INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a manuscript sent to us for publication and microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted. Pages in any manuscript may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. Manuscripts may not always be complete. When it is not possible to obtain missing pages, a note appears to indicate this.

2. When copyrighted materials are removed from the manuscript, a note appears to indicate this.

3. Oversize materials (maps, drawings, and charts) are photographed by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each oversize page is also filmed as one exposure and is available, for an additional charge, as a standard 35mm slide or in black and white paper format.*

4. Most photographs reproduce acceptably on positive microfilm or microfiche but lack clarity on xerographic copies made from the microfilm. For an additional charge, all photographs are available in black and white standard 35mm slide format.*

***For more information about black and white slides or enlarged paper reproductions, please contact the Dissertations Customer Services Department.**

U·M·I Dissertation Information Service

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

Ongwela, Grace Hully

A STUDY OF CURRENT TEACHER EVALUATION PRACTICES AND PERCEPTIONS HELD TOWARD THOSE PRACTICES BY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN THE MICHIGAN CONFERENCE OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS

Michigan State University PH.D. 1986

PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy. Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark __✓__.

1. Glossy photographs or pages _____
2. Colored illustrations, paper or print _____
3. Photographs with dark background _____
4. Illustrations are poor copy _____
5. Pages with black marks, not original copy _____
6. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page _____
7. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages __✓__
8. Print exceeds margin requirements _____
9. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine _____
10. Computer printout pages with indistinct print _____
11. Page(s) _____ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author.
12. Page(s) _____ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows.
13. Two pages numbered _____. Text follows.
14. Curling and wrinkled pages _____
15. Dissertation contains pages with print at a slant, filmed as received _____
16. Other _____

_____

_____

University
Microfilms
International

A STUDY OF CURRENT TEACHER EVALUATION PRACTICES AND PERCEPTIONS HELD TOWARD THOSE PRACTICES BY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN THE MICHIGAN CONFERENCE OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS

By

Grace Hully Ongwela

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Teacher Education

1986

ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF CURRENT TEACHER EVALUATION PRACTICES AND PERCEPTIONS HELD TOWARD THESE PRACTICES BY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN THE MICHIGAN CONFERENCE OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS

By

Grace Hully Ongwela

The purpose of this study was two-fold: first, to investigate the current teacher evaluation practices and the perceptions held toward those practices by elementary school principals in the Michigan Conference of Seventh-day Adventists; and second, to design a proposed evaluation system for the Conference.

The research questions for this study were grouped into two categories: (a) how the Adventist schools in the Michigan Conference currently evaluate their elementary teachers, and (b) process for designing an educational practice--teacher evaluation.

The population of this study consisted of all fifty-five elementary school principals in the Michigan Conference. The survey instrument used in the study was adapted from the one used by Hauge (1981). The instrument

was designed to reflect the teacher evaluation practices as perceived by elementary school principals. The survey instrument and the cover letter were sent to the principals by first class mail.

Data analysis was done by a tabular arrangement of the items and giving account of the number of observations for each item. The account given was based on the number of responses for each item computed into percent.

A summary of significant findings dealing with how Adventist schools currently evaluate teachers was presented according to the four research questions and general areas investigated in this study: purpose of teacher evaluation, current evaluation practices, Adventist elementary school principal's perception toward current teacher evaluation practices, and differences in teacher evaluation practices between the Michigan Conference elementary schools and those found in research.

To answer part B of the study, "Does the formal design process used here result in the incorporation of research findings into educational practice?" required obtaining further data on the Conference schools and delineation of the design process. This design was organized according to context and knowledge base and included: (1) rationale and purpose of teacher evaluation; (2) procedures and elements of teacher evaluation; (3) follow-up and staff development,

(4) assumptions underlying the proposed design, and (5) a proposed plan for evaluating the design.

The contextual base of the proposed design was formed by the information obtained from the Conference Office of Education on current teacher evaluation practices and also the data collected from the elementary principals then analyzed. The research synthesis conducted formed the knowledge base for the proposed design.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my family

Husband Gado A.

Son James Aggrey

and

Daughter Janice Hilly

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The completion of this study was made possible only through the direct or indirect guidance, assistance, and support of many people.

My sincere thanks to my dissertation director, Dr. Robert, Hatfield, for his patience and expertise and for advising me to go this way with this project. My Committee chair, Dr. Bruce Cheney, who by his patience and directive skills was an unfailing source of encouragement and guidance throughout the entire doctoral program. To Dr. Lawrence Lezotte for his helpfulness and willingness to serve in my doctoral committee.

I wish to thank the principals in the Michigan Conference elementary schools who gave their valuable time to provide information for this study without which the study would have not been a reality.

My gratitude goes to my family, husband and children, for their love, patience, prayers, and understanding during my studies, and for undergoing so much to see me through.

Above all, I give thanks to my Heavenly Father for His care, love and protection during the whole process. To Him be honor, glory, and dominion forever.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The Seventh-day Adventist church operates the largest, world-wide Christian education system ranging from preschool through university level. According to the office of the Archives Statistics of the Seventh-day Adventists (1985, p. 24), this world-wide system operates 4,334 elementary schools. Of these, the 1985 record of the Michigan Conference Office of Education indicates that 55 schools are located within its territory in Michigan.

The Seventh-day Adventist church recognizes that quality education is a must if its youths are to receive the training that makes them effective workers in both the church and secular sectors. It is also recognized that education is a complex task in which the teacher plays a significant role. The Adventists view of the teacher as the key person in the education of children is supported by Buchmann (1983) in the statement that "the activities of teaching are predicated upon the belief that a change for the better can be affected in some way through what a teacher does" (p. 7). Hence, each teacher in the Adventist system of education is considered to be an educational

resource person who should be accorded every opportunity to grow professionally. With this view of the teacher's role in the educational process of children, the Michigan Conference Office of Education charges each local educational administrator, the principal, to provide leadership that will enable each teacher to grow professionally so as to improve instruction in the classroom. One of the ways by which the principal can help a teacher improve instruction is to observe him/her in the classroom and then provide constructive feedback. On this, Hauge (1981) stated:

> The observation of the classroom instruction is a component of the process to instructional improvement. The evaluation of teaching requires certain skills, knowledge and abilities on the part of the administrator. (p. 30)

As evidenced in the above statement, the principal needs to be aware of the new developments that affect teacher evaluation as a process of improving instruction. He/she needs to maintain skills, knowledge, and abilities to a level that will be helpful in keeping abreast with current trends in teacher evaluation. With an awareness of current changes in the teacher evaluation process, the principal can adjust himself/herself to meet the needs of teachers in the school. To assist principals in their task of evaluating teachers, and inquiry into how they perceive current trends in the process can serve as a means of feedback on their performance. Such an inquiry, according to the Michigan

Conference Office of Education, has not been done on its elementary school principals. This researcher, therefore, has undertaken the task by adapting an instrument "designed to reflect the current teacher evaluation practices as perceived by elementary school principals" (Hauge, 1981, p. 58).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is two-fold: one, to investigate the current practices of teacher evaluation and the perception held toward these practices by elementary school principals in the Michigan Conference of Seventh-day Adventists; and two, to design a proposed evaluation system for the Michigan Conference Office of Education based on the contexts within which the schools operate and the research base for teacher evaluation. This process will also provide an opportunity to assess the effectiveness of a formally stated design process.

Background of the Study

In order for teachers to benefit from their evaluation, the process must be up-to-date with the changes that affect classroom instruction and education at large. This can be done if the evaluators, the principal and others, utilize current research findings from teacher evaluation. This notion is also supported by Peterson and Ward (1980):

> Those who design and use teacher evaluation systems should inform themselves about the research evidence already available and should resolve to keep abreast of on-going and future research . . . . It should be understood that teacher evaluation is an extremely complex procedure and that carrying out this task in a professionally responsible and legally defensible manner requires great resources in professional expertise and time. (p. 13)

Unfortunately, evaluators have not used research findings as they should to improve or update teacher evaluation systems (Hatfield, 1985; Eisner, 1984; Tikunoff and Ward, 1983; and Borg, 1973). Borg (1973) gave two reasons why administrators have not been able to apply research results in teacher evaluation as follows:

> First, research findings are rarely written in a way that permits their direct application to practical school problems. Second, promising approaches that are manipulated in research projects are usually developed only to the point necessary to provide an independent variable in the research design. (p.7)

In order to enable administrators to apply research findings in teacher evaluation, Hatfield (1985) suggested that "a new process for the design and development of educational practice as a means for the utilization of research for practice is needed to bring about the most effective educational improvement" (p. 3). Thus, the

principal and others involved in teacher evaluation and education at large need to learn how to design and develop educational programs which would assist in the improvement of instruction. Based on research findings, procedures and skills need to be developed that would effect current changes and practices in teacher evaluation as it affects classroom instruction. In other words, principals and other educators need a "systematic process of creating new alternatives that contribute to the improvement of educational practice" (Hemphill, 1973, p. 3).

Teacher Evaluation: What is It?

Teacher evaluation, if not understood, can be characterized by an artificial and routine quality which makes it a process that becomes an end in itself. That is to say, evaluation may be used mainly as a disguised weapon for slashing budgets, for getting rid of militant or non-conformist teachers, or only for making decisions about permanent certification or dismissal with just cause. As genuine as these reasons may be, they should not constitute the major purpose for evaluating teachers. It is easy to emphasize subsidiary reasons for evaluating teachers if there is no proper understanding of the process. Different authors have attempted various approaches to define teacher evaluation. Redfern (1973) stated:

> Evaluation is a means to an end. It is a tool to help the teacher to become more competent in the performance

> of his duties and responsibilities. These duties and responsibilities must continually be evaluated in relationship to the primary task of the school--that of improving learning opportunities for boys and girls. (p. 15)

Any attempt to define or to clarify the meaning of teacher evaluation should not be taken for granted. The evaluators, more than ever before, need to understand and to broaden their views about teacher evaluation. Rose and Nyre (1977) have this to say:

> The attempt to clarify the meaning of evaluation is not an idle exercise. Quite the contrary. It is of a major importance since no one is agreed upon a definition and the different definitions people accept carry with them different advantages and disadvantages, each affecting the way in which evaluators approach and carry their tasks. (p. 7)

It is possible that due to lack of a consensus as to what teacher evaluation is exactly may be the result of many problems that the process faces. When evaluators have different definitions of or views about teacher evaluation, they are bound to differ in their approaches to the task. With this kind of variation in teacher evaluation procedures, teachers tend to think, in general, that the evaluators' interest, not theirs, is served in the process. For the reasons given above, this study attempts to clarify the meaning of teacher evaluation in the context of the

general principles presently applied in the process. In this study, there is no claim made for a conclusive definition. It is hoped that the ideas presented can be of use and have direct application to evaluators. In harmony with the purpose of this study, the definition given by the Belmont school district (Peterson, 1982) is:

> Evaluation is the process of making considered judgements concerning the professional accomplishments and competencies of all certified employees, based on broad knowledge of the areas of performance involved, the characteristics of the situation of the individuals being evaluated and the specific standards of performance pre-established for their positions. (p. 8)

Evaluation should promote awareness of the strengths and weaknesses of all certified personnel, provide opportunity for growth and improvement, and encourage beneficial change in employees. Teacher evaluation is much broader than any single assessment technique or instrument. It is a necessary and meaningful function in maintaining a viable profession. Evaluation of teachers in a school district should be a part of the total educational process directed towards instructional improvement that enhances the learning of children. It should be constructive, fair and equitable. In order for the process to be successful, there should be an on-going communication between the evaluator and the evaluatee.

Evaluation, therefore, should be viewed as "part of the process of making decisions and planning for action" (Hawley, 1976, p. 16). Thus, teacher evaluation "can be and ought to be viewed as an intrinsic element in both teaching and learning" (Sergiovanni, 1975, p. 275). Through evaluation, teachers should know their strengths and weaknesses in classroom instruction. They should be directed to the resources that can assist in improving instruction. Teacher evaluation should be the means by which teachers can be more aware of how students perform in the learning tasks. In teacher evaluation, it should be remembered that although the assessment of a teacher as a person and his/her teaching are inseparable, the "process is pointless unless the starting point is the performance of the teacher" (Redfern, 1972, p. 7). To this, Bolton (1973) adds:

> Teacher evaluation has to do with judgments about the "goodness" of teacher behavior and/or the results of that behavior in the light of agreed objectives . . . . Therefore, good evaluation is preceded by (a) determination of what is important, (b) measurement, (c) analysis,. and (d) interpretation. Judgments made prior to these activities are likely to be unsound. (p. 24)

As can be seen teacher evaluation is a process that involves certain stages before a conclusion is reached. Any conclusion reached should be in relation to the objectives set, not on the personal worth of a teacher as seen by the

evaluator. Formal teacher evaluation should be analytical rather than comparative. It should not be an issue of whether a teacher does better or worse than the other teachers. The whole process should evolve around the idea of helping an individual teacher to grow professionally and to improve classroom instruction. In other words, the emphasis of teacher evaluation should be on assisting an individual teacher to improve his/her contribution to the learning of children rather than taking punitive or controlling actions making unnecessary comparisons, or using self-motivated techniques.

In general, teacher evaluation involves much more than merely rating a teacher according to a student's test results or comparing his/her performance with other teachers. It is a process that should provide a continuous and a responsible basis for decision-making by the teacher and also school administrators. As a reminder to evaluators, Hawley (1976) stated:

> Evaluation is based on values, attitudes, and beliefs of individual human beings and groups of human beings. There is no universal standard, no ultimate or final authority. Every element of the curriculum, every instructional technique, every organizational procedure is based upon values. Many of these values remain unexamined--taken for granted and one of the principle problems encountered in evaluation is that individuals involved often think that they have a common

> understanding and agreement concerning the value basis for their work when, in fact, there is none. (p. 15)

It can, therefore, be stated here that the general trend in teacher evaluation is that evaluators often proceed from the context of an accepted value system. They view teacher behavior in the light of a set of attitudes and opinions reflecting the sorts of behavior approved or disapproved by individuals or groups. By the use of words like "good" or "superior" value concepts are introduced in teacher evaluation. It is often found that these value concepts grow out of preferences, beliefs, opinions, and attitudes held by individuals or groups. This places responsibility on people or groups undertaking teacher evaluation to define their value system. While an effort is made towards forming a value system for a group, it might be worth bearing in mind what Smith (1976) said:

> It seems likely, however, that no wholesale evaluation of a teacher is possible. Teaching is far too complex and too involved in various types of affective and cognitive learning and reactions to permit a general evaluation of a teacher. This means that the evaluation of a teacher's work must always be specific. (p. 85)

Need for Evaluation

Evaluation of teachers continues, in the 1980s, to be a growing concern in education. Both the public and parochial school systems are pressured from all sides to evaluate

teachers. Hence, the need for evaluation of teachers is not limited to Adventist schools only. Sergiovanni and Starrat (1983) observe that "from the federal and state governments down to local taxpayer groups, one finds an increasing demand for evaluation" (p. 285). Noonan (1981) also observed:

> All aspects of the school organization have been under closer scrutiny due perhaps to the declining enrollment, inadequate financing, student achievement reports, and lowered public confidence. The emphasis on accountability leads inevitably to a closer look at what kind of personnel schools have and what manner of monitoring job performance is being used. (p. 1)

As can be seen, the public confidence in education has been lowered by what takes place in schools. This then leads to questioning teachers performance in the classroom and what the administrators are doing to help teachers improve classroom instruction. The school administrators and boards of education are, therefore, pressured to evaluate teachers. On this issue Hauge (1981) elaborated:

> The increased demand by the American public for quality education and recent development in public education are requiring school administrators and boards of education to review their procedures for evaluating teachers. The increased membership and power of teacher organizations, teacher surplus, teacher "burnout," the demand for accountability, advanced classroom

technologies and the increased need to promote staff morale are all reasons to study the current teacher evaluation practices and perceived attitudes of those practices by elementary school principals. (p. 1)

The increased demand from different groups in society to evaluate teacher performance in the classroom is a clear indication that society expects schools, both public and parochial, to give direction to and to provide better education for children. Beginning in the 1970s, the public has been increasingly concerned about the quality of its tax-supported educational system (Popham, 1972; Noonan, 1981; Sergiovanni and Starrat, 1983). Since teachers are major agents of education, the evaluation of their performance is considered to be one of the means by which classroom instruction can be improved.

