long-range plan
- December
- steering committee to monitor progress of peer visits and department chair visits (one per semester)
- January
- director and principal to review results of sample student evaluation of teachers and to conduct conferences with sampled faculty to assess benefits of feedback provided by the new system; decision to be made on purchase of forms for a full run of the system later in the spring semester
- February
- department chairs each to plan one weekly meeting of the steering committee to increase leadership participation in the committee inservice
 - director to begin third round of observations with a new focus and accompanying report format

- director to order forms for student evaluation of entire faculty in late March
 - principal, department chairs, and director begin to assign teachers for next year, bringing evaluations into the planning context for placement decisions
- March
- faculty meeting to assess progress and acceptance of the revised plan, and to begin to reach consensus on the list of criteria by which future evaluations will be made; meeting also to preview remaining steps and to prepare for evaluation by students
 - director to conclude third round of observations and conferences
- YEAR 2
- April/May
- principal, director, and steering committee to outline plan for the next school year, to include:
 - identification of criteria relating to the mission and based on performance evaluations from Year 1
 - shift of primary classroom observation/conference role to the principal for Year 2; director and department chairs to remain involved in secondary responsibility role; student evaluations ongoing each semester
 - preview of inservice allotment for Year 2 from approved budget
- Summer
- preparation of school-opening inservice meetings

- August-May - continue Year 1 plan of 4-fold variety of evaluations
- monitor progress each quarter, make necessary adjustments in process and schedule

2. Cross-section of the Plan as It Responds to Guideline Themes from the Literature Search

Research-based Theme

- a. The plan must interconnect with other systems in the school; samples of such systems include those described below.

Mission Statement: all programs and processes relate to the mission. The plan responds by reviewing the Manatt criteria for evaluation of teacher performance and "localizing" them to the mission statement.

Long-Range Planning: also flowing from the mission and from the accreditation self-study, the long-range plan identifies and schedules strategies to meet the objectives in personnel, program, physical resources, and financial resources areas. The evaluation plan responds by helping to refine the process of assigning personnel to the appropriate areas where they will have the greatest impact on students' development and to focus the faculty on achievement of specific, scheduled objectives.

Inservice: the long-range plan includes regular assessment of and provision for inservice needs and greater attention to planned allocation of available inservice funds to take

advantage of the best opportunities in regional and national workshops. The plan responds by having the steering committee assist the principal and plan director in identifying, developing, and scheduling inservice programs and in allotting available funds to meet faculty requests for the year.

Job Descriptions: as strategies to achieve the long-range plan are developed, personnel roles and relationships need to be reviewed for possible revision and need to be rewritten for communication purposes. The plan responds by reviewing the job descriptions of the principal, director, and department chairs as the plan patterned them all into new responsibilities and relationships.

- b. The plan must recognize that there is a valid research base available and that professional educators have an obligation to relate to it. Sample responses in the plan are listed below.

Robert Manatt's criteria are a list of researched teaching behaviors that produce improved learning, as tested over a five-year period. As observations are made and related to the school mission, the criteria are "localized" to form a set of expectations or parameters for hiring, performance, development, and retention processes.

The SUMA software program and forms (sample in appendix) obtained for use by the students in evaluating faculty have a nationwide validation basis based on extensive research and replicated studies. The program provides statistical

comparison data for each academic department and for all teachers in the system

Inservice needs are assessed by the evaluation plan, and the steering committee is charged with researching available inservice opportunities and helping to allocate the budget to help the personnel take advantage of the best available inservice opportunities.

- c. The plan must respect the human instruments involved, recognizing their capacity for self-growth and their need for supportive feedback. Sample responses in the plan are discussed below.

The peer visit system intends to expand teacher contact and communication, broadening their own teaching perspectives and providing mutual encouragement, feedback, and support. In the plan, each teacher selects a visitation partner both within and outside one's own academic department and schedules at least one mutual visit each semester.

Selection of the Manatt criteria encourages the faculty to personalize and relate their own performance strengths to the school mission; the base of accepted behaviors then returns strength to the teacher in the form of clearly defined expectations or parameters within the system.

The student evaluation results are intended as immediate feedback to the teacher, providing the opportunity during the course of the semester to respond to areas of improvement recommended by the students. Perceived improvements will

strengthen rapport between students and teachers and invest both in the growth of the mutual learning process.