Professional Development

The evaluation process should be an integral part of the professional development program. This view is held by Doyle (1983) when he stated, "evaluation for diagnosis and improvement not only of the person as a teacher, but also of the teacher as a person; that is, evaluation can assist in personal as well as professional growth" (p. 13). The school, as an organization composed of students and teachers, should be a growing organism, a learning community, and an open living system in which staff

development programs lead to the improvement of education for children and youth (Klopf, 1979).

The professional development programs which incorporate teacher evaluation principles should assist teachers to exert leadership by: stating their problems, devising ways of seeking solutions, participating in decision-making and accepting responsibility for the outcome. In summary, McNergney and Carrier (1981) stated:

> The goal of teacher development is to support the growth of classroom teachers in their performance in various tasks. The more tasks teachers can accomplish, the better persons and professionals they are likely to become. (p. 22)

The person who can plan professional development programs for teachers and also create an atmosphere in which the programs can be functional is the principal. A preliminary review of literature showed that the principal generally assumed the primary responsibility for evaluating teachers and planning programs that would enable them to grow professionally (Noonan, 1981; Hauge, 1981; Kowalski, 1978; Wiles and Lovell, 1975; and Redfern, 1972). The principal, more than any other person, is in a position to be the main source of reinforcement and encouragement to his/her teachers. He/she should be the one to institute and activate an instructional development system that would enrich the experiences of teachers. The principal together with the teachers should do a careful study of the existing

situation to determine the best strategies that can effect the needed change. In this cooperative endeavor, the principal should remember that "teachers need information about themselves and the availability of developmental resources, and they need self-motivation, commitment and opportunity" (Wilson, 1981, p. 1). The principal, therefore, needs to keep abreast with current teacher evaluation practices and also be able to use research findings in his/her task of teacher evaluation.

Research Questions

Although the principal and the evaluation of teachers have been the subject for a wide selection of research studies, there is no study that has dealt specifically with teacher evaluation in the Seventh-day Adventist schools in Michigan. The Michigan Conference Office of Education has expressed to this author the need for a study of how the principals in its elementary schools perceive current teacher evaluation practices. The office has authorized this study to be done.

It is hoped that this study will provide information that the Michigan Conference Office of Education could use to improve its teacher evaluation program. Also, it is hoped that the findings and recommendations of this study will be useful to the Conference in enhancing the knowledge and skills of its principals in evaluating teachers.

The research questions for this study are divided into two parts, A and B.

A. How Adventist Schools Currently Evaluate Teachers

The first purpose of this study is to provide information on how Adventist schools currently evaluate their teachers. The questions are:

1. What is the purpose of teacher evaluation in Seventh-day Adventist schools?

2. What are the current teacher evaluation practices being used in the Seventh-day Adventist elementary schools?

3. What is the Adventist elementary school principal's perception toward current teacher evaluation practices?

4. Are there differences in teacher evaluation practices between Seventh-day Adventist schools and current practices found in research?

B. Process for Designing an Educational Practice

This part of the research study seeks to design a teacher evaluation system by utilizing a systematic process for designing an educational practice (teacher evaluation), which could be used by the Michigan Conference.

Scope of the Study

The focus of this study is limited to evaluation practices of classroom teachers by elementary school principals in the Michigan Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. All fifty-five elementary school principals are

included in the study. Since this study examines the perceptions held toward current teacher evaluation practices by elementary principals, it is limited to the interpretation of evaluation as perceived by the respondent.

Overview of the Study

This study is organized into six chapters. Chapter I is an introduction of the study. It includes the statement of the problem, purpose of the study, background of the study, study questions, scope of the study, and outline of the organization of the study.

Chapter II reviews literature related to teacher evaluation and the process for designing a practice. The organization of the study deviates from the typical report because of the design process. For this purpose the review of literature becomes more important and central to the study and constitutes along with Chapter IV, the data base for the design proposed in Chapter V. The literature review focuses on major elements of teacher evaluation, professional development, and the principal's role in teacher evaluation. In addition, a synthesis of the research on practices used in teacher evaluation is given.

Chapter III describes the methodology used in this study. Details are given on the population of the study, the instrument for obtaining data, data collection procedures, and the method used for data analysis.

Chapter IV presents the survey data, the analysis of the data from the survey, and a discussion of the findings.

Chapter V presents a design for the proposed evaluation process that could be used by the Michigan Conference.

Chapter VI contains a summary of the study, conclusions, and recommendations for further study of teacher evaluation and the design of educational practice.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of literature has been developed to provide a background of information which relates to the practices of teacher evaluation in the elementary school. The review is divided into the following sections: (a) purpose of evaluation, (b) evaluation procedures, (c) role of the principal in teacher evaluation, (d) climate and relationships, (e) evaluation processes, and (f) professional development. A second section is included providing a synthesis of the research on teacher evaluation.

Introduction

The school, as an organization, must see itself as a growing organism, a learning community, and an open living system. It should be a place where teachers have the opportunity to grow professionally and the children are able to express their potentials through learning. Teacher evaluation, when properly used, can be an educational aspect of the entire school program that improves teacher performance and student learning. Peterson (1982) indicated:

> Evaluation, along with all other major aspects of the educational system, has as its goal, the improvement of

> learning for all those who take part in educational programs. Evaluation focuses upon the improvement of instruction. It is concerned with the continuous redefining of goals, with the wider realization of the human dynamics for learning and for cooperative effort, and with the nurturing of a creative approach to the problems of teaching. (p. 68)

In order to accomplish what is stated above, teacher evaluation must be an aspect of a comprehensive plan for career development, school improvement and improving total teacher performance. When teacher evaluation is viewed in this way and the plans are made with the learning of children in mind, the process becomes beneficial to teachers. According to McNergney and Carrier (1981, p. 73), the process:

1. Provides indications for teachers' needs and abilities as they are revealed in their work with students.

2. Yields information that helps teachers become more aware of their own behaviors and those of their students.

3. Provides data that enables teachers to compare and contrast their behaviors with those of their students and to decide on what changes in teaching styles might be appropriate.

4. Documents classroom behaviors that teacher educators can use to encourage change based on facts.

On the other hand, teacher evaluation, if not executed with care, can easily turn out for the worse for those

involved. It can be a very sensitive issue between an evaluator and evaluatee. However, there need not be any misunderstanding when there is proper planning and execution of teacher evaluation process. Peterson (1982) stated:

> It should be emphasized that teacher evaluation is a strategic procedure. Improperly handled, it can destroy staff morale and seriously hamper the efficient operation of the school, on the other hand, cooperative planning of a purposeful program in the appraisal of teacher effectiveness, conceived as a guidance procedure, offers unusual opportunities for better understandings, more satisfying relationships, and a truly cooperative atmosphere between the teaching staff and administration. (p. 87)

Purpose of Teacher Evaluation

Teacher evaluation can hardly succeed without the establishment of a simple, clear purpose. The statement of a purpose is a major element to a teacher evaluation process. A statement of purpose clarifies the function of the evaluation process in relation to the needs of the school program. It specifies the reason for the process. When the purpose of teacher evaluation is stated clearly, teachers are likely to feel a sense of partnership and less threatened (Hawley, 1976). Without a definite statement of the purpose of a teacher evaluation process, Spears (1953) saw the possibility of the evaluator's efforts being focused

on the instrument rather than on what is to be accomplished. Hawley (1976) stated that "the most important principle is to recognize the clear relationship between the purpose of evaluation and the means of conducting the evaluation" (p. 11).

In their research, Ryan and Hickcox (1980, pp. 10-11) identified the following as purposes for teacher evaluation:

1. Assist the teacher in identifying areas that need improvement.

2. Recommend probationary teachers for permanent status.

3. Assess effectiveness of instructional program.

4. Comply with central office, board, or provincial policy.

5. Stimulate improvement in classroom performance.

6. Assist evaluator in identifying areas that need improvement.

Peterson (1982) summarized the multi-purposes of teacher evaluation as:

> (a) to improve instruction; (b) to improve performance of teachers by correcting teaching, management or other deficiencies; (c) to humanize instruction; (d) to increase overall-accountability on the part of teachers and school administrators and to improve the overall growth of the teaching staff. (p. 81)

In the literature, educators generally agree that the primary purpose of teacher evaluation is to safeguard and

improve instruction received by students (Sergiovanni and Starrat, 1983; Ryan and Hickcox, 1980; Hawley, 1976; Bolton, 1973).

Teacher Evaluation Procedures

The first step in a teacher evaluation procedure is that a teacher must be informed of the duties and responsibilities that his/her performance of the assignment requires. On this, Herman (1973) illuminated:

> It is basic that an employee must know what is expected of him in order that he is able to attempt to perform in a satisfactory manner. It is unreasonable to criticize an employee for not performing his job in a satisfactory manner if he is not informed of his duties. Only as the expectancies are detailed, discussed and committed to writing can evaluation become possible. Two prime means of letting an employee know what is expected are by developing written job descriptions and by establishment of priority performance objectives. (p. 33)

It is evident, therefore, that informing the teacher of his/her job expectations is absolutely essential to a successful teacher evaluation process.

Another element is to identify the needs of the evaluatee at the beginning of the process. Both the evaluator and the teacher should spend time together so as to determine the areas of need. These areas should include

both weaknesses and strengths. During such meetings, those involved should remember that there is always room to improve areas of strength to enhance the overall teaching performance. Redfern (1980) proposed that "a useful way to identify needs is to regard them as areas to emphasize in order to attain the maximum degree of improvement in performance" (p. 24). Involving the teacher in needs assessment, makes him/her more committed to the entire evaluation process. The teacher becomes more aware of what will be evaluated and what needs to be done to prepare for evaluation. Hawley (1976) pointed out that the key to successful evaluation of teaching lies in the teachers themselves. The teachers, more than anyone else, know areas of their strengths and weaknesses.

Thus, "the more the teachers are involved in a real and meaningful way in both planning and conducting the evaluation, the more likely it is to succeed in its purpose" (Hawley, 1976, p. 18). The assessment of needs in teacher evaluation helps both the evaluator and the teacher to determine the difference between knowledge, skills, and attitudes required and those that the teacher presently applies in teaching.

Teacher evaluation should not be done in isolation. It should be related to the entire school program. Bolton (1973) points out that "the evaluation of teachers is a part of a total effort a school system makes to assess its total program" (p. 127). Explanation as to how the teacher

evaluation process can be related to the entire school program is given by Wiles and Lovell (1975):

> It must not be a treatment that is applied to teaching alone. Teachers cannot be expected to participate wholeheartedly in the evaluation of teaching unless it follows or goes concurrently with a school's goals, administrative procedures, and supervisory techniques. It cannot be something forced on them. It is a part of a total process of improvement. (p. 231)

It can be seen from the above statement that teacher evaluation must represent an aspect of broad supervisory service that begins with sound standards of teaching and embraces the entire school program. Its planning should be systematic and based on a set of guidelines and procedures that reflect the school's goals. The process should be closely related to school activities in which teachers are encouraged to state their problems and then devise ways of seeking solutions, to have leadership roles, and to participate in decision-making and then accept responsibility for the outcome. On this major element of teacher evaluation, Noonan (1981) adds:

> A positive appraisal system is more than a method or an instrument. The basic philosophy of the school district needs to be involved. This philosophy should recognize that teachers and principals need to work together in an atmosphere of mutual understanding which involves

> mutual preplanning, goal setting, and suggestions for improvement. (p. 8)

In conclusion, it can be said that an attempt to relate teacher evaluation to the entire school program requires a more productive and realistic approach that will make it relevant to the educational needs of the school. Teacher evaluation, therefore, should be viewed as a process of appraisal in which all elements that constitute the teaching process are given appropriate consideration (Kortum, 1963).

Sources

The evaluation process plans should include many sources of evidence to be used and "a variety of instruments and techniques employed in gathering data on teacher behavior, satisfaction of pupil needs, pupil-teacher relationships, and other factors affecting the teacher's efficiency" (Peterson, 1982, p. 87). The teacher should be fully aware of the procedures to be used in the evaluation process, and the division of responsibility for carrying out those procedures. In other words, confidence must be developed in the teacher that there are resources necessary to achieve satisfactory results from the evaluation undertaken. The teacher then has the responsibility to carry out the activities planned while the evaluator monitors the performance. On monitoring a teacher's performance, Redfern (1980) said:

> Basic to the plan of action is the monitoring of the evaluatee's performance. The evaluator should monitor

> the evaluatee's performance to collect data and information that relate to the objectives being pursued. Monitoring is concerned with performance outputs; it is the evidence-gathering part of the total evaluation process. The parties involved must discuss it and, it is to be hoped, agree upon certain matters concerning the monitoring (i.e. the data gathering, forms to be used, kinds of and frequency of visitations, the identity of monitors, conferences, and other types of contracts) . . . . Information from monitoring should never be stored away when prompt feedback will enhance performance. (p. 16)

Scheduling

The school district's plan for teacher evaluation should include how often it should be done. This is a major element that requires careful consideration from school administrators. There are specific guidelines given in the literature regarding this element. Vacc (1982) offered a general statement that teacher evaluation should not be viewed as a one-time prediction activity but rather, as continuous throughout one's teaching career. Peterson (1982) stated that teacher evaluation should be a continuous process comprised of frequent discussions, cooperative planning, and principal-teacher conferences throughout the school year. The process should grow out of the normal program of supervision and in-service training that contributes to the effectiveness of a teacher's classroom

instruction. Throughout a teacher's career, evaluation of teaching should reflect the spirit of inservice development and not a detailed inspection and accounting of teaching effort (Spears, 1953). If instructional improvement is made the central factor for teacher evaluation, school administrators are to work constantly with teachers in establishing ways for professional growth. The continuous assessment permits inspection of the teaching process and allows the evaluator to assess a teacher's progress relative to achieving goals; the effectiveness of teaching strategy; the acquisition of desired behavior change(s); making decisions concerning alternative goals and the teaching strategy or method, if necessary (Vacc, 1982).

In his study, Shinkfield (1977) reported that teachers support the idea that evaluation of teaching should be continuous throughout the year. It should be an integral part of school activities and not just a one-shot burdening experience to a teacher. Evaluators need to bear in mind that "teachers will respond to an evaluation process which allows for their participation, recognition, and self-growth" (Noonan, 1981, p. 40). In addition, teachers want to know the level of their performance in teaching, whether the students are learning or not, and how they can improve their teaching performance. Thus, any effort made to strengthen their professional repertoire by identifying additional competencies needed is welcomed by the teachers. Peterson (1982) further observed, "teachers perceive more value in an

evaluation system that develops professional competency rather than judgment rating" (p. 85). Such an evaluation should be continuous and systematic. On this, the National School Public Relations Association (1974) suggested that "evaluation should be an ongoing, long-term process that takes into account all of a teacher's over-all performance and of progress between periods of evaluation--not a one-shot, stand-or-fall rating" (p. 57). The value of systematic teacher evaluation, according to Redfern (1982), is that it enables a teacher to:

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

2. Establish long and short-term goals.

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

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

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

As a whole, a systematic, continuous teacher evaluation serves as a multi-dimensional activity that establishes directions which enable a teacher to grow in his/her profession. It serves as a means to obtain and use information for generating and establishing teaching goals, strategies, and teaching effectiveness.

Observation

The evaluatees performance can best be monitored in classroom situations. Classroom observation allows the teacher and evaluator to work as a team and to concentrate on improvement. It provides the opportunity for both evaluator and evaluatee to assess how well goals have been met, whether they should be amended, or others added to the list. Hayman (1975) highlighted the value of classroom observation to the teacher evaluation process as follows:

> To observe is much more than mere seeing. Observing involves the intentional and methodological viewing of the teacher and students. Observing involves planned, careful, focused, and active attention by the observer. Observing involves all the senses and not just sight or hearing . . . . Observing is a critical task for the supervisor. (pp. 23-24)

The author further indicates that classroom observation is valuable to the teacher evaluation process because:

1. It helps teachers by providing precise and systematic feedback.

2. It offers an opportunity to assess the changes a teacher makes over time.

3. It makes it possible to gather evidence needed for teacher evaluation.

4. It enables the evaluator to reflect his/her concern for the teacher and the students. It is a demonstration of

interest in the teacher and students. It reveals caring to know firsthand what is going on in the classroom.

Classroom observation is considered to be one of the factors that contribute positively to teacher evaluation (Shinkfield, 1977). Kleinman (1966) indicated, "measurement of behavior by observation appears to be the most promising technique to date for assessing teacher effectiveness" (p. 234). It is also pointed out by Anderson and Hanko (1973) that the solution to certain problems in the evaluation process lie in the use of pupil-teacher interactions and the interpretation of this interaction by a trained observer. A study by Noonan (1981) stated that classroom "observation is the proper technique for data collecting" (p. 42). In considering classroom observation as a major element of teacher evaluation that should not be overlooked, the National School Public Relations Association (1974) pointed out that "any supervisory or evaluative procedure which avoids this is fake at worst or incomplete at best" (p. 17). It is obvious from the emphasis placed on classroom observation that teacher evaluation should not be based on impressions but on close observation of what the teacher and the students do in the classroom.

Conference

Another element which must be a part of teacher evaluation is the assessment of its results. Without this aspect, the process is worthless. On this, Redfern (1980) said, "interpreting the meaning and significance of

monitored data is a very important part of the total process of evaluation" (p. 24) that should not be overlooked. The evaluator should be knowledgeable of how to analyze, interpret, and present the data.

Teacher evaluation is not complete until the evaluator and teacher hold the final conference to discuss the results of the process. By this time, if the teacher has been involved in the entire process, there should exist an intimate relationship between the evaluator and teacher. As Spears (1953) noted, "the most fruitful source of any appraisal, either written or oral, is a teacher-supervisor conference that reflects a wholesome atmosphere" (p. 424). The final conference should give a clear indication that the evaluator has a continued concern and interest in the teacher and his/her work. As the discussion focuses on the objectives set at the beginning, the evaluator should help the teacher to view the results of evaluation from a constructive rather than negative perspective. Both the evaluator and evaluatee should ultimately find out from the information gathered whether the objectives have been met. From the data analysis, the evaluator should carefully present the strengths and weaknesses of the teacher. When this is done, the evaluator should remember that the prevailing atmosphere and the way he/she presents the results will determine the teacher's acceptance or rejection of certain evaluation results. The teacher should have an opportunity to respond or comment on the evaluation

outcomes. When the teacher's weakenesses are revealed, there should also be remedies suggested. The evaluator should accept the responsibility to assist the teacher and to make plans for activities like in-service education for the improvement of weaknesses. A plan for a consistent follow-up should be set by both the evaluator and teacher to ensure improvement.

When the evaluator has developed the final report for evaluation, the teacher should see it and be given a chance to reply to it, if she/he wishes, before the filing takes place. The school should make a provision whereby the teacher may request the removal from the file any information considered obsolete.

In summary, teacher evaluation should be a more comprehensive procedure rather than a rating process. It should involve purposes and be concerned with situations. When finalized, the process should enable the teacher to have a constructive approach to self-analysis and improvement. It should be an opportunity to commend a teacher for good work done and to boost the general morale of workers in the school.

The Role of the Principal in Teacher Evaluation

The teacher evaluation process is an integral part of the entire school program and its management. Like any other organizations, schools are accountable to the public that supports them. In order for a school to know what goes on in

general and the level of its instructional performance, the teaching personnel must be evaluated. The primary purpose of teacher evaluation, therefore, is to provide feedback that helps teachers in their professional growth and improvement of instruction (Herman, 1973; Kowalski, 1978; and Hauge, 1981).

In elementary school, "principals are regarded as the primary evaluators" (Noonan, 1981, p. 160). Redfern (1972) observed that principals "are obliged to make evaluative judgments about teaching effectiveness" (p. 64). The degree to which they are able to make good evaluation judgments is often considered to be a mark of their competence. Peterson (1982) noted:

> Today's principal must be familiar with current technical capabilities to evaluate teachers for evaluation is part of his responsibilities. At the end of the year, he usually is required to turn to the district officials some type of evaluation on teacher effectiveness. He should take the opportunity to visit classrooms, to observe teachers and classes, using some teacher approved rating scale, and hold post-conferences with the teachers. (pp. 76-77)

For the past two decades or so, the expectations of the principal's role as the key evaluator of teachers in the elementary schools has increased. Goedken (1969) indicated that "the principal does most of the observation in the elementary school" (p. 77). A study by Nield and Oldham

(1974) revealed certain direction that the role of the principal as key teacher evaluator has taken:

> Traditionally, the teacher's immediate supervisor, usually the principal has been responsible for evaluating the teacher, and today, despite changes in approaches, the principal is still the individual most often charged with this important duty. Some principals have reported they spend up to 90% of their time performing functions related to evaluation, classroom visits, conferences, inservice training, etc., and many districts identify teacher evaluation as the major duty of principals. (p. 10)

There seems to be agreement between the above study and that done by Ryan and Hickcox (1980) in which "the respondents indicated that for both probationary and permanent teachers, principals were involved in 90% of the observations" (p. 7). The authors note that "while this is not a surprising finding, it does serve to emphasize the crucial role principals play in current evaluation practices" (p. 7).

The task of evaluating teachers is not an easy one. It involves different stages that require a variety of skills and experiences from the principal. Thus, the principal needs to acquire knowledge about teacher evaluation through training. Noonan (1981) indicated that "if principals are taught to observe, know what it is they are looking for, and observe what happens and not what they think is happening nor how they feel about what is happening" (p. 42), teacher

evaluation can be a productive endeavor towards improving classroom instruction. In addition, if principals have to:

> provide valid and reliable data on the interpersonal communications between a teacher and students, he must undergo extensive training to learn the behavior categories used for classifying teacher and student messages; he must master the use of behavior record forms and the other recording procedures so that accurate judgments can be made; and he must demonstrate that his records are consistent from one observation to another. (Bolton, 1973, pp. 110-111)

In order to know what to do, evaluators must be knowledgeable. They should be trained for their task. The National School Public Relations Association (1974) stated that "those who do the evaluating should be trained for the job and must themselves be evaluated regularly" (p. 57). A trained evaluator is in a position to approach his/her duty in a professional manner. It should often be remembered that teaching is a complex process and there is no easy formula to evaluate it without proper skills and knowledge (Peterson, 1982). With the knowledge of what teacher evaluation requires for its success, a trained evaluator will attempt to develop an atmosphere in which creativity and teamwork between the teacher and appraiser are the basis for all plans. Bolton (1975) sees training for evaluators for their job as crucial to the success of the teacher

evaluation process. He suggests some ways by which evaluators could be trained:

1. Elective in-service course or courses at universities.

2. A principals' meeting devoted entirely to evaluation.

3. A general explanation given at principals' meetings.

4. Workshop or clinic, lasting from one to three days, using the assistance of an outside consultant, observation of films of live classrooms, and discussions.

5. Written manuals describing procedures and explaining forms and policy.

6. Work of central office personnel with individual principals.

The training of evaluators is a likely means to bring professionalism into teacher evaluation. It may be a means to eliminate certain problems which often beset the teacher evaluation process due to an evaluator's lack of skills or knowledge. When teachers deal with those who know what teaching and its evaluation is all about, instructional improvement will be attained easily.

The literature reveals that inadequate preparation of principals in the area of teacher evaluation can be detrimental to teachers' professional growth which, in turn, may lead to poor instruction in the school. Hodel (1979), who surveyed twenty-six elementary principals to identify formal and informal evaluation practices used by principals

to improve teaching effectiveness of individual teachers, found this to be true. He found that "principals do not adequately possess supervisory skills and this deficiency contributed significantly to their perceived inability to successfully improve instruction" (p. 133). If the main purpose of teacher evaluation is to improve instruction and if the evaluator's lack of skills hinders it, "the knowledge and ability of the evaluator are more important than any guide or program" (Peterson, 1982, p. 77). The issue is further highlighted by Washington (1977):

> The performance of the classroom teacher can be evaluated only by a qualified professional educator. Competent evaluation depends on the perceptiveness, experience, and technical skill of the evaluator . . . . His knowledge and intelligence are chief measuring instruments used in the program. The evaluator needs well-defined technical skills to make meaningful assessment of teachers' expertness. He must be a skilled scientific observer, have extensive professional experience, know how to relate an observed action, and be thoroughly acquainted with the classroom program and the conditions he is observing. He must know how to look for it, know when he sees it, and how to assess it. (pp. 2-3)

In essence, the professional expertise of the principal in teacher evaluation is a must. It cannot be over-emphasized. It must be understood and acted upon if the

teacher evaluation process is to fulfill its purpose. With proper training, the principal can successfully play a significant role in the stages of the teacher evaluation process.

Climate and Relationship

The atmosphere in which the process of teacher evaluation is conducted is a major factor that must be considered. It should be conducive to a cooperative effort between evaluator and evaluatee. Flexibility and openness must characterize each phase of the process. At any stage, there should be no indication of exercising authority by the evaluator. The National School Public Relations Association (1974) pointed out:

> Evaluation must take place in a constructive and nonthreatening atmosphere. The teacher must feel that improvement of his performance is a cooperative effort involving him, his evaluator and others on the school staff. No matter how well designed--in the abstract--an evaluation program may seem, if it is perceived by teachers as negative or punitive, it will not improve teaching, but will lower teacher effectiveness because of teacher fears and lowered morale. (p. 57)

Setting Climate for Teacher-Principal Relationships

A conducive atmosphere for employer-employee relationships is essential for a successful leadership. At school, the principal is the person who can set a climate in

which teachers can work and students learn. The principal must set up a climate of "acceptance" between himself and the teachers. Such relationships may be established through "easy face-to-face communication, sharing decision-making and operational problem-solving, and confidence in the integrity and motivations of each other" (Redfern, p. 68). The principal-teacher rapport should reveal genuine respect and interest in each other. When the principal recognizes teachers as professional colleagues, he/she sets the pace for mutual respect.

The teacher evaluation process requires a climate in which the principal and teacher can work as a team. The principal-teacher relationship should be on a sound, mutual understanding for teacher evaluation to be successful. The principal can establish the necessary working atmosphere from the beginning of a school year when a meeting is held to acquaint teachers with each other and to orient them to the school program. During the meeting, the old teachers will, of course, be updated on any changes from the previous year while the new teachers' orientation may include information on school plant, school personnel, school policies, pupils, parent groups, and overall nature of school community (Redfern, 1980).

During the school year, the principal should have personal contacts with each individual teacher. In order to build a good evaluation climate, the principal should show a daily genuine interest in helping and working with teachers.

He should try to give the time and energy required to work with each teacher on instructional improvement through evaluation. Redfern (1972) cautions principals that "a rigid superior-subordinate relationships detracts from a good evaluation climate" (p. 68). Through his/her role as a personnel manager, communicator, and a public relations person, the principal should be able to establish a relationship with teachers that is conducive to the evaluation process.

Principal as a Personnel Manager

The principal's skills in personnel management can be an asset to teacher evaluation. As he/she plays this role, the principal can establish a working relationship with the teachers that will set the right atmosphere for the evaluation process. In order to establish such a climate, the principal should recognize human diversity in his staff, whether it be in terms of personality, experience, beliefs, or cultural heritage (Wiles and Bondi, 1980). In other words, the principal must accept the individual teachers as they are with no conditions attached for personal gain. He/she must be willing to work with individual teachers wherever they are in their development. The principal should recognize the diversity in teachers and also be sensitive to their potentials that could be used to improve the educational program of the school.

The principal, as a personnel manager, makes evaluation of teachers a smooth process if he/she "builds and maintains

the group, gets the job done, helps the group feel comfortable and at ease, helps set and clearly define goals and objectives, and cooperatively works toward those goals and objectives" (Wiles and Bondi, 1980, p. 141). In order for principals to develop a school environment suitable for teacher evaluation, Redfern (1972, p. 76) recommends the following personnel procedures:

1. Treat each other as an individual
2. Tailor needs of individual teachers
3. Make assignments equitable
4. Enlist teachers to contribute ideas and to share in problem-solving
5. Be available when problems arise and help is needed
6. Promote peer-level interaction
7. Be consistent and fair
8. Anticipate problems and face them realistically
9. Give credit where due and be sparing in allocating blame.
10. Give criticism only in example
11. Lead by example

When these procedures are often applied by the principal in personnel management of the school, formal or informal evaluation of teachers will not be difficult to perform. The principal-teacher relationships will make it easy for the principal to help teachers both inside and outside the classroom.

The Principal as a Communicator

Without communication between the principal and teachers, evaluation of teachers becomes an impossible task. There must be effective daily communication between the principal and teachers such that "the receiver interprets the message he has received in a way the sender intended him to" (Hayman, 1975, p. 160). Effective communication between the principal and teacher should involve mutual trust, confidence and empathy; accurate sending and receiving verbal messages mixed with non-verbal ones; and listening to each other. Bolton (1963) has this to say about principal-teacher communication in relation to teacher evaluation:

> Continuous interaction between teacher and principal assists both to analyze information. This does not negate the use of formal written feedback at stipulated periods. To be most effective, the communication must be two-way, requiring that each person listen to the other. Effective evaluation of teachers is dependent on both adequate quality and quantity communication between teachers and principals. (p. 97)

When principal-teacher communication is effective, teacher evaluation becomes an on-going process not limited to set times and convenience. The same view is shared by Hodel (1979) who stated:

> The evaluation of teachers is an on-going process in school systems and is not limited to or totally governed by formal evaluation procedures. Considerable

> evaluative data is obtained informally by principals during normal operations of schools, and this data affects the principal's perception of a given teacher's performance. (p. 133)

A continued principal-teacher communication enables the principal to "keep an informal record of his contacts with the teacher, e.g. diary with dates of contacts, observational notes and reactions" (Redfern, 1963, p. 76).

When proper communication does not exist between principal and teachers, "the value of supervisory and appraisal relationships is diminished" (Redfern, 1963, p. 77). It is the principal's duty to maintain open communication with teachers. She/he must be willing to listen to what teachers have to say. The principal must communicate to teachers, in every instance, whatever is needed and why it is needed. If the principal makes effective communication with teachers a routine part of her/his job, the task of evaluating teachers would not be difficult.

Human Relationships: An Asset to Principal in Teacher Evaluation

A principal may encounter difficulty in the teacher evaluation process if she/he lacks skills in human relationships. Perceiving teachers and other personnel as human resources in the educational process, and perfecting skills in a wide spectrum of interpersonal relationships are

some of the imperatives of the principal's leadership responsibilities as an effective evaluator.

Human relations involve "one's ability and judgment in working with people" (Sergiovanni and Starratt, 1983, p. 286). Self-understanding and acceptance are the avenues of human relations which when extended from one to others, leads to considering their needs as people. To develop such a relationship with teachers, principals, according to Redfern (1972, p. 67), should:

1. Avoid the "boss complex" wherever possible. Help the teacher feel that evaluation is a means to help, not hinder.

2. Seek to establish that evaluation is a means to enhance teacher's effectiveness.

3. Be aware that the principal's personality as well as that of the teacher have influence upon the evaluation relationship.

4. Be willing to allow the teacher to express his feelings without fear of censure or reprisal even if that opinion is markedly different from the views of the principal.

5. Strive for a climate of mutual respect.

6. Be prepared to take as well as to give.

7. Be committed to the concept that the teacher and principal are members of a team working for the best interest of a good educational program.

8. Invite constructive criticism.

9. Avoid giving the teacher the "brush-off" when problems are presented.

10. Be genuinely interested in the teacher as a person, willing to take time to help work through problems.

The day-to-day interactions between the principal and teachers should be such that the above suggestions are incorporated. Any attempt made to do this, makes "the relationship between day-to-day supervisors plus administrative contacts with the teacher and appraisal more direct and close" (Redfern, 1963, p. 74).

In his daily contacts with teachers, the principal can set a climate that makes the teacher evaluation process possible and helpful to teachers. When the principal is able to communicate with teachers and to establish good human relations, teachers often cooperate during the evaluation process.

Current Evaluation Processes

The evaluation of teachers can be done through different methods and techniques. This section discusses the current teacher evaluation processes as are found in the literature. The processes are administrative ratings, student ratings, peer ratings, self ratings, students achievement tests, teaching performance tests, clinical supervision, and performance objectives.

Administrative Ratings

In the literature, the principal is identified as the key teacher evaluator in elementary schools (Peterson, 1982; Hauge, 1981; Hodel, 1979; Kowalski, 1978; Lovell and Phelps, 1977). It is also revealed in the literature that other administrators like the vice-principal, supervisors, and so on may be involved in teacher evaluation.