The addition of the plan director from the teacher ranks and the revision of the steering committee job descriptions made a statement by the new system that necessary time and personnel resources will be committed to make the replacement evaluation system a priority that will not simply add a layer of new responsibility and time to the teachers' load.

Starting the plan with positive observations to be reported at the first faculty meeting gives support to the teachers in the form of recognition of their strengths which, reported to the entire group, can form a common base upon which all can draw for ideas.

Participatory Planning Theme

- a. Teachers must have ownership of improvement efforts for lasting change to take place. There must be joint decisions about needs and activities, a realization that commitment by the faculty will have an impact on the organization.

The peer visitation component of the plan leaves teachers the decisions about mutual observations and how to use the results.

The Manatt criteria will be localized by teacher behaviors and discussion at faculty meetings. The criteria selected by the teachers become the foundation for observations, evaluation, and inservice as the plan progresses from year to year.

The plan will have an impact on the mission and long-range planning objectives of the school; personnel resources are the priority basis for the planning.

The four-part structure of the evaluation plan (peer, administrative, department chair, and student) distributes the workload and responsibility for the system so that it contains a variety of perspectives and does not rely solely on teachers meeting expectations required by the administration. The steering committee, as departmental representatives and advocates of the teachers, have a central role in the development and application of the revised evaluation system.

Teacher/Supervisor Relationship Theme

- a. The plan should reduce barriers and encourage communication about teaching.

As part of the plan, the researcher attended a university practicum course in teacher evaluation. The clinical supervision techniques were applied in practice sessions on teachers in the school, and emphasis by the instructor was on the development of occasions on which teacher and supervisor talked with one another about teaching and learning.

Peer visitations are intended to assist teachers to move with relative comfort out of their own classrooms to give and receive peer support and to open common grounds for shared communication about teaching and integration of learning.

The common criteria from those listed by Manatt give the teachers input into the system and help them develop boundaries within which they can operate with relative assurance and security that they are accomplishing organizational goals and following validated behaviors that benefit student learning.

By researching and attending inservice programs as entire academic departments, teachers invest interest in the system and again find common experience to build new channels of communication.

- b. Teachers must accept some new responsibilities for making the system work, and they need respect and support for their contributions.

Under the new system, the teachers have responsibility in every stage from planning to implementation to evaluation, and have strong representation on the steering committee. Other than making summative evaluation decisions, the faculty share the plan at all levels.

- c. The principal must be involved in the system. Evaluation is the principal's most important responsibility. If necessary, those who administer the evaluation plan must seek the necessary training to apply the system effectively. Before Year 1 the principal was to receive updated training in university coursework and gave primary direction to the self-study that established evaluation of teachers as a top priority. The principal during Year 1 was to select and

assign the director for the new plan to give it sufficient emphasis to overcome the potential inertia of merely continuing program maintenance. The principal was to fulfill a support role in the first year of the new plan, and a primary role in coordinating it with the other systems giving direction to the school.

During Year 2 of the revised plan, the principal is scheduled to work with the director to make any adjustments necessary based on Year 1 experience, and then to take over the primary role as a classroom observer while assigning the director to a strong support role in evaluation. The director in Year 2 would pave the way in a lead role for development of related inservice and curriculum planning.

The Planning Process Theme

- a. The plan must focus on the basic purposes of the organization. By connecting the Manatt criteria to the mission statement of the school, the revised plan grows from the accepted organizational purpose and, in turn, helps to strengthen the school's posture toward achievement of the mission and long-range planning strategies.
- b. The plan must help teachers and administrators develop a common language and encourage its use in new communication experiences.

The Manatt criteria, regular sharing at faculty meetings, the representative role of the steering committee, peer

visitations, clinical supervision practices, and shared development of inservice programs are all conducive to the building up and use of common grounds for communication among teachers and between teachers and supervisors.

- c. The plan needs to help teachers resolve unfavorable attitudes toward evaluation.

The plan director was selected from the faculty ranks specifically to bridge the gap between the old and new evaluation plans, and the steering committee involvement of representative department chairs was intended to deter skepticism and provide leadership by example.

The plan calls for the director and principal to make early observation visits for the sole purpose of noting and reporting strengths in current teaching behaviors. By reporting these at early faculty meetings, the two observers hope to reduce threatening aspects involved in any change, especially one involving performance evaluation. From these early observations also, the teachers are to begin to convert what they are doing into localizing of the Manatt criteria for a foundation of expected behaviors and future observations. The practice of clinical supervision further reduces threatening feelings and helps build more favorable communication between teachers and supervisors. When the teachers experience these new processes, begin to feel supported and treated with respect as partners in the system,

begin to see results and to build inservice growth upon those results, it is anticipated that unfavorable attitudes toward the evaluation process will be greatly reduced.