Administrators can use various techniques available for collecting data on teacher/student classroom interactions. These techniques include systematic observation procedures, rating scales, checklists, and narrative reporting.

Systematic rating procedures. The main purpose for these procedures is to study interactions between teacher and student by keeping a running record of selected behavioral events that occur within the classroom (Bolton, 1973). The author also indicated that these procedures are:

> Designed to minimize the influence of observer bias. These measurement techniques are characterized by prior analysis of the criterion behaviors, clearly defined behavior category dimensions, use of an observational record for recording purposes, establishment of interrater and intrarater reliability, and intensive training of the observers in observational and recording techniques. (p. 113)

The most commonly used systematic observation procedures are listed by Kowalski (1978, pp. 4-5).

1. Flanders Interactional Analysis, which analyzes verbal interaction between teachers and students (Flanders, 1970).

2. Galloway's Non-Verbal Communication, which analyses the types of non-verbal behaviors teachers use with students by means of video tape recording (Galloway).

3. Parson's Types of Question Analysis, which analyses the types of questions teachers use with students (Evaluation Handbook, 1975).

4. Bales's Interaction Process Analysis, which analyzes interaction patterns of group members (Evaluation Handbook, 1975).

5. The Verbal Interaction Category System, an adoption of the Flanders system, including measurement of the non-verbal behavior of the teacher and student (Griffith, 1973).

6. The Classroom Observational Method, which analyzes cognitive levels on which classroom verbal interaction takes place (Griffith, 1973).

7. Observation Guides, which are a comprehensive itemization of specific and observational aspects of teaching and learning which helps a supervisor to monitor certain phases of instruction (Griffith, 1973).

8. The Briggs Observational Guide, a collection of questions which serves as a guide to help supervisors arrive at judgments regarding the purpose of a lesson, classroom climate, organization, and development of lessons, among others (Griffith, 1973).

9. Video-tape analysis, which allows teacher and supervisor to review a lesson and reach consensus on constructive alternatives for teaching improvement (Griffith, 1973).

10. Observation Schedule and Record (OScAR), a verbal category system which yields frequency counts of the occurrence of different verbal behaviors (Medley, 1973).

11. Instrument for the observation of Teaching Activities (IOTA), which is a written description of classroom behavior by a team of at least three observers.

The above techniques have their strengths and weaknesses. Brandt and Perkins (1973) indicate that "observational methodology may simplify some of the complexity of analyzing classroom activity to the point at which it can be better understood by both teachers and supervisors" (pp. 79-80). The systematic observation procedures have been found to enhance the quality of teacher evaluation (Kowalski, 1978).

One of the shortcomings of systematic procedures is that the local administrators using them need intensive training and such systems may not provide a justifiable return for expenses incurred (Bolton, 1973). The practitioners have also faced the problem of adopting systematic observation procedures to their particular needs. Despite the shortcomings of systematic procedures, educators still find them useful because they provide a common language for analyzing the teaching-learning process.

Rating scales. There are many different types of rating scales. Remmers (1963, pp. 329-343) identified groups of rating scales as follows:

1. Numerical Rating Scales: Numbers are assigned to categories, usually on an a-priori basis. The observer assumes that the intervals of this kind of scale represent equal psychological intervals between adjacent numbers.

2. Graphic Rating Scales: The graphic rating scales provides a continuous straight line with cues or categories along the line to guide the rater. It appears in many varieties, for it is possible to present the straight line in many ways, with or without descriptive categories and with or without numbers for the scale units.

3. Cumulated-Points Rating Scale: The cumulated-points method of scoring is common to several rating scale types. By this method, scales are scored in the same way as psychological tests, usually one or zero per item.

4. Multiple-choice Rating Forms: The alternatives for each item may be arranged in multiple choice form and the choices weighted a priori according to their "desirability" of degree of representation of a specified dimension of teaching.

5. Forced-choice Rating Scale: The forced-choice rating scale is not an a-priori kind of scale but a psychologically scaled instrument requiring considerable experimental work for its construction.

> Kowalski (1978) in describing rating scales said: In general rating scales contain a listing of descriptions regarding certain teacher classroom behaviors. When using such a scale, the rater judges the extent to which a teacher manifests the quality described by putting a check on a number scale or on a comment (such as good, improving, conditional, or unacceptable). (p.5)

The rating scales, like any other instruments for measuring teacher behaviors, have their strengths and weaknesses. As for strength, the rating scales "allow the observers to consider clues from a variety of sources before making a judgment" (Mohan and Hull, 1975, p. 266). The problem with rating scales is that they tend to enhance the subjective biases when they cover a considerable period of time and a wide variety of conditions and teacher behaviors (Brandt, 1973). Other problems are pointed out by Bolton (1973, p. 36):

1. When too many ratings are clustered at a particular point, the evaluator may infer that raters are too lenient, too harsh, or unwilling to be decisive and objective.

2. It is easier to identify the very poor and the very good than to differentiate in the middle range of a rating scale. Therefore, middle-range ratings are more difficult to justify.

Although rating scales have these shortcomings, Popham (1974, p. 143) observed that "if an evaluator has no

practical alternative tc rating scales then rating scales are probably better than nothing, especially if they are used only to isolate the extremely weak and extremely strong teachers.

Checklists. Checklists are similar to rating scales in certain ways. They are composed of items relevant to the teaching-learning process. As in rating scales, "the evaluator usually checks appropriate items or writes a brief comment next to it to indicate the specific type of behavior manifested by the teacher" (Kowalski, 1978, p. 5). There are certain advantages for using checklists in evaluating teachers. One of the advantages is that it is possible to construct checklists "locally to meet particular needs, once their potential utility is recognized and the general procedures for their development understood" (Brandt, 1973, p. 29). Other advantages are given by Griffith (1973, p. 54): (a) It directs attention to aspects of a lesson which an observer might otherwise miss; (b) It gives a degree of objectivity to an evaluator's observations; (c) It provides a permanent record which is quick and easy to make; and (d) It helps a teacher to analyze his or her own lesson and to determine what a supervisor considers important. The author also gives the disadvantages of using checklists as follows: (a) A checklist influences an evaluator to analyze teacher performance during a lesson according to a common pattern even though lessons may vary widely in form and purpose thus making classroom observations a mechanical, routine

procedure; (b) Items on a checklist often are numerous and vary in significance and there is rarely any attempt to weigh their relative importance; (c) Checklists usually deal with details which are often superficial; and (d) When the use of checklists becomes routine, supervisors are apt to make judgments without patient reflection and careful analysis.

The decision as to the kind of evaluation instrument is suitable for local use should be made by both school administrators and teachers. When rating scales or checklists are chosen, "their accuracy may be improved by clearly defining the focus of the evaluation; developing specific , low-inference items; using common record forms; and providing adequate training for observers" (Bolton, 1973, p. 36).

Teacher Self-Evaluation

Self-evaluation of teachers should be an integral part of a school's evaluation program. On this, Peterson (1982) stated, "self-evaluation should and must play an important role in the evaluative process" (p. 88) of teachers in a school system. Researchers in teacher education often find that "self-evaluation can form the basis for the rational change and can help the instructor to systematically allocate a reasonable amount of time and effort for self-improvement in the areas where he believes changes are likely to be most profitable" (Simpson, 1966, p. 1). Also, Bolton (1973) indicated:

> The teacher's analysis helps to reduce the natural conflict that is often encountered when an outsider makes judgments about teacher behavior. Since the supervisor is placed in the role of a resource person, assisting to develop the teachers coding and analysis skills, he is no longer perceived as a threat to the teacher. The common goal of the supervisor or principal and the teacher in self-evaluation is to provide a teacher the opportunity to improve his teaching skills by observing his own behavior in a threat-free atmosphere (p. 140-141).

In the self-evaluation of teachers, the principal plays the role of a counselor and works together with the teacher throughout the evaluation process. Olds (1973) offered suggestions for self-evaluation cycles as follows:

1. Individuals select proposed job targets for the evaluation period based upon review of previous evaluations and/ or self-appraisal.

2. Present proposed targets to evaluator and reach mutual agreement on plan at target-setting conference.

3. Monitor and help gather performance data.

4. Hold periodic conferences with evaluator to discuss progress made toward targets and to review data flow.

5. Review performance data from all sources, make analysis, and prepare self-evaluation report on progress made toward selected targets.

6. At a final progress conference, review self-evaluation with evaluator and discuss evaluation report made by the evaluator.

7. Propose follow-up activities and discuss evaluator's proposals based upon analysis of the evaluator's preliminary discussion of target ideas for next cycle.

8. Offer suggestions for improvement of performance evaluation program under procedure established for the evaluation system.

As can be seen, the final progress conference provides the time to review what has taken place in a teacher's self-evaluation and to propose what needs to be done in the next cycle. Redfern (1980) states that "self-evaluation, properly used, is a guide for planning further self-improvement" (p.33).

School administrators need to understand that teachers, as professionals, want to be autonomous in seeking their own improvement. Directly or indirectly, teachers have "expressed a desire to be the determiner of whether process goals were met and of the appropriate action to take" (Bolton, 1973, p. 141). When a school system encourages self-evaluation, it recognizes "teachers to be students of teaching, systematically assessing and revising their own behavior" (McNeil and Popham, 1973, p. 231).

The teacher has the responsibility of making self-evaluation a success while working with the evaluator who acts as a counselor. The teacher should view self-evaluation

as a way of continually diagnosing his/her work in terms of what is being done, and how it is progressing. To the evaluators and teachers, Redfern (1963) suggested:

> Self-appraisal should be accomplished within the framework of judging performance in terms of the appraisee's own concept of satisfactory service. In other words, each appraisee has in his own mind a picture of what he considers to be acceptable or satisfactory standards of achievement. Self-appraisal merely means measuring accomplishment in terms of the individual and personal standards of satisfactory service. It does not mean trying to compare oneself with the teacher across the hall. Thoughtful self-appraisal is a process of reporting as honestly and as accurately as possible how well the appraisee feels he has done in each of the areas of performance. (pp. 37-38)

Self-evaluation can take different forms. An audio or video tape recording of teaching behavior can be used. The teacher then analyzes the recorded behavior for the purpose of judging whether the behavior is useful to teaching. Films or recordings can be used cooperatively with the help of outside evaluators, principal or other teachers, to interpret certain teacher behavior and student response to those behaviors in the classroom. Although the use of audio-visuals is becoming a common practice in teacher evaluation programs, teachers should remember that the student body is

an asset to a self-evaluation process. Bolton (1973) said, "teachers should be encouraged to acquire feedback from students as a regular part of self-evaluation procedures" (p. 141).

In any teacher evaluation program, self-evaluation has been found to play a significant role (Olds, 1973; Redfern, 1980; Knicker and Nyler, 1981). The authors seem to agree that self-improvement based on self-evaluation is both desirable and crucial to an evaluation program. Olds (1973) indicated:

> One of the great advantages of self-evaluation efforts, when made as part of a school system's performance evaluation plan, is that the evaluation is a mutual venture. The evaluatee has definitive rights as well as responsibilities. (p. 43)

On the other hand, self-evaluation has its shortcomings. Redfern (1980) states, "the primary disadvantage is that the standards used for evaluation may not relate readily to outside criteria or needs of the school district" (p. 38). The author recommends that before implementing a teacher self-evaluation program, a school district should provide teachers with (a) training to help them specify their own goals in measurement terms, (b) a framework (e.g., an observational system) for analyzing and interpreting their own behavior, and (c) the technical competence needed for operating various new media for recording their own behavior.

Student Evaluation-of-Teachers

Although teacher evaluation by students does not seem to be a popular practice at the elementary level, the literature indicates that it takes place. In her nationwide survey on evaluation of teachers' performance, Kowalski (1978) showed that 1.7% of elementary schools in the responding school districts require student evaluations of classroom teachers as a part of the formal recorded evaluation. Other school districts suggest or require students to evaluate teachers, but allow the results to be used mainly by teachers and do not become part of the teacher's personnel file record. Noonan (1981) shows that superintendents, principals, and teachers agree that students should be involved in teacher evaluation. Peterson (1982) recommend that "students be involved in teacher evaluation" (p. 87). The involvement of students in the teacher evaluation process has its advantages and disadvantages. Knicker and Naylor (1981) give both sides:

> Ratings of teachers by students are the least popular form of evaluation, in the opinion of the educators. Teachers believe that students will praise the easy or popular teachers, or that young students do not have the maturity to judge good teaching. Conversely, advocates of greater student input argue that students are the consumers of education and have every right to be heard. Additionally, there is evidence that students

pick up the same best teachers as do their elders when there have been comparative ratings. (p. 126)

Acheson and Gall (1980) consider the results of student evaluation to be useful data "because teachers often are very concerned about how their students perceive them" (p. 139). Herman (1973, pp. 41-42) indicated advantages and disadvantages of student evaluations. Advantages of student evaluations:

1. The user (student) is best able to evaluate the giver (teacher).

2. Students are in daily contact with a number of teachers; and therefore, have the best basis upon which to make comparative judgments of teacher production.

3. The number of evaluations is greatly increased and the evaluation becomes much broader in scope. Also, the biased evaluations can quickly be discarded, and a large number of evaluations will remain.

4. This method would not add any dollar cost to the process.

Disadvantages of students evaluations:

1. Students may tend to provide low evaluations for the stricter teacher, the teacher who gives a great deal of work, the teacher who is a low marker or the teacher of a subject that is mandatory and considered boring by the majority of students.

2. Students are too immature to evaluate teacher performance.

3. A student may influence other students to rate a teacher poorly because he has a particular axe to grind with the teacher being evaluated. Youngsters sometimes, have cliques and a single student's dislike for a teacher might cause an overall negative bias to be present in the evaluations.

As a whole, student evaluations of teachers can provide useful data. The data can be compared with those of other evaluators, principals and others, to ensure that information obtained is valid for making decisions about the teacher's behavior in the classroom.

Evaluation of Teachers by Peers

In a nationwide survey of current practices of evaluating teacher performance, Kowalski (1978) indicated that "poor evaluation of classroom teachers takes place in several of the surveyed school districts" (p. 66). The author further notes that, in these schools districts, whenever a teacher selects peer evaluation as an option during the period of a required supervisory evaluation, the results become part of the formal teacher evaluation process. Oldham (1974) stated:

> Peer evaluation, the evaluation of the one teacher by another, is being used increasingly, most often in conjunction with evaluation performed by a supervisor. Teachers themselves generally are receptive to the idea of being evaluated by a peer, not only because they feel a fellow teacher will be sympathetic, but because

> they believe a fellow teacher is more competent to judge what transpires in a classroom than a supervisor who is less familiar with the classroom. (p. 10)

The evaluation of teachers by peers should not be taken lightly. It should not be just a matter of one teacher evaluating another. The evaluator should be an experienced teacher (Sargent, 1978). On peer evaluations, Lancaster (1974) stated:

> A colleague's rating should be based upon certain things which are known that students would not know or would not be eligible to judge; such as knowledge of the subject matter, devotion to teaching, clearness of presentation at technical meetings, attitudes and feeling toward students, etc. Even if colleagues visit classes to get their views, they are given from a different learning level than that of a student. Regardless of how an opinion is formed, the opinion should be presented in an organized fashion, showing the basis for it. (p. 246)

Evidently, evaluation by one's peers seems to be a logical way of achieving appropriate information for teacher evaluation purposes. However, there are pros and cons about the peer evaluation methods. Herman (1973) gives both sides. Advantages of peer evaluations:

1. A fellow worker assigned the same task possesses more in-depth knowledge of the requirements of the specific assignment than any other individual.

2. A fellow worker is best equipped to provide an objective analysis of strengths and weaknesses, and he is also best able to provide detailed assistance in overcoming the weaknesses that have been located.

3. A comradarie exists between co-workers that makes the evaluation process less threatening, and this fact puts the person being evaluated at ease.

4. A peer evaluation process produces better morale throughout the entire employee group because peers are placed in a helpful relationship.

Disadvantages of peer evaluations:

1. The peer evaluator may be myopic in vision; and therefore, he may not understand the total district's needs. This could cause some very important information to be completely missed.

2. The peer evaluator is placed in the unfair position of evaluator when he has no authority or responsibility to make judgments about the quantity and quality of a fellow workers production level. This responsibility is an administrator's responsibility, and the administrator should shoulder this complete load.