- d. The plan must encourage the development of reliable evaluation criteria.

The plan begins with experimentally validated research criteria from the Manatt system and converts this foundation into a "home-grown" version based on the four distinct evaluation approaches of peer visitation, student, department chair, and supervisory evaluation. From systematic observations, feedback, inservice, and improved communication, the plan will provide appropriate conditions for development of reliable criteria that will build renewed confidence in both teachers and evaluators.

- e. The plan should create a tension that causes participants to seek fulfillment.

The plan will create peer pressure to become involved through cross-visitiation, departmental attendance at inservice opportunities, and shared development of the local criteria. Evaluation by students, the front-line and primary clients of the professional teacher, will also give timely and direct feedback to the teachers in a setting where responsiveness will receive immediate support.

Recommendations

From the experience of this field project, three recommendations emerged for a professional educator attempting to replace the system for evaluation of a high school faculty in such a way that the change has an improved chance of being lasting and meaningful.

First, the educator must build for the intended change a rationale and a plan that include the personnel and systems affected as well as the pool of research that has been accomplished in the area. Once a change has been built in this way, it can be monitored in accordance with its foundations and limits. Aspects of the rationale can be updated through further research, and adjustments can also be made as elements of the plan are experienced in practice. In addition, the rationale and plan establish visible common ground for communication among teachers and supervisors about teaching, and set parameters that can be recognized and adjusted by the participants with mutual respect and agreement, a situation approaching Walberg's 1979 dream.

Second, the search for materials such as the SUMA faculty evaluation by students is well worth the effort and expense in providing both teachers and supervisors a well-honed piece of professional equipment for doing their jobs with increased confidence. The SUMA materials have been built upon sound educational research criteria and tested for validity and reliability over five years of experience in nationwide testing. Confidence in the value of such educational research has increased over the past twenty years, and important change proposals that ignore the information available in the field

could, as Manatt indicates, be construed as the equivalent of professional malpractice.

A final recommendation concerns the survey results which indicate at their top end the importance of the principal's involvement in the evaluation system and at their low end the caution not to be discouraged by initial disappointment in the effects of the peer supervision component of the plan. The peer activity clearly needs to be reviewed and re-introduced and guided in practice so that it more closely approximates the results it has the potential of achieving. It became clear from teacher comments in the survey that different elements of the evaluation plan impacted individual teachers differently. There would appear, then, to be inherent strength and value in the diversity of the evaluation approaches built into the plan, and it should be expected that teachers and supervisors will continue efforts to find the evaluation components that best suit each teacher in the attempt to accomplish the agreed-upon objectives of the plan.

Bibliography

- Bickel, William E. and Nancy J. Artz. (1984) Improving Instruction through Focused Team Supervision. Educational Leadership, April, p. 22-24.
- Bliss, Traci, et al. (1986) School/University Partnerships: Teacher Education and Secondary School Reform at Brown University. Teacher Education Quarterly, 13:2, Spring, p. 50-58.
- Brandt, Ronald S. (1987) On Teacher Evaluation: A Conversation with Tom McGreal. Educational Leadership, April, p. 20-24.
- Brandt, Ronald S. (1987) On Teachers Coaching Teachers: A Conversation with Bruce Joyce. Educational Leadership, February, p. 12-16.
- Brandt, Ronald S. (1986) On the Expert Teacher: A Conversation with David Berliner. Educational Leadership, October, p. 4-9.
- Clark, D. L. (1981) In Consideration of Goal-Free Planning: The Failure of Traditional Planning Systems in Education. Educational Administration Quarterly, Summer, p. 42-60.
- Cook, Gillian E. (1984) Clinical Supervision in My School? Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators. New Orleans, 26 pp.
- Cooley, W. W. and William E. Bickel (1986) Decision-Oriented Educational Research. Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff Publ., pp. 8, 190.
- Crews, Carole (1981) Rush to Judgment--No Time for Teacher Evaluation? Make Time. NASSP Bulletin, February, p. 12-16.
- Fisher, Charles W. and David C. Berliner (1985) Perspectives on Instructional Time. New York: Longman.
- Fitpatrick, Kathleen and W. W. Charter, Jr. (1986) A Study of Staff Development Practices and Organizational Conditions Related to Instructional Improvement in Secondary Schools. Final Report. Center for Educational Policy and Management. March, 121 pp.
- Georgia State University (1983) An Analysis of Skills Update of Teachers in High Technology Programs in Georgia. Atlanta Department of Vocational and Career Development. 69 pp.
- Halpin, Andrew W., Editor (1958) Administrative Theory in Education. New York: Macmillan.
- Hamilton, James B. and Michael E. Wonacott (1984) Updating Teachers for Tomorrow's Technology: A Strategy for Action. Research and Development Series No 242. National Center for Research in Vocational Education. Columbia: Ohio State University. 76 pp.