3. The peer evaluator will not be objective in his evaluation since he is a member of the same employee group. The tendency to whitewash all employees may be increased with the presence of unions and collective bargaining.

4. The peer evaluation may conflict with that of the immediate administrative supervisor who has to make

recommendations as to hiring, firing, and promotion. Peer positive evaluations may undergird his case and hinder the administrator's decision. At the very least, the administrator might have to spend many hours with union stewards in defending his decision if the administrator presents a negative overall evaluation of an employee.

5. A peer evaluation could lead to resentment of a coworker by the evaluatee if the evaluation is not favorable. This, in turn, could lead to intra-group conflict which could be detrimental to the total school district's operation.

6. Peer evaluations could be very costly when the amount of released time from the prime duties of the evaluators is considered.

Student Achievement Tests

Wiles and Bondi (1980) indicate that "many state legislatures are demanding greater teacher accountability in terms of the performance of students on achievement tests" (p. 239). As an example of this demand by legislatures, Ryan and Hickcox (1980) stated:

> It is clear that the California legislators intended teacher evaluation to be based upon assessment of student achievement. However, the standards for the achievement and the methods for assessing achievement were left to the discretion of local school districts. (p. 57)

This view of legislatures seems to receive the support of Erickson and Erickson (1980) when they say, "student achievement is an important criterion for assessing teaching effectiveness, and it would be a mistake to ignore it completely" (p. 66). Herman (1973) gave this view:

> Teacher evaluation by use of student scores on standardized achievement tests is one method that should probably be incorporated as a portion of the total evaluation scheme. The evaluator, however, must be cognizant of the fact that standardized tests normally measure only the areas of information retained; they do not deal with attitudes, values, appreciations and other important outgrowths of information. Overreliance on standardized test scores may also cause the teacher to teach for the test. Finally, pupil achievement is due to many factors including the instructional environment provided by teachers who had the students in prior years. (p. 48)

Advocates of evaluating teachers by student achievement tests argue that students are the consumers of education, therefore, their gains should be one of the ways to determine teacher effectiveness (Oldham, 1974; and Wiles & Bondi, 1980). This kind of reasoning "has popular appeal to people whose experience in science, industry, cost accouting, quality control and similar fields predisposes them to look for quantitative results for each action put into a product system" (Oldham, 1974, p. 12).

The supporters of the method quote research finding on teacher effectiveness. Research has been able to document that certain teacher behaviors are related to student gains (Sergiovanni & Starrat, 1983).

Those who do not favor evaluating teacher's performance by student achievement tests offer various reasons for their stand. Ryan and Hickcox (1980) give two reasons:

1. Measuring teaching ability in terms of student gains assumes that the teacher alone determines such gains. And, such an assumption is clearly unwarranted since it has been shown that students' home background and other factors have a major effect upon their achievement.

2. If a student does not cooperate or expand the necessary effort in order to learn, it is unfair to fault the teacher.

These reasons indicate why teachers do not favor measuring their competency by student gains. Teachers know that, apart from their efforts, there are many factors involved in a student's learning. Just as in any other profession where the condition or progress of a client is not the determining factor of effectiveness, student gains may be viewed the same in teaching. Medley (1982) stated:

> To say that teacher competence should be assessed on the basis of pupil learning makes sense only if you regard the work of a teacher as subprofessional, as comparable to that of the salesman or the television repairman. If you regard the teacher as one whose role

> is comparable to that of physician or the attorney, it does not make sense. (p. 10)

Teachers, like other professionals, "do not have to be able to guarantee outcomes; rather they must defend what they are doing in a professional sense" (House, 1975, p. 76). They may be answerable to such things as their competence on the subject matter, their ability to communicate with students.

The argument against using student achievement to assess teachers may be given by spelling out what teachers are expected to do as professionals. Peterson and Walberg (1978) expressed:

> Teachers are not hired to cram information into students' heads to be retained just long enough to enable them to pass objective tests. Teachers are hired to educate children, to produce important, lasting changes in their behavior, not short-term changes in tests. Teachers are supposed to teach children to read, to communicate, to reason, to become happy, productive, responsible members of this democracy. (p. 17)

It can be seen that teaching is a complex task which embraces broad and lasting aspects of students' learning. Thus, it becomes difficult to measure a teacher's competence by students' gains. While it is true that a teacher "may increase the achievement levels of most of his or her students, he or she may be unable to reach some students whose home backgrounds are so chaotic as to cripple their ability to concentrate on academic tasks (Sergiovanni and

Starratt, 1983, p. 278). In considering the nature of teaching and different learning abilities of students, Knight (1981) says, "one form of staff appraisal which must firmly be rejected is assessement based on pupil performance in standardized tests" (p. 66).

When the pros and cons of achievement tests as a measure of teacher effectiveness are considered, it becomes clear that a school system or an evaluator has to decide whether to use the method. In deciding to use student gains to evaluate teachers, Howsan (1973) suggested to evaluators to remember the following about achievement tests:

1. They are limited to the small segments of the educational program which can be adequately measured and so are never a comprehensive measure of the teacher.

2. Those aspects of the school program to which they can be applied may not be the most significant of the aspects.

3. Their use is largely restricted to research since to use pupil gain in school systems would tend to place undue emphasis on the measured areas of the program.

4. It is never possible to isolate the influence which can be attributed to a given teacher over a given period of time.

5. The imperfections in tests used make it difficult for some pupils and classes to demonstrate satisfactory gain no matter how effective the teacher.

6. Pupil gain measures tend to have low reliability and a doubtful validity.

7. Researchers, with few exceptions, have not been too successful in demonstrating that the methods differentiate between more or less competent teachers.

8. The methods take more immediate gains into account but fail to consider the long-term influence on the child (success in later school work or behavior in adult life).

Performance Objectives Approach

The Performance Objectives Approach to teacher evaluation provides an opportunity for teachers and evaluators to work together. Since this method of evaluation is based upon analysis or measurement of the progress made on predetermined objectives, the evaluator and evaluatee must together agree and establish the objectives. To do this, there must be mutual understanding between the teacher and the evaluator. Objectives provide the basis of action for the teacher during classroom instruction. The performance objectives approach places responsibility for the evaluation process on both the teacher and evaluator. On this, Redfern (1980) said:

> There is no doubt that evaluation by objectives puts new demands upon leadership talents of school administrators who are involved in the process. They are obliged to know more about evaluation as a process. They have to improve their skills in helping teachers set appropriate performance objectives. They are

> obliged to devise better monitoring and information-gathering techniques. And inescapably, they have to perfect counseling and conference competencies. (p. 8)

At the time when the evaluatee and evaluator jointly establish work objectives, they should also agree upon well established action plans, and how to measure accomplishments in terms of results obtained. In order to implement the objectives set in classroom instruction, they must be communicable and measurable. Hence, the objectives should be stated in behavioral terms. Since the objectives constitute a performance commitment on the part of a teacher, they should be clearly stated so that it can be determined when they have been reached. Bell (1974) suggests that the "objectives should be written using quantitative language and the anticipated results should be stated in numbers, percentages, ratios, or some other way very definite measurable terms" (p. 63). Such objective, therefore, should communicate performance intent, have all elements of ambiguity eliminated, and avoid words that have several meanings or to which there can be many interpretations.

Redfern (1980) identified six basic components of a performance objectives-oriented program aimed at improving an individual teacher's performance:

1. Set responsibility criteria: Duties and responsibilities in the performance of an assignment must be indicated.

2. Identify needs: Using responsibility criteria, the evaluatee and the evaluator cooperatively identify the status of the former's current performance.

3. Set objectives and action plans: Objectives and action plans are the means to achieve desired outcomes determined by the evaluation process.

4. Carry out action plans: The evaluator should monitor the evaluatee's performance to collect data and information that relate to the objectives being pursued. Monitoring is concerned with performance outputs; it is the evidence-gathering part of the total evaluation plan.

5. Assess results: Interpreting the meaning and signinficance of monitored data is a very important part of the total process of evaluation. This represents the culminiation of all that has gone before.

6. Discuss results: The evaluation conference is exceedingly important. It is the occasion for the persons most intimately involved in the process to discuss the outcome of their efforts to achieve the objectives. A very important responsibility is placed upon the evaluator to help the evaluatee view evaluation as a constructive rather than a negative process.

During the discussion stage, the current objectives are reconsidered and those which are no longer necessary are eliminated. Depending on an individual teacher's ability and need, new objectives may be added to the previous ones which

have not been met. In other words, performance objectives evaluation is cyclical.

The evaluator and evaluatee need to know that the performance objectives evaluation is not problem free. The weakness of the method lies in the teachers' inability to identify and set realistic job targets. It is found that teachers set either too ambitious objectives that may require much of their time or invalid ones in which the pupils already possess the competence and do not need more work in (McNeil, 1971). Frequently heard criticism of goal-based evaluations is that focusing attention on the results of performance only in terms of its intended objectives narrows the evaluation, so that the different procedures used to achieve results and their relationship to performance outcomes are ignored.

On the other hand, performance objectives evaluation has its strengths. Redfern (1980) listed the following:

1. Establishment of clearer perceptions of performance expectations: The process definitely clarifies the scope of an individual's duties and responsibilities. This comes about especially during the needs assessment process conducted before specific performance objectives are determined.

2. Use of feedback to refine performance strategies and procedures: Evaluatees profit most when information regarding their performance is communicated to them in a timely manner. Feedback needs to be used as it becomes

available. Periodic progress evaluations, throughout the year, should be used to modify performance procedures, to alter objectives, to discard some, and to replace those discarded with more relevant ones.

3. Availability of more valid data: The major emphasis in this type of evaluation is upon collecting, analyzing, and assessing performance information. These data enable both the evaluatee and the evaluator to be more precise in making judgments about and estimates of accomplishment.

4. Reinforced practitioner-supervisor relationships: The performance objectives approach to evaluation changes the nature of the working relations between the practitioner and supervisor as the emphasis is upon partnership.

5. Greater sensitivity to needs and concerns of clients: It is repeatedly emphasized that in evaluation by objectives a major consideration is the learning achievements of students. The welfare of the student/ client is paramount. Performance objectives stress what happens to students under the instruction and guidance of the teacher. While objectives may be fixed in other areas, the learner's needs and concerns come first.

6. Stronger emphasis upon improvement: Greater practitioner proficiency is the focus of the evaluation process. While other purposes may be included, they are secondary to the central purpose of improvement.

7. More adequate documentation of extent of incompetency: While the major emphasis is upon improvement,

it is not possible to avoid the necessity, on occassion, to document areas of inadequacy . . . . Carefully kept records of help provided, data monitored, and results achieved become the documentation that is necessary if and when due process must be carried out.

8. Skill in evaluation given higher priority: Skill in evaluation is not often given a high enough priority on the list of administrative and supervisory responsibilities by principals and other administrators . . . . Yet evaluator skills are tremendously important in performance objectives evaluation, and, as administrators see the need more clearly, they will accommodate themselves to a realignment of their job priorities.

The objectives-based evaluation, as can be seen, is a learner-oriented process. The evaluatee and evaluator are able to work together throughout the process in order to accomplish the objectives. The teacher carries out plans in the classroom and the evaluator assists by monitoring the teacher's performance.

Teaching Performance Test

The teaching performance test is generally referred to as a "teaching performance" or "instructional mini-lesson." This method of evaluation attempts to measure how effective a teacher is by having him/her teach a special brief unit to a group of pupils for a time usually no longer than a single class period. A special test is then administered after the unit, and the amount of gain shown by the average pupil is

taken as a measure of effectiveness or competence of the teacher (Medley, 1982).

The purpose of a teaching performance test, therefore, is to determine a teacher's effectiveness in terms of the students' performance in a test. The steps for this evaluation approach is given by Popham (1973):

1. A teacher is given a measurable instructional objective (along with a sample test item) and directions to plan a short lesson of 15 to 20 minutes designed to (a) promote learner mastery of the objective and (b) elicit interest in learners.

2. The teacher plans the lesson, incorporating whatever instructional procedures he deems appropriate.

3. The teacher presents the lesson to a small group of learners--six to eight students. For certain objectives, the learners should be children; for others they should be adults (for example, the teacher's colleagues).

4. The learners are then administered a post-test based on the objectives. Although the post-test has not previously been seen by the teacher, its nature is readily inferrable from the objective and sample test item.

5. An appraisal of the instructor's skill on the teaching performance test is provided by both the cognitive index--learners' post-test performance--and the affective index-- the learners' interest ratings.

McNeil and Popham (1973) suggest that the reliability of a performance test can be increased by using a number of

lessons and different kinds of objectives--different subject matter, different levels of expected behavior, etc. Also, the pupils can be divided into small groups in such a way that no teacher instructs the same group of pupils in more than one lesson so that no group receives a particular lesson more than once. Retention tests as review lessons may be given to learners, thereby adding another dimension to the teacher's ability to accomplish pre-specified objectives.

The evaluation of teachers by performance tests also has it shortcomings. On these, Medley (1982) stated:

> Because the time allotted is so brief, the teacher cannot be expected to bring about any changes in pupils that take time to effect, that is, any of the more important kinds of learning. What he can do is raise scores on tests that measure only concepts that can be absorbed quickly by most pupils--such as facts. The kinds of outcomes measured are, then, representative of only a small part of those a teacher is expected to achieve, a part limited to those things that pupils can learn (and presumably forget) very quickly. Progress in learning to read--or to get along with others--would be too slow to detect in the few hours involved in these tests. (p. 12)

The results of teacher evaluation by performance tests will vary from teacher to teacher. However, it is often found that some teachers are more successful than others in

getting desired results when there is control over factors such as teacher familiarity with content and pupil populations.

Clinical Supervision

Clinical supervision is defined as supervision focused upon the improvement of instruction by means of systematic cycles of planning, observation, and intensive intellectual analysis of actual teaching performance in the interest of rational modification (Weller, 1971). It "refers to face-to-face contact with teachers with the intent of improving instruction and increasing professional growth" (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1983, p. 292). Specifically, the word "clinical" is "meant to suggest face-to-face relationship between teacher and supervisor and a focus on the teacher's actual behavior in the classroom" (Acheson and Gall, p. 8).

Clinical supervision acknowledges the need for teacher evaluation, under the condition that the teacher participates with the supervisor in the entire process. Expanding on this concept, Sergiovanni and Starratt (1983) stated:

> In practice, clinical supervision requires a more intense relationship between supervisor and teacher than that found in traditional evaluation, first in the establishment of colleagueship through the cycle of supervision. The heart of clinical supervision is an intense, continuous, mature relationship between

surpervisor and teacher with the intent being the improvement of professional practice. (p. 299)

The primary goal of clinical supervision is "the professional development of teachers, with an emphasis on improving a teacher's classroom performance" (Acheson and Gall, 1980, p. 11). The authors further indicate the aims of clinical supervision to be the following:

1. To provide teachers with objective feedback on the current state of their instruction.

2. To diagnose and solve instructional problems.

3. To help teachers develop skill in using instructional strategies.

4. To evaluate teachers for promotion, tenure, or other decisions.

5. To help teachers develop a positive attitude about continous professional development.

In order to achieve these aims, Sergiovanni, and Starratt (1983) suggested:

> The focus of clinical supervision should be on formative evaluation. The supervisor is first and foremost interested in improving instruction and increasing the teacher's personal development . . . . A formative evaluation emphasis is entirely consistent with holding teachers accountable, but in a professional, not occupational sense. Professional accountability is growth-oriented and implies commitment to consistent improvement. (p. 293)

The authors also mention that "clinical supervision can and should take many forms, and that more experimentation with different forms is needed" (p. 324). Although the phase/stages of clinical supervision have been identified with various labels attached to the components involved, the content is similar with general emphasis placed on planning, observation and evaluation (Sullivan, 1980). Acheson and Gall (1980) view clinical supervision as "a model of supervision that contains three phases: planning conference, classroom observation, and feedback conference" (p. 11). The authors also suggest that planning and feedback conferences be used to identify and share evaluative criteria. And, classroom observation data be used not only as a feedback to the teacher but also as the basis for objective evaluation of the teacher's performance.