- Harris, Douglas E. and Keith A. Pillsbury (1987) Shared Governance of Staff Evaluation. Educational Leadership, April, p. 63.
- Hosford, Philip L., Editor (1984) Using What We Know about Teaching. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Hunter, Madeline C. (1976) Prescription for Improved Instruction. El Segundo, CA: TIP Publications.
- Jessel, Linda and Teresa Brandon (1984) Beaverton High School Staff Development Project: A Five-Year Study. Beaverton School District 48, Oregon.
- Joyce, Bruce and Marsha Weil (1980) Models of Teaching. Second Edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Knox, William G. et al. (1977) Power or Pawn: Leadership and the Department Head. A resource Booklet, Ontario Teachers' Federation.
- Manatt, Richard P. Lessons from a Comprehensive Performance Appraisal Project. Educational Leadership, April, 1987, p. 8-14.
- Manatt, Richard P. and Shirley B. Stow (1985) Clinical Manual for Teacher Performance Evaluation. Ames: Iowa State University Research Foundation.
- Martin, David S. (1983) Can Teachers become Better Thinkers? Paper Presented at the Annual Conference of the National Staff Development Council. Tulsa, Oklahoma.
- McGreal, Thomas L. (1983) Successful Teacher Evaluation. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Mohan, Madan and Ronald E. Hull (1975) Teaching Effectiveness: Its Meaning, Assessment, and Improvement. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.
- Mosston, M. and S. Ashworth (1985) Toward a Unified Theory of Teaching. Educational Leadership, May, P. 31-34.
- Omaha Public Schools. Series of Inservice Program Outlines Provided by Dr. Margaret Fitch.
- Page, B. (1958) Teacher Comments and Student Performance: A Seventy-four Classroom Experiment in School Motivation. Journal of Educational Psychology, p. 173-81.

- Schambier, Robert F. (1983) Staff Development: The Carrot or the Stick? Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for Adult and Continuing Education, Philadelphia, PA. November.
- Sergiovanni, Thomas J. and Robert J. Starratt (1979) Supervision: Human Perspectives. Second Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Skoglund, Frederic A. (1983) An Approach to Instructional Management. Arizona.
- Stallings, Jane A. (1983) An Accountability Model for Teacher Education. Essential Knowledge for Beginning Educators, David C. Smith, Ed. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, p. 133-39.
- Stallings, Jane A. (1985) How Effective Is an Analytic Approach to Staff Development on Teacher and Student Behavior? Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers.
- Stallings, Jane A. (1977) Learning to Look: A Handbook on Classroom Observation and Teaching Methods. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.
- Suprina, Richard N. (1978) Supervision Do's and Don'ts. NASSP Bulletin, December, p. 51-54.
- Sweeney, J. and R. Manatt. (1984) Supervising the Marginal Teacher. Educational Leadership, April, p. 25-27.
- Townsend, David (1984) Teacher Evaluation in Secondary Schools: The First Year of Implementation of a Policy of Teacher Supervision and Evaluation in the Five Secondary Schools of Lethbridge School District No. 51. Summary Report, Planning Services Branch, Alberta, Edmonton Department of Education.
- Valentine, Jerry (1978) The Supervisory Process--A Practical Look. NASSP Bulletin, December, p. 55-59.
- Walberg, Herbert J. (1979) Educational Environments and Effects: Evaluation, Policy, and Productivity. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Walberg, Herbert J., Ed. (1974) Evaluating Educational Performance. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Walberg, Herbert J., Ed. (1982) Improving Educational Standards and Productivity: The Research Basis for Policy. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