Cogan (1973) identified eight phases to the cycle of clinical supervision:

1. Phase 1 requires establishing the teacher-supervisor relationship

2. Phase 2 requires intensive planning of lessons and units with the teacher

3. Phase 3 requires planning of the classroom observation strategy by teacher and supervisor

4. Phase 4 requires the supervisor to observe in-class instruction

5. Phase 5 requires careful analysis of the teaching-learning process

6. Phase 6 requires planning the conference strategy

7. Phase 7 is the conference

8. Phase 8 requires the resumption of planning.

Another model is that of Goldhammer (1963) which consists only of five stages: (a) preobservation conference, (b) observation, (c) analysis and strategy, (d) supervision conference, and (e) post-conference analysis.

From the above clinical models, it can be seen that "the supervisor works at two levels with teachers during the cycle: helping them to understand and improve their professional practice and helping them to learn more about the skills of classroom analysis needed in supervision (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1983, p. 302). After using clinical supervision models, Sullivan (1980) in his research indicated:

1. The model's tenants and process are compatible with the dessires of teachers and administrators.

2. Changes in the teacher's classroom behavior occurred in directions designated as "desirable."

3. There was evidence of teacher growth in self-confidence and self-direction.

4. The nature of the teacher-supervisor relationship affected the teacher student relationship.

5. Supervisor-teacher relationship was found to be more democratic in clinical supervision than in other supervisory approaches, rapport and openness have been revealed as importan characteristics.

In general, it has been found that the clinical supervision process often ends up producing a "professionally responsible teacher who is analytical of his/her own performance, open to help from others, and self-directing" (Cogan, 1973, p. 12). The reasons for such professional growth are that both the teacher and the supervisor participate actively in conferencing, data gathering and analyzing information gathered; they both work on the level of decision makers; they work as individuals and may agree to disagree with the shared understanding about the final decisions and their implementation.

Professional Goals

In order for teacher evaluation to succeed, setting objectives for the process is a major element. Both the evaluator and the teacher should be involved in setting specific performance objectives which will form a useful basis for the collection of data needed. The importance of setting objectives is given by Redfern (1980):

> Objectives and action plans are the means to achieve desired outcomes determined by the evaluation process . . . . At the time performance objectives are agreed upon, it is important to discuss the actions and efforts that will be expended to obtain the objectives. (p.15)

It is a consensus in the literature that setting performance objectives is a major step in the teacher evaluation process and that it should be done jointly by the

teacher and evaluator (Barth, 1978; Beecher, 1979; Wood, 1979; Stocker, 1971; McNeil, 1967). The objectives should be stated in behavioral terms that can be measured for evaluation purposes. As the teacher and evaluator work together in setting objectives, the needs of the teacher should be defined by her/him and then be incorporated. The teacher may also suggest ways to secure the data that will determine whether the objectives have been achieved. It is the responsibility of the evaluator to assist the teacher to see how the suggestions given can be best fitted into evaluation procedure. Both the teacher and the evaluator should agree on how progress on the objectives will be recognized and recorded. They should also agree on how any help, technical or personal, will be obtained or obtainable. The joint effort of the teacher and evaluator places responsibility on both for the success or failure of the evaluation process. It also allows the recognition of a teacher as a participating professional in design, implementation, and results of the process. This kind of partnership, Noona (1981) observed, can make the process of teacher evaluation effective and successfull. The author also observed:

> The job satisfaction of teachers would increase both by recognition as a professional whose input is critical and by participation in the process. Personal development so crucial to teachers would have direction

and the backing of the administrator for the need would be clear and methods for correction available. (p.9)

As can be seen, the teacher involvement at any stage of the evaluation process is not just a formality but a necessity. In summarizing the role of the evaluator and evaluatee in setting objectives and the importance of objectives to teacher evaluation, Redfern (1980) stated:

> The nature of the performance targets is influenced by the strategies that are devised to attain them. The plan of action is composed of those activities that the evaluatee and the evaluator have decided are the most promising for achieving the objectives. The evaluatee and the evaluator have mutual interest in the successful achievement of the targets. The former has a direct and personal interest and the latter has an interest that stems from management and supervisory responsibilities . . . . When proper planning has taken place, it will be possible for the evaluatee to know precisely how to proceed in independent action during the year. (p. 29)

Professional Development of Teachers

An effective system for professional development of teachers is one that permits teachers to grow in their own way and at their own pace. The underlying theme for all professional development programs is that the adult must see learning and the acquisition of new competencies as a

lifelong process. In literature, professional development has been given various definitions which are the same in principle (McNergney and Carrier, 1981; Klopf, 1979; Rubin, 1978; Hite and Howey, 1977). Howey (1985) broadly defined the term "as activities pursued by teachers individually or in groups to enhance their capacity as professionals after they have obtained licensure and begun professional practice" (p. 59). Here the focus is on the teacher as a person and how to improve the daily performance in the classroom.

The principal as the leader of teachers in a school initiates the plans for professional development programs. The principal and the teachers work together in planning activities appropriate for their needs in the school. Klopf (1979) stated:

> The principal is the key individual in the school setting responsible for the staff development program. The establishment of the climate and the involvement of persons and resources to support staff development is the responsibility of the principal. (p. 2)

In order to involve teachers in productive professional programs, Marks, Stoops and King-Stoops (1978) suggest the principal consider the following:

1. Build a relationship with teachers--establish communication links, develop empathy and dialogue. Communicate!

2. Needs assessment-- a needs assessment determines the differences between the knowledge, skill, and attitudes required and those that presently exist. In other words, encourage self-evaluation.

3. Strategies and media--the action phase. Once objectives have been determined, the supervisor analyzes each objective to determine the primary type of learning specified, what instructional strategy is necessary, and what media is to be used.

4. The fourth phase is evaluation which serves two major purposes, (a) to determine if the learner did achieve the criterion measure stated in the instructional objectives, and (b) to determine the validity of the instructional strategy and its components.

5. The last phase is program revision.

The authors point out that this approach can enable teachers to develop to their possible potential and capability in teaching and helping students in their learning. As the principal endeavors to apply the above suggestions, a total picture will emerge that hopefully can provide the necessary framework for productive professional development programs.

Purpose of Professional Development Programs

In literature, there is a consensus among various authors that the ultimate purpose for professional development programs for teachers is the learning of

children and youth (Howey and Vaughan, 1983; Griffin, 1983; Klopf, 1979; Sergiovanni and Elliot, 1975). Howey (1985) identified six major purposes:

1. Pedagogical development: Activities in this developmental area focus on teaching in specific curriculum areas.

2. Understanding and discovery of self: More attention should be given to self-understanding because of the highly interpersonal nature of teaching and the tendency to view teachers instrumentally rather than personally.

3. Cognitive development: Adults including teachers differ in their development status in terms of developmental stages proposed by cognitive/developmental theories. Differences in cognitive and interpersonal development affect the way teachers learn in staff development activities and interact with students in their classroom.

4. Theoretical development: Theories related to the core functions of teaching do exist but teachers rarely use them. To be useful and meaningful, these theories must be grounded in practice through cycles of action and reflection.

5. Career development: The career of many teachers can be enhanced in two fundamental ways. The first is the creation of differentiated, realistic and complementary roles for teachers. The second is the development of more viable hierarchical leadership roles for teachers.

Designing a Professional Development Program

In designing a professional development program for teachers, there is need to consider various factors. Those who design these programs should remember that the potential patterns for organizing continuing professional growth is limited only by the constraints of imagination. Provisions for a professional development program must fit the particular objectives involved. Nonetheless, whatever the objectives and irrespective of how and by whom they are determined, the program organizer should consider these six essential factors suggested by Rubin (1978): (a) time, (b) expert consultation, (c) motivation, (d) reinforcement, (e) evaluation, and (f) recognition. To this list Klopf (1978) adds other factors:

1. Assessment of the needs of staff based upon school's goals, objectives and program.

2. Goals of long-term development program.

3. Objectives of a year's program.

4. List of events and activities with specific objectives for each.

5. Review of resources available for conducting program.

6. Calendar of dates and times.

7. Selection of satisfactory spaces.

8. Revision of calendar as year progresses with eliminations, substitutions, and additions on the basis of reassessment.

9. Plan for evaluation, both ongoing and final.

In addition to considering these factors, the organizer should keep in mind that the selection of the training mode or strategy to be used depends upon appraisal of all dynamics of the setting, the objectives to be attained, and the resources available. Whether or not a program is perceived as a continuing one and each activity is part of a sequence, there needs to be a statement of purpose or objective for a particular event. Sergiovanni and Elliot (1975) indicated that staff development objectives are usually of four kinds, "presenting information of one kind or another, helping teachers understand this information, helping teachers apply this understanding in their teaching, and helping teachers accept and be committed to these new approaches" (p. 155).

Professional development programs should be made meaningful by involving teachers. As participators, "teachers must take the responsibility for assessing their own strengths and weaknesses, developing personal-professional plans for improvement, and measuring their progress toward these goals" (Marshall and Caldwell, 1984, p. 24).

Some Evolving Characteristics of Effective Professional Development

Effective professional development programs depend on the availability of activities that are congruent with the

needs perceived by the learner. In other words, the needs of those involved in the program should determine its course. Merenbloom (1984) gave the following characteristics:

1. Definite goals, objectives, and organizational plan.

2. A sustained, sequential, continuous effort.

3. A sensitivity to the needs of the teachers.

4. Active involvement of the participants.

5. An open, honest assessment of the various activities.

6. The opportunity to add new dimensions to the program.

7. Strong leadership of the principal or project coordinator as well as leadership from the faculty.

For any professional program to materialize, "the input and leaderhip of the principal is the key . . . ." (Marenbloom, 1984, p. 28). In order to implement effective professional development programs that will have impact on teachers, Howey and Vaughan (1983) suggested:

1. Interactiveness--considers how the program interacts with other sets of mediating variables.

2. Comprehensiveness--clear conceptualization and delineation of the why, where, when and how, as well as the what of staff development is essential.

3. Continuity--staff development must be viewed as an incremental process requiring reinforcement through continuing follow-up and feedback.

4. Potency--this includes the need for both relevance and practicability.

5. Provision of support structures and personnel--the necessity of providing appropriate support to counteract the individual isolation and pragmmatic fragmentation that often exists in schools.

6. Documentation--in order to make valid judgments about the impact and viability of any staff development effort, it is essential that provisions be made to document thoroughly the planning, implementation, and outcomes of all activities.

Synthesis of the Research on Practices Used in Teacher Evaluation

This section of the chapter provides the knowledge base for teacher evaluation. It is a synthesis of research on teacher evaluation in the following categories: (a) rationale and purpose for teacher evaluation, (b) goals and outcomes of teacher evaluation and (c) descriptions of elements and procedures constituting teacher evaluation.

Rationale and Purpose for Teacher Evaluation

Evaluation of teachers has increasingly become a critical issue in education. The public demand for educational accountability in schools focuses on the classroom performance of teachers. What the teacher does during classroom instruction affects the learning of students, the major consumers in education. In the light of

public demands on education, Sergiovanni and Starrat (1983) observe that the stress is placed on teacher evaluation as a way of holding schools accountable to taxpayers and funding agencies that support them. Teacher evaluation, besides being a measure of accountability in schools, has been found by educators and researchers in the field to be a way of helping teachers improve instruction for children. Successful teaching is not an accident. It is the result of constant effort in assessing the activities involved and providing feedback that enhances instruction in the classroom.

The primary purpose of teacher evaluation is to safeguard and improve instruction received by students (Sergiovanni and Starrat, 1983, Ryan and Hickcox, 1980; Hawley, 1976; and Bolton, 1973). Peterson has given the multi-purpose of teacher evaluation as (a) to improve instruction, (b) to improve performance of teachers by correcting teaching, management or other deficiencies, (c) to humanize instruction, (d) to increase overall-accountability on the part of teachers and school administrator, and (e) to improve the overall growth of the teaching staff.

Goals and Outcomes of Teacher Evaluation

Teacher evaluation, if not understood, can be characterized by artifical and routine quality which makes it a process that becomes an end in itself. Redfern (1973) views teacher evaluation as a tool to help teachers become

more competent in the performance of their duties and responsibilities. These duties and responsibilities should be continually evaluated in relationship to the primary task of the school--that of improving learning opportunities for boys and girls. Teacher evaluation helps school administrators in making judgments concerning the professional accomplishments and competencies of certified employees, based on broad knowledge of the areas of performance involved, the characteristics of the situation of the individuals being evaluated and the specific standards of performance pre-established for their positions (Peterson, 1982).

Evaluation of teachers should promote awareness of the strengths and weaknesses of all certified personnel, provide opportunity for growth and improvement, and encourage positive change in employees. It should be viewed as "part of the process of making decisions and planning for action" (Hawley, 1976, p. 16). Thus, teacher evaluation should be seen as an intrinsic element in both teaching and learning (Sergiovanni, 1975). The porcess should evolve around the idea of helping an individual teacher grow professionally and improve classroom instruction. From evaluation programs, teachers and school administrators should have a continuous and a responsible basis for decision-making.

When a teacher evaluation program is properly used, it can be an educational asset of the entire school program that improves teacher performance and student learning.

Through a teacher evaluation program, a school, as an organization, can become a growing organism, a learning community, and an open system where teachers have the opportunity to grow professionally and the children are led to express their potentials through learning. Peterson (1982) summarized the goals and outcomes of teacher evaluation as follows:

> Evaluation, along with all other major aspects of the educational system, has as its goal, the improvement of learning for all those who take part in educational programs. Evaluation focuses upon the improvement of instruction. It is concerned with the continuous redefining of goals, with the wider realization of the human dynamics for learning and for cooperative effort, and with the nurturing of a creative approach to the problems of teaching. (p. 68)

Teacher evaluation programs must be an aspect of a comprehensive plan for career development and improving total teacher performance. When this view is taken into account, teacher evaluation becomes an enhancement of the entire school program.

Professional Development

An effective professional development program for teachers is one that permits teachers to grow in their own way at their own pace. Howey (1985) defines professional development as "activities pursued by teachers individually or in groups to enhance their capacity as professionals

after they have obtained licensure and begun professonal practice" (p. 59). There is a consensus in the literature, among various authors that the ultimate purpose of professional development programs is the learning of children and youth (Griffin, 1983; Klopf, 1979; Sergiovanni and Elliot, 1975).

Howey (1985) identifies major purposes of profassional development as (a) pedagogical development, (b) understanding and discovery of self, (c) cognitive development, (c) theoretical development, and (e) career development. Professional development programs for teachers should be designed in such a way that particular objectives involved are accommodated. Sergiovanni and Elliot (1975) indicate that staff development objectives are usually of four kinds: "presenting information of one kind or another, helping teachers understand this information, helping teachers apply this understanding in their teaching, and helping teachers accept and be committed to these new approaches" (p. 155). In order for professional development programs to be meaningful and relevant to teachers, they must be involved in the planning stages. As planning takes place, "teachers must take the responsibility for assessing their own strengths and weaknesses, develping personal-professional plans for improvement, and measuring their progress toward these goals" (Marshall and Caldwell, 1984, p. 24). Effective professional development programs depend on the availability of activities that are congruent with

the needs perceived by the learner. In other words, the needs of those involved in the program should determine its course.

Major Elements and Program Designs for Teacher Evaluation

Professional Goals

The first major element in the teacher evaluation process is that teachers be informed, at the time of appointment, of the duties and responsibilities that their performance in the assignment requires. It is basic that a teacher should know from the beginning what is expected of her/him in order to plan and discharge the duties assigned effectively. Herman (1973) points out that it is only when expectancies are detailed, discussed and committed to writing can evaluation become possible. The author suggests two prime means of letting an employee know what is expected (a) by developing written job descriptions, and (b) establishment of priority performance objectives.

As planning of the teacher evaluation process begins, a major element to keep in mind is the identification of the needs of the teacher. Both the teacher and evaluator should spend time together to determine the teacher's areas of need. Both weaknesses and strengths of the teacher should be put into consideration. Redfern (1980) proposed that "a useful way to identify needs is to regard them as areas to emphasize in order to attain the maximum degree of improvement in performance" (p. 24).

Setting performance objectives is another major element in the teacher evaluation process. The teacher and evaluator should together set specific performance objectives that form the basis for gathering information during evaluation (Beecher, 1979; Barth, 1978; Wood, 1979; Stocker, 1971; and McNeil, 1967).