- Walberg, Herbert J. and James W. Keefe, Ed. (1986) Rethinking Reform: The Principal's Dilemma. A Special Report of the NASSP Curriculum Council.
- Wallace, Richard et al. (1984) Secondary Education Renewal in Pittsburgh. Educational Leadership. March, p. 73-77.
- Westerberg, Tim (1983) Mastery Learning for Teachers: A Competency-Based Program for Improving Instruction. NASSP Bulletin. March, p. 22-25.
- Wichowski, Chester and Thomas Walker (1982) Research Questions in Trade and Industrial Education. Presented at the American Vocational Association Convention, St. Louis, December.
- Wildman, Terry M. and Jerry A. Niles (1987) Essentials of Professional Growth. Educational Leadership. February, p. 4-10.
- Wilson, Alfred P. and Vivian E. Smith (1974) The Public School Principal's Function in Evaluation as Defined by an Analysis of Periodicals and Books. Center for Extended Services. Manhattan: Kansas State University.
- Witt, J.C. (1986) Teachers' Resistance to the Use of School-Based Interventions. Journal of School Psychology. Spring, p. 37-44.
- Wuhs, Susan K. and Richard Manatt (1983) The Pace of Mandated Teacher Evaluation Picks Up. The American School Board Journal. May, p. 28.
- Zumwalt, Karen K., Ed. (1986) Improving Teaching. Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Alexandria, VA.

Appendixes

- A. SUMA Sample Form for Evaluation of Teachers by Students
- B. SUMA Sample Form for Reporting Feedback to Teachers
- C. Outline of Teacher Evaluation Program to Replace Previous Program
- D. Teacher Survey to Monitor Early Progress of the Replacement Evaluation Plan
- E. Details of Responses by Teachers to the Evaluation Plan Survey

INSTRUCTIONAL SURVEY



Darken only one response circle for each item. If you feel the statement is **not applicable**, or you are not able to give a knowledgeable response, simply leave the item **blank** and proceed to the next. Please answer carefully and thoughtfully.

Indicate as accurately as possible your opinion of the instructor's performance in this class by responding to Items 1-22 on a scale from five to one where five means "Strongly Agree" and one means "Strongly Disagree." Your opinions are to be anonymous and you should feel free to answer honestly.

DIRECTIONS FOR MARKING FORM

- USE A #2 PENCIL ONLY.
- DO NOT USE INK OR BALLPOINT PEN.
- ERASE ANY ERRORS COMPLETELY.
- DO NOT MAKE ANY STRAY MARKS ON THIS FORM.