Environmental Conditions

The setting of a conducive atmosphere for interaction between the evaluator and evaluatee is a major factor in the teacher evaluation process. Flexibility and openness must characterize each phase of the process. A summary of the kind of atmosphere needed for the teacher evaluation process is given by the National School Public Relations Association (1974) as follows:

> Evaluation must take place in a constructive and nonthreatening atmosphere. The teacher must feel that improvement of his performance is a cooperative effort involving him, his evaluator, and others on the school staff. No matter how well designed--in the abstract--the evaluation program may seem, if it is perceived by teachers as negative, it will not improve teaching, but will lower teacher effectiveness because of teacher fears and lowered morale. (p. 57)

Frequency of Evaluation

The frequency of teacher evaluation is a major element which should be considered in the process. How often

teachers should be evaluated should be included in planning of the teacher evaluation process. Helpful suggestions on this are available in literature. Vacc (1982) stated that teacher evaluation should not be viewed as a one-time prediction activity but rather, as continuous throughout one's teaching career. This means that whether a teacher is tenured or probationary, assessment of his/her performance is needed and is helpful. Peterson (1982) suggested that teacher evaluation be a continuous process comprised of frequent discussions, cooperative planning, and principal-teacher conferences throughout the school year. In his study, Shinkfield (1977) found that teachers support the idea that evaluation of teaching should be more continuous during the school year.

Relating the teacher evaluation program to the entire school's program is considered a major element that deserves attention (Bolton, 1973). Teacher evaluation should not be done in isolation. It should represent an aspect of broad supervisory service that begins with sound standards of teaching and embraces entire school program. Noonan (1981) showed that the teacher evaluation program should be a part of the basic philosophy of the school system. This philosophy should recognize that teachers and principals need to work together in an atmosphere of mutual understanding which involves mutual preplanning, goal setting and suggestions for improvement.

The Role of the Principal

In elementary schools, "principals are regarded as the primary evaluators of teachers" (Noonan, 1981, p. 160). Redfern (1972, p. 64) observes that principals" are obliged to make evaluative judgments about teaching effectiveness." The task of evaluating teachers is not an easy one. It involves different stages that require a variety of skills and experience from the principal. The principal needs to acquire knowledge about evaluation through training.

The skills of the principal in personnel management can be an asset to teacher evaluation program. In this role, the principal can establish a working relationship with teachers that will create a conducive atmosphere for teacher evaluation process. The principal should recognize the diversity in teachers and be sensitive to their potentials that could be used to improve the school's educational program. In his capacity as personnel manager, a school principal can make evaluation of teachers a productive process by building and maintaining the morale of teachers and by helping them to set clearly defined goals and objectives.

The principal must be a communicator to make evaluation program valuable to teachers. Effective communication between the principal and teachers should be carried out daily in the school (Hayman, 1975). This kind of principal-teacher communication makes the teacher evaluation process

an on-going process not limited to set times and convenience.

Lack of human relation skills by the principal can be a hindrance to the teacher evaluation process. Redfern (1972) suggested that "the placing of greater emphasis upon good human relations, perceiving teachers and other personnel as human resources in the educational process, and perfecting skills in a wide spectrum of interpersonal relationships are some of the imperatives of the principal's leadership responsibilities as an effective evaluator" (pp. 77-78).

Formal Classroom Observation Schedules

Classroom observation allows the teacher and evaluator to work as a team and to concentrate on improvement. It provides an opportunity for both evaluator and evaluatee to assess how well goals have been met. Classroom observation is considered to be one of the factors that contribute positively to the teacher evaluation process (Shinkfield, 1977). Kleinman (1966) indicated that measurement of behavior by observation appears to be the most promising technique to date for assessing teacher effectiveness.

The initial stage of the process is the preobservation conference. This conference serves as the stage where the principal and teacher meet together to decide what they want to accomplish during the evaluation process. Bolton (1973) referring to the conference said "any decisions made predetermine much of the effectiveness of the eventual procedures" (p. 24). The preobservation conference enables

the evaluator and evaluatee to lay a foundation for the entire evaluation process.

The next step is the actual classroom observation. It provides central data for feedback and evaluation procedures. When the data collected from classroom observation is properly analyzed and presented to the teacher, there can be motivation by the teacher to initiate innovative classroom activities, take on greater teaching responsibility, and to display creativity far in excess of what normally takes place in the classroom.

Following classroom observation, a postobservation conference should be held. The conference serves as the stage of the teacher evaluation process in which the data collected and analyzed by the evaluator are communicated to the teacher. It is also the time for both evaluator and teacher to discuss the results of the evaluation. The key to the success of the postobservation conference is communication. The results of evaluation should be viewed in the context of the objectives set at the beginning of the process.

For postobservation conferences to be a success Blumberg (1974) suggested, (a) the interpersonal relationships between a teacher and supervisor must enable the two to give and receive in a mutually satisfactory manner, and (b) the supervisor must have the resources to provide the kind of help required or know where the resources may be found for the teacher. After the feedback

is given and discussed, both the evaluator and teacher should plan for actions that need to be taken thereafter. They should arrange for follow-up visitations by the evaluator to see how the teacher progresses on the feedback suggestions. It is the responsibility of the evaluator to devise different follow-up procedures. The procedures may take both formal and informal forms.

Criteria and Instrument

The plans for the evaluation process should include many sources of evidence and "a variety of instruments and techniques employed in gathering data on teacher behavior, satisfaction of pupil needs, pupil-teacher relationships, and other factors affecting the teacher's efficiency" (Peternson, 1982, p. 87). The teacher should be informed of the procedures to be used in the evaluation process and the division of responsibility for carrying out those procedures. Acheson and Gall (1980) pointed out that the concerns and anxieties of the teacher can be alleviated by involving the teacher in the evaluative process--for example, by sharing the evaluative criteria beforehand and by basing the evaluation on observational data shared with the teacher. This process of sharing ideally results in the teacher and the evaluator working together rather than at cross-purposes.

In the process of teacher evaluation, the evaluator should use a valid and reliable instrument to collect information on a teacher's performance during classroom

observation. The contents of the instrument should be in harmony with the teaching criteria agreed upon by both the teacher and evaluator (Bolton, 1973; Hayman, 1975). To develop an instrument suitable for a local school system, a united effort should be made by both school administrators and teachers.

Evaluation Processes

The evaluation of teachers can be done through different methods and techniques. The literature includes different kinds of models as; administrative ratings, student evaluations, peer evaluations, self evaluations, student achievement, teaching performance, performance objectives and clinical supervision.

Administrative ratings. Administrators can use various techniques for collecting data on teacher/student classroom interactions. These techniques include systematic observation procedures, rating scales, checklists and narrative reporting.

Teacher self-evaluation. Self-evaluation of teachers should be an integral part of a school's evaluation program. Peterson (1982) stated, "self-evaluation should and must play an important role in the evaluative process" (p. 88) of teachers in a school system. The teacher has the responsibility of making self-evaluation a success. The evaluator can serve as a counselor to the teacher. Self-evaluation may take different forms. An audio or visual tape recording of teaching behavior can be used. Films or

recording could be used with the help of an evaluator. In self-evaluation process, teachers should remember that students are an asset.

Student evaluation of teachers. Although teacher evaluation by students is not a popular practice at the elementary level, the literature indicates that it takes place. Acheson and Gall (1980) consider the results of student evaluation to be useful data "because teachers are often concerned about how their students perceive them" (p. 139). When used carefully, student evaluation of teachers may provide useful data to the teacher and to school administrators.

Evaluation by peers. Evaluation of teachers by peers should not be taken lightly as just one teacher evaluating another. The evaluator should be an experienced teacher (Sergent, 1978). Evaluation by one's peers, who have experience in the classroom, seems to be a logical way of achieving appropriate information for teacher evaluation purposes.

Student achievement tests. Wiles and Bondi (1980) indicated that "many state legislatures are demanding greater teacher accountability in terms of the performance of students on achievement tests" (p. 239). Advocates of evaluating teachers by student tests argue that students are the consumers of education, therefore, their gains should be one of the ways to determine teacher effectiveness (Oldham, 1974; Wiles and Bondi, 1980). In using student gains to

evaluate teacher performance, it should be kept in mind that teachers, like other professionals, do not have to guarantee outcomes, rather, they must defend what they are doing in a professional sense (House, 1975). They may be answerable to such issues as their competence on subject matter, and their ability to communicate with students.

Teaching performance test. Teaching performance tests are generally referred to as a "teaching performance" or simply "instructional mini-lesson." This method of evaluation provides a way to evaluate teacher effectiveness by having a person teach a special, brief unit to a group of pupils for a time usually no longer than a single class period. The results of teacher evaluation by performance tests will vary from teacher to teacher.

Performance objectives approach. This method provides the opportunity for both the teacher and evaluator to work together in setting objectives to be accomplished. The objectives-based evaluation is a learner-oriented procedure. The teacher carries out the plans in the classroom and the evaluator assists by monitoring the teacher's performance and then analyzing the results for discussions between the two.

Clinical supervision. Clinical supervision is defined as supervision focused upon the improvement of instruction by means of systematic cycles of planning, observation and an intensive intellectual analysis of actual teaching performance in the interest of rational modification

(Weller, 1971). It acknowledges the need for teacher evaluation under the condition that the teacher participates with the supervisor in the entire process.

Summary

This chapter dealt with the various aspects of teacher evaluation. It included the following: (a) the purpose of teacher evaluation; (b) teacher evaluation procedures which took into account things such as scheduling, observation and conferences; (c) the role of the principal in teacher evaluation; (d) climate and relationship which looked into areas like setting climate for teacher-principal relationships, the principal as a personnel manager, the principal as a communicator, and human relationships as an asset to the principal in teacher evaluation; (e) current evaluation proccesses which involve the following methods and techniques: administrative ratings, teacher self-evaluation, student evaluation of teachers, evaluation of teachers by peers, student achievement tests, teaching performance tests, clinical supervision and professional goals; and (f) professional development of teachers.

A second section was included in this chapter which synthesized the research on practices used in teacher evaluation. This synthesis was done according to the following categories: rationale and purpose for teacher evaluation, goals and outcomes of teacher evaluation, and descriptions of elements and procedures constituting teacher evaluation.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The purposes of this study were two-fold; first, to investigate the current practices of teacher evaluation and the perception held toward these practices by elementary school principals in the Michigan Conference of Seventh Day Adventists; and second, to design a proposed evaluation system for the Michigan Conference Office of Education based on the contexts within the operation of the schools and the research base for teacher evaluation. This process also provided an opportunity to assess the effectiveness of a formally stated design process to design educational practices. This chapter includes the stated research questions, the population of the study, the general design, the data collection procedures and procedures for data analysis. In addition, the process used for designing the teacher evaluation system is described.

Research Questions

The research questions for this study were divided into two parts, (a) how the Adventist schools evaluate teachers and (b) process for designing an area of educational practice.

A. How Adventist Schools Currently Evaluate Teachers

The first purpose of this study was to provide information on how adventist schools currently evaluate their teachers. The questions were:

1. What is the purpose of teacher evaluation in Seventh-day Adventist schools?

2. What are the current teacher evaluation practices being used in the Seventh-day Adventist elementary schools?

3. What is the Adventist elementary school principal's perception toward current teacher evaluation practices?

4. Are there differences in teacher evaluation practices between Seventh-day Adventist schools and current practices found in research?

B. Process for Designing an Educational Practice

This part of the study sought to design a teacher evaluation system which could be used by the Michigan Conference by using a systematic process for designing an educational practice (teacher evaluation). The question to be answered from the study was: Does the formal process used here result in the incorporation of research findings into educational practice?

Population of the Study

The population of this study consisted of all fifty-five elementary school principals in the Michigan Conference of Seventh day Adventist.

In order to identify the elementary principals in the Michigan Conference, a current list (1985) of their names and addresses was obtained from the Conference Office of Education.

General Design

A survey instrument was used to obtain information on how teacher evaluation is carried out in the Michigan Conference elementary schools. The areas investigated included the purpose of teacher evaluation, current teacher evaluation practices, and how the principals perceived those practices.

A proposed design for teacher evaluation, based on contextual data and a research synthesis, was developed for the Michigan Conference. The contextual base of the proposed design was formed by the information obtained from the Conference Office of Education on current teacher evaluation practices and also the data collected from the elementary principals. The summary of the contextual base is presented in Chapter IV. The research synthesis formed the knowledge base for the proposed design. The synthesis is presented in Chapter II of this study.

Collection of Data

Research Instrument

The survey instrument used in the study was adapted from the one used by Hauge (1981). Hauge revised the instruments used by Goedken (1969) and Kowalski (1978). The instrument (Appendix A) was designed to reflect the teacher evaluation practices as perceived by elementary school principals. Current teacher evaluation practices were identified and used in the framing of the survey instrument items.

Validity and Reliability of the Instrument

A panel of professors, administrators and practitioners reviewed the questionnaire to verify its validity. Their suggestions were incorporated into the final draft of the questionnaire.

A pilot study was conducted by Hauge on a sample of twenty elementary school principals in twelve school districts. An agreement of 93% by the principals on final items of the survey instrument was achieved.

Data Collection Procedures

In order to collect data for this study, questionnaires were mailed to all principals of the Michigan Conference Elementary Schools. A cover letter, with an endorsement of this study, was obtained from the Michigan Conference Office of Education. This letter and a letter describing the study (Appendix A) were attached to the questionnaire. These

materials and a self-addressed stamped envelope were sent by first class mail to the principals.

A coding system was devised on the master list containing the names and addresses of all the subjects of the study. As the questionnaires were returned, a check was made against each code number on the master list. This made it possible to identify those who had not responded. A seventy-three percent return was received from the first mailing so a follow-up mailing was not done.

Data Analysis

In the analysis of the data, a tabular arrangement and account of the number of observations in each item is given. The number of responses and percent for each item was determined based on the tabulated observations. Questions relating to each of the major sections in the questionnaire were grouped together for analysis.

Designing an Educational Practice

Answering part B of the study, "Does the formal design process used here result in the incorporation of research findings into educational practice?" required obtaining further data on the conference schools and the delineation of the design process.

School Data

School data were obtained from the Conference Office of Education. These data dealt with the organization of the schools and who is responsible for the local schools.

Design Process

This design process has been developed from an analysis of the structure of scientific theory and the concepts of knowledge utilization in education (Hatfield, 1984). It is also predicated on the concept that the underlying focus for developing practice in a profession is on the basis of goals (Simon, 1969). Using a formal process to design practice which incorporates a synthesis of research findings and the contextual data of the site for implementation combines what has been loosely termed theory and practice.

The final design proposed here includes the following elements (a) the expected outcome or goals for the practice, (b) a description of the procedure and/or elements constituting the teacher evaluation system, (c) supporting assumptions derived from the proposed procedure with related research and contextual data to determine possible negation of the assumptions, and (d) a plan for evaluating the practice to determine if the proposed goals are being achieved.

The data used in the design were based on the research synthesis and contextual factors. Research synthesis data dealt with the knowledge base of the design. This section provided the major components of teacher evaluation. It

included the purpose and goals of evaluation, procedures to follow in carrying out evaluation and the current evaluation processes. The contextual factors provided information on how the practice is currently carried out in the Michigan Conference. This section also included the resources and personnel used, description of the school, current teacher evaluation practices, and organizational conditions.

The data represented in chapters two and four were used as the basis for the design. The design was based on research findings as to what should be included in teacher evaluation and the contextual base was used as a vehicle on how the practice is presently used in the Conference. Using these two sources of information provided a solid base on which to build the design.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY OF THE DATA

This chapter presents a summary and analysis of the data collected from the survey. A discussion of the findings is given in relation to the research questions pertaining to how the Michigan Conference elementary schools evaluate their teachers. These four research questions deal with, (a) the purpose of teacher evaluation in the Michigan Conference elementary schools, (b) current teacher evaluation practices in the Michigan Conference elementary schools, (c) the Adventists elementary school principal's perception toward current teacher evaluation practices, and (d) differences in teacher evaluation practices between the Michigan Conference elementary schools and those found in research. The responses to the items in the questionnaire are organized according to these research questions and represent the perceptions of the elementary school principals in the Michigan Conference. The responses are tabulated in percent. Included in this chapter is a second section giving a narrative description of the conditions in which teacher evaluation is carried out in these elementary schools based on the summary of the findings and information obtained from the Conference office of education.