ACCEPTABLE MARKS



UNACCEPTABLE MARKS



1. The instructor speaks clearly.

Strongly Agree (5) — (4) — (3) — (2) — (1) Strongly Disagree

2. The assignments contribute to my understanding of the subject.

Strongly Agree (5) — (4) — (3) — (2) — (1) Strongly Disagree

3. The requirements of the course (projects, papers, exams, etc.) were explained adequately.

Strongly Agree (5) — (4) — (3) — (2) — (1) Strongly Disagree

4. The instructor's presentation often causes me to think in depth about this subject.

Strongly Agree (5) — (4) — (3) — (2) — (1) Strongly Disagree

5. The instructor treats my ideas and opinions with respect.

Strongly Agree (5) — (4) — (3) — (2) — (1) Strongly Disagree

6. The methods being used for evaluating my work (such as tests, projects, etc.) are reasonable.

Strongly Agree (5) — (4) — (3) — (2) — (1) Strongly Disagree

7. The instructor provides adequate opportunity for me to ask questions.

Strongly Agree (5) — (4) — (3) — (2) — (1) Strongly Disagree

8. The instructor is teaching the course material or skills clearly.

Strongly Agree (5) — (4) — (3) — (2) — (1) Strongly Disagree

9. The instructor seems to be well prepared.

Strongly Agree (5) — (4) — (3) — (2) — (1) Strongly Disagree

10. The instructor seems to care about my learning.

Strongly Agree (5) — (4) — (3) — (2) — (1) Strongly Disagree

11. Class time is well spent.

Strongly Agree (5) — (4) — (3) — (2) — (1) Strongly Disagree

12. Examinations cover materials or skills emphasized in the course.

Strongly Agree (5) — (4) — (3) — (2) — (1) Strongly Disagree

13. I look forward to attending this class.

Strongly Agree (5) — (4) — (3) — (2) — (1) Strongly Disagree

14. The instructor encourages me to participate in this class.

Strongly Agree (5) — (4) — (3) — (2) — (1) Strongly Disagree

15. The time allowed to complete exams is adequate.

Strongly Agree (5) — (4) — (3) — (2) — (1) Strongly Disagree

16. The instructor shows interest in and enthusiasm for the course subject.

Strongly Agree (5) — (4) — (3) — (2) — (1) Strongly Disagree

17. The instructor is fair and impartial to all students.

Strongly Agree (5) — (4) — (3) — (2) — (1) Strongly Disagree

18. In this course, I am learning much.

Strongly Agree (5) — (4) — (3) — (2) — (1) Strongly Disagree

19. The out-of-class assignments are challenging.

Strongly Agree (5) — (4) — (3) — (2) — (1) Strongly Disagree

20. The instructor keeps enough order in the classroom.

Strongly Agree (5) — (4) — (3) — (2) — (1) Strongly Disagree

21. Examination questions are phrased clearly.

Strongly Agree (5) — (4) — (3) — (2) — (1) Strongly Disagree

22. Overall, I rate this instructor a good teacher.

Strongly Agree (5) — (4) — (3) — (2) — (1) Strongly Disagree

STUDENT RESPONSES	TOTAL RESPONSES					STRONGLY DISAGREE					UNIT MEAN	COMPREHENSIVE MEAN		
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5				
23. The instructor is patient and understanding.														
24. The instructor relates underlying theory to practice.														
25. The instructor is considerate and courteous.														
26. The instructor provides useful feedback on my progress (identifying strengths and weaknesses).														
27. The textbooks contribute to my understanding of the subject.														
28. The laboratory experiences meet my learning needs for this course.														
29. The instructor explains or demonstrates laboratory techniques clearly.														
30. Pre-laboratory assignments (assigned readings and exercises) contribute to my understanding of laboratory experiments.														
31. The laboratory contributes to my understanding of the subject.														
32. The laboratory manual adequately explains the procedures to be followed in the laboratory.														
33. Equipment and materials needed to perform the laboratory experiments are organized and readily available for use during the laboratory.														
34. The teaching method used most often in this course is														
	Total Responses	Lecture	Discussion	Demonstration	Combination of these	Other								
40.							5	4	3	2	1			
41.							5	4	3	2	1			
42.							5	4	3	2	1			
43.		Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Less than Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory		5	4	3	2	1			
44.		36. My class is						5	4	3	2	1		
45.		Total Responses	9	10	11	12	5	4	3	2	1			
46.		37. My overall high school grade average to date is						5	4	3	2	1		
47.		Total Responses	A	B	C	D	5	4	3	2	1			
48.		38. The grade I presently have in this class is						5	4	3	2	1		
49.		Total Responses	A	B	C	D	5	4	3	2	1			
50.		39. If I needed help outside of class, the instructor has given help to me.						5	4	3	2	1		
			Yes	No	Have not needed help.		5	4	3	2	1			

APPENDIX B

FORMATIVE EVALUATION

PURPOSE: TO IMPROVE THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROCESS

CONSTRAINTS: TIME & USELESS PAPERWORK

PROCESS: * MULTIFACET (TRIANGULATION OF DATA)
 * EMPHASIS ON EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES
 * FLEXIBLE
 * INFORMAL----->FORMAL
 * AFFIRMATIVE DIRECTION

- I. ACADEMIC ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL OBSERVATIONS/VISITATIONS/REVIEW
 - A. Immediate written feedback after 30 minute observation
 - B. Copy of written feedback on file
 - C. Opportunity for more indepth feedback (meeting)
 - D. Visitation/Reviews -- 2 times a semester
- II. DEPARTMENT HEAD OBSERVATIONS/VISITATIONS/REVIEW
 - A. Visitation/Review -- 1 a year/1 a semester
 - B. Written feedback -- copy to Assistant Principal
 - C. Opportunity for more indepth feedback (meeting)
- III. PEER VISITATION/REVIEW
 - A. Visitation/Review
 1. Select a faculty member to visit your class
 2. Each faculty member makes only one visit
 3. One peer visit/review per semester
 4. Process similar to Assistant Principal Review
 - a. Style--Environment--Delivery--Organization
 - b. Questioning skills--Wait Time--Reinforcement
 - c. Suggestions--Tips--"This idea works for me"
 - B. Written feedback--copy to Assistant Principal
 - C. Opportunity to exchange ideas
- IV. INSERVICE OBSERVATION
 - A. Observe a teacher--go watch a pro
 - B. Feedback optional
- V. EVALUATION/FEEDBACK OF FORMATIVE EVALUATION PROCESS
 - A. Feedback to Department Heads in December/May
 - B. Special concerns, suggestions, comments to A.P.

APPENDIX D
TEACHER SURVEY OF 1988 SUPERVISION AND EVALUATION

The intent of our supervision and evaluation system was to develop and foster the following:

- 1) Improvement of instruction
- 2) Provide feedback and encourage professional development
- 3) Help open lines of communication between teachers and administration, and teachers and fellow teachers.

I. PLEASE RATE THE EVALUATION SYSTEM IN ACCORDANCE TO THE ABOVE MENTIONED OBJECTIVES.

RATING SCALE: strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

The supervision and evaluation system aided me in:

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Improving the level of instruction in my classroom | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. Providing feedback | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 3. Encouraging me to develop professionally | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 4. Opening the lines of communication between the administration and myself | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 5. Opening the lines of communication between other teachers and myself | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

II. PLEASE RATE THE FOLLOWING SUPERVISION/EVALUATION FORMATS

RATING SCALE: Very helpful 5 4 3 2 1 Not helpful
(0 = did not experience)

- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. PEER SUPERVISION | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 2. DEPARTMENT CHAIR VISIT | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 3. ADMINISTRATIVE VISIT #1 by AP
(general 30 min observation/overview) | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 4. ADMINISTRATIVE VISIT #2 by AP
(focus on student behavior) | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 5. ADMINISTRATIVE VISIT #3 by AP
(10 minutes/start of class) | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |

COMMENTS: (Recommendations- areas of improvement, what would you like to see next year, etc.)

APPENDIX E

Teacher Responses on Evaluation Plan Survey

Rating the Evaluation System in Accordance with Stated Objectives

The supervision and evaluation system aided me in:	Number of Responses by columns on Scale					
	5	4	3	2	1	0
1. Improving the level of instruction in my classroom	3	13	15	4	5	1
2. Providing feedback	20	15	4	2	0	
3. Encouraging me to develop professionally....	6	20	5	7	3	
4. Opening the lines of communication between the administration and myself	13	13	6	6	3	
5. Opening the lines of communication between other teachers and myself	4	13	10	12	2	

Rating the Supervision/Evaluation Formats Very Helpful to Not Helpful

1. Peer supervision.....	3	10	9	6	9	
2. Department chair visit	3	10	11	5	1	11
3. Administrative visit #1 (general 30-minute)	8	18	11	1	3	
4. Administrative visit #2 (student behaviors)	8	14	8	4	5	1
5. Administrative visit #3 (10-minute starts)	7	15	6	5	7	1
Should we continue the evaluation program?	YES	31	NO	8	NA	2

Comments

Focus always on competence with material and student-teacher interrelationship in class

All teachers can profit from supervision, but not all need the same amount.

Include such other items as effective prefecting, keeping class attentive during announcements, etc.

It encourages us to keep on working hard to do our best. I think this is a very good approach.

To want it, a person has to be a little bit of a masochist, but....

Do they have to be so frequent?

(continued next page)

Maybe a bit overdone--not necessary so often. Focus on newer or older teachers with special problem areas.

Concentrate on teachers who need it.

Forget peer visits and anything else that takes teacher time.

Peer visiting extended or encouraged. This route ultimately the most helpful, I think.

Have someone qualified in my subject come in from outside if we really need to do this.

I think it is good as well as professional to be evaluated as well as to take the time to evaluate others. I appreciate the open and positive spirit out of which this all was done--not to "nail" someone on faulty techniques but to help assist and inform.

More emphasis on peer cooperation/feedback.

I like the thoroughness of your procedure and have appreciated the promptness and specificity of your feedback.

Some don't like it, some don't care; but for me it was a great help.

For myself, I would like to take the time to observe a "master" teacher several times here or elsewhere.

It's a hoop to be gone through, probably a necessary one. It doesn't bother me, but it takes a lot of an administrator's time.

You put in a great amount of work and effort, hence my low ratings are an indication of my feelings on evaluation by department head, principal, assistant principal, etc., not a reflection on you or your efforts. Having been on both sides as department head and teacher, I've never been satisfied with the results--I feel the only true results that can be used are from graduates who have found out if their teachers and courses did prepare them for college. No one can tell that in a limited time frame.