Purpose of Teacher Evaluation

What is the purpose of teacher evaluation in the Michigan Conference elementary schools? In an attempt to answer this question, responses to items 1, 2, and 3 of the questionnaire were analyzed. A total of 82% of the elementary schools in the Michigan Conference evaluated teachers for the purpose of professional development (Table 1). Rated second by 75% of the principals was improvement of instruction. Layoffs, promotion and tenure were selected much less frequently as purposes for teacher evaluation. This response suggests that teacher evaluation is not used for either dismissal or layoff. In fact there has been little need for such action. The teachers generally decide to teach in church schools because of their commitment to Adventist philosophy of education.

Item 2 of the questionnaire requested respondents to indicate how the purpose of teacher evaluation was developed. Table 2 shows that for 67.5% of the respondents, the purpose of teacher evaluation is developed by the Conference Office of Education. While 12.5% of the respondents indicated that in their schools the principal and teachers developed the purpose of teacher evaluation, another 12.5% indicated that they did not know who developed the purpose. The latter response suggests that there was either no communication or little of it in terms of evaluation guidelines in these schools.

Table 1

Purpose of Teacher Evaluation: Frequency and Percent

	Frequency N = 40	Percent
Professional Improvement	32	82
Improvement of instruction	30	75
Dismissal	4	10
Promotion	2	5
Tenure	2	5
Layoff	1	2.5
Salary Increment	0	0
Other	4	10

Table 2

How the Purpose is Developed: Frequency and Percent

	Frequency N = 40	Percent
By the Conference Office of Education	27	67.5
By the principal and teachers	5	12.5
Don't know	5	12.5
By the school board and teachers	2	5.0
Other	1	2.5

In response to how the purpose was made known to the teacher (Table 3), 47.5% of the respondents showed that an individual conference with the teacher was made. The use of written correspondence to communicate the purpose of

evaluation to the teacher was indicated by 32.5% of the principals. There were 22.5% of the principals who indicated that the purpose was not made known to the teacher. Only 7.5% of the schools used faculty meetings to inform teachers about the purpose of evaluation.

Table 3

How the Purpose is Made Known to the Teacher

	Frequency N = 40	Percent
Individual conference	19	47.7
Written correspondence	13	32.5
Not made known	9	22.5
Policy statements	7	17.5
Faculty meeting	3	7.5
Other	3	7.5

According to the information obtained from the data, the evaluation of teachers in the Michigan Conference elementary schools was done mainly for the purpose of professional development and improvement of instruction. How the purpose of teacher evaluation was developed was not uniform in the schools. There seemed to be a lack of coordination in developing the purpose either at the Conference level or at the school level. Individual conference and written correspondence were seen to be the main ways by which the purpose was made known to the elementary school teachers in the Michigan Conference. There

need to be improvement or coordination of how the purpose was made known to the teacher as suggested by the 22.5% of the respondents who indicated the purpose was not made known.

Teacher Evaluation Practices

What are the current evaluation practices being used in the Seventh-day Adventist elementary schools? Responses to items 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 of the survey instrument were analyzed to answer this question.

The areas related to this research question are (a) criteria used for evaluation, (b) classroom observation, (c) evaluation models, (d) follow-up procedures, and (e) instrument used. The percent summary of each area is presented in tabular form followed by narrative discussions.

Criteria Used

Responses to item 4 (Table 4) indicated that teaching techniques were the most frequently used criteria for teacher evaluation in 62.5% of the elementary schools in the Michigan Conference. Student achievement and teacher beliefs were shown to be used as criteria for teacher evaluation by 57.5% and 50% of the principals surveyed respectively. Professional goals, indicated by 30% of the respondents, were the least used criteria.

Table 4

Criteria Used for Teacher Evaluation

	Frequency N = 40	Percent
Teaching techniques	25	62.5
Student Achievement	23	57.5
Teacher beliefs and characteristics	20	50.0
Teacher knowledge	18	45.0
Professional goals	12	30.0
Other	4	10.0

Responses to item 13 (Table 5) show that in 57.5% of the schools, teacher evaluation was partially based on student achievement, while in 32.5% of the schools, this was not the case.

Table 5

Teacher Evaluation Based on Student Achievement

	Frequency N = 40	Percent
Partially	23	57.5
No	13	32.5
Yes	2	5.0
No response	2	5.0

Classroom Observation

Responses to item 5 (Table 6) indicate that observations of teachers were most frequently done by the superintendent and assistant superintendent as represented

in 40% of the schools. In 35% of the schools, respondents indicated that the assistant superintendent did most of the observation of teachers in the classroom. In 12.5% of the schools, the principal, superintendent and assistant superintendent observed teachers in the classroom.

Table 6

Classroom Observation Practices

	Frequency N = 40	Percent
Superintendent and assistant Superintendent	16	40.0
Assistant superintendent	14	35.0
Principal, superintendent, and assistant superintendent	5	12.5
Principal and assistant superintendent	2	5.0
Principal	1	2.5
No response	2	5.0

Responses to item 7 (Table 7) indicate that the continuing contract classroom teachers were formally observed twice a year in 65% of the elementary schools in the Michigan Conference. Probationary teachers were observed in the classroom twice a year in 22.5% of the schools. In response to "other" 25% of the principals indicated that probationary teachers were formally observed in the classroom three or four times a year.

Table 7

Number of Formal Observation: Frequency and Percent

N = 40	Tenured/continuing contract teachers		Probationary teachers	
	freq.	%	freq.	%
Twice a year	26	65.5	9	22.5
Once a year	3	7.5	1	2.5
Once a month	2	5.0	1	2.5
Other	6	15.0	10	25.0
No response	3	7.5	19	47.5

In answer to item 8 (Table 8), 67.5% of the respondents indicated that formal classroom observation schedules were unannounced for continuing contract teachers. For probationary teachers, 32.5% of the schools did not announce

Table 8

Formal Observation Schedules: Frequency and Percent

N = 40	Tenured/continuing contract teachers		Probationary teachers	
	freq.	%	freq.	%
Unannounced	27	67.5	13	32.5
Principal request/ unannounced	3	7.5	2	5.0
Principal request	2	5.0	2	5.0
Teacher request/ unannounced	2	5.0	1	2.5
Other	3	7.5	2	2.5
No response	3	7.5	20	50.0

formal classroom observation schedules. From this, it appeared that more probationary teachers than continuing

contract ones were informed of classroom observation schedules.

The approximate length of the formal classroom observation for both continuing contract and probationary teachers was from 20 to 40 minutes (Table 9).

Table 9

Length of Formal Observation: Frequency and Percent

N = 40	Tenured/continuing contract teachers		Probationary teachers	
	freq.	%	freq.	%
30 minutes	14	35.0	4	10.0
20 minutes	10	25	8	20.0
40 minutes	8	20	5	12.5
10 minutes	3	7.5	-	--
Other	3	7.5	3	7.5
No response	2	5.0	20.0	50.0

Follow-up Procedures

In 50% of the schools, conferences were always held with the continuing contract teachers following a formal classroom evaluation (Table 10). In 37.5% of the schools, a conference was always held with probationary teachers after a formal classroom observation. In 45% of the schools conferences were sometimes held with continuing contract teachers after a formal classroom observation and with probationary teachers in 15% of the schools.

Table 10

Teacher Conference: Frequency and Percent

N = 40	Tenured/continuing contract teachers		Probationary teachers	
	freq.	%	freq.	%
Always	20	50.0	15	37.5
Sometimes	18	45.0	6	15.0
Never	--	--	--	--
No response	2	5.0	19	47.7

Responses to item 11, show that a written report of the observation was always given to the continuing contract teachers in 70% of the schools (Table 11). For probationary teachers, 40% of the schools provided a written report of the formal classroom evaluation.

Table 11

Written Report of Observation: Frequency and Percent

N = 40	Tenured/continuing contract teachers		Probationary teachers	
	freq.	%	freq.	%
Always	28	70.0	16	40.0
Sometimes	7	17.5	4	10.0
No response	5	12.5	20	50.0

As a means of follow-up after formal classroom observation, 25% of the schools made their continuing contract teachers set goals for improvement (Table 12).

Table 12

Follow-up Information: Frequency and Percent

N = 40	Tenured/continuing contract teachers freq.	%	Probationary teachers freq.	%
Set goals for improvement	10	25.0	5	12.5
Workshops, seminars, inservice training	7	17.5	2	5.0
Provide resources, workshops, seminars, in-service training and set goals for improvement	6	15.0	5	12.5
Provide resources, workshops, seminars and in-service training	3	7.5	3	7.5
Provide resources	1	2.5	1	2.5
Workshops, seminars, inservice training and set goals for improvement	1	2.5	-	--
Provide resources and set goals for improvement	1	2.5	-	--
Other	3	7.5	3	7.5
No response	8	20.0	21	52.5

In 12.5% of the schools, probationary teachers also set goals for improvement. Of the principals responding, 17.5% indicated that their schools had workshops, seminars, and inservice training for continuing contract teachers. The principals indicated by 15% and 12.5% that continuing

contract teachers and probationary teachers respectively set goals for improvement and also attended workshops, seminars, and in-service training as a follow-up to the evaluation. In 7.5% of the schools, a follow-up after formal classroom observation for both continuing contract and probationary teachers was done by providing resources and attending workshops, seminars, and in-service training.

Teacher Evaluation Models

Current teacher evaluation models were identified in Chapter II of this study and are reflected in item six of the survey instrument (Table 13).

Lesson plans and materials used were indicated by 57.5% and 32.5% of the principals as a means of obtaining information during evaluation of continuing contract and probationary teachers respectively. Teachers formally evaluated their own performance in 37.5% of the schools if they were on continuing contract. Probationary teachers evaluated their own performance in 17.5% of the schools.

A checklist describing teacher characteristics was used in classroom observation in 35% and 15% of the schools for continuing contract and probationary teachers respectively. Specific detailed observation of teacher's or children's verbal and non-verbal behavior was collected and used for evaluating continuing contract teachers in 32.5% of the schools and for probationary teachers in 12.5% of the schools.

Table 13

How Information is Obtained for Evaluation: Frequency and Percent

N = 40	Tenured/continuing contract teachers freq.	%	Probationary teachers freq.	%
Lesson plans and materials used	23	57.5	13	32.5
Teachers formally evaluate their own performance	15	37.5	7	17.5
A checklist which describes teacher characteristics is used in the classroom observation	14	35.0	6	15.0
Specific detailed observations of teacher's or children's verbal and non-verbal behavior is collected	13	32.5	5	12.5
Teacher and principal set goals before classroom observation	10	25.0	3	7.5
Achievement test scores are used to evaluate teacher performance	10	25.0	6	15.0
Parents' contacts	10	25.0	8	20.0
Students rate teachers	8	20.0	2	5.0
Teachers formally evaluate each others' performance in written report	7	17.5	1	2.5
Use of video-tape recording to evaluate teacher performance	2	5.0	1	2.5
Other	4	10.0	3	7.5

Achievement test scores and parents' contacts were used to gain information for teacher evaluation in 25% of the schools for continuing contract teachers. For probationary teachers, achievement test scores were used for evaluation in 15% of the schools while parents' contacts were used in 20% of the schools.

The least used avenue to gain information about teacher performance was the video tape recording. It was used in only 5% of the schools to evaluate continuing contract teachers and in 2.5% of the schools for probationary teachers. Continuing contract teachers formally evaluated each other's performance with a written report in 17.5% of the schools and probationary teachers did the same in only 2.5% of the schools. Student rating of teachers was used in 20% of the schools for continuing contract teachers and in 5% of the schools for probationary teachers.

As a whole, lesson plans and materials used in the classroom were the leading sources of information for evaluating elementary school teachers in the Michigan Conference. Teachers' self-evaluation was the second means by which information was obtained to evaluate the teachers. Video-tape recording was the least used method to evaluate teacher performance in the Michigan Conference elementary schools.

Teacher Evaluation Instrument

In response to item 14 of the questionnaire, principals indicated that 5% of the schools used their own instruments to evaluate both continuing contract and probationary teachers (Table 14). The majority of the schools, 82,5% and 80% for continuing contract and probationary teachers respectively did not use local instruments in evaluation. This suggests that teachers were evaluated by what is developed by the Conference office of education.

Table 14

Local School Instrument: Frequency and Percent

N = 40	Tenured/continuing contract teachers		Probationary teachers	
	freq.	%	freq.	%
No	33	82.5	32	80.0
Yes	2	5.0	2	5.0
No response	5	12.5	6	15.0

Adventist Elementary School Principals' Perception Toward Current Teacher Evaluation Practices

What was the Adventist elementary school principals' perception toward current teacher evaluation practices? The responses to items 15, 16, and 17 were analyzed in an effort to answer this question.

In response to item 15 of the questionnaire, 45% of the principals indicated that they were generally satisfied with

their current teacher evaluation practices. Of the respondents, 35% felt that their current teacher evaluation practices needed to improve. There were 5% of the principals who were not satisfied with their current teacher evaluation practices. Another 5% of the principals indicated that they were completely satisfied with their current practices of teacher evaluation. The small percentage of those completely satisfied seems to suggest that there is need to improve the current teacher evaluation practices in the Michigan Conference elementary schools. This is also supported by these principals (35%) who indicated the need for improvement.

Table 15

Principals' Perception Toward Current Teacher Evaluation Practices

	Frequency N = 40	Percent
Generally satisfied	18	45
Need to improve	14	35
Not satisfied	2	5
Completely satisfied	2	5
No response	4	10

Sixty-percent of the principals indicated that the emphasis on criteria used in teacher selection was consistent with teacher evaluation practices in the schools (Table 16). However, 27.5% of the respondents felt that the

emphasis on teacher selection criteria was not consistent with the teacher evaluation practices.

Table 16

Emphasis on Criteria Used in Teacher Selection

	Frequency N = 40	Percent
Yes	24	60
No	11	27.5
No response	5	12.5

Item 17 of the questionnaire attempted to identify comments and suggestions by principals concerning the improvement of their present teacher evaluation practices. Of the principals responding to this item (Table 17), 66.7% indicated the need for formalized teacher evaluation practices. The principals also identified the need to have time for educational leadership and a better understanding of the work of the teacher in the classroom.

Differences in Teacher Evaluation Practices between Adventist Schools and Current Practices Found in Research

Are there differences in teacher evaluation practices between Seventh-day Adventist schools and current practices found in research? To answer this question, a comparison of the two is made in the following areas: purpose, models used, formal observation schedules and follow-up procedures.

Table 17

Occurrence of Comments and Suggestions in Response to the Statement Concerning the Improvement of Teacher Evaluation

Responding (N=9)	Frequency	Percent
Need for More Time	2	22.2
"Principals in Adventist schools need more time--not for teacher evaluation--but for overall educational leadership."		
"Wished we had more time to spend in the classroom with teachers to relieve their personal anxieties and pressures."		
Teacher Evaluation Practices and Procedures	6	66.7
"More frequent evaluations: Always confer with the teacher after an evaluation."		
"Occasional visits by the Conference educational officers for the purpose of evaluation seem to be mainly for boosting morale."		
"Evaluation for the most part takes place at the conference level and from what I have observed, the teachers are not informed about the rationale or purpose."		
"More frequent visits from the Conference office for observation and conference. More teacher input into teacher evaluation instruments. More inservice for teachers."		
"I feel it would be beneficial to have a formal instrument and evaluation of teachers by using the instrument and inservice, etc. to help improve skills."		

Table 17 (continued)

"Evaluations should not be based on brief visits to classroom unless teachers are given opportunity to inform evaluators as to the progress and success of on-going procedures and projects that are not readily apparent in that brief visit.		
Miscellaneous	1	11.1
"A better parent and board understanding of teachers--not whims. Teachers are people not miracle workers to undo in a short time things done over a lifetime in homes."		

Purpose

From Table 1, it can be seen that the two major purposes of teacher evaluation in Michigan Conference elementary schools were professional improvement and improvement of instruction. Research findings also indicate similar purposes (Peterson, 1982: McNergney and Carrier, 1981; Hauge, 1981; Noonan, 1981; Ryan and Hickcox, 1980; Klopf, 1979; Hawley, 1976; Sergiovanni, 1975; and Redfern, 1972).

The review of literature indicates that the purpose of evaluation should be made known to the teacher (Herman, 1973; Redfern, 1980; Hawley, 1976; and Beecher, 1979). Table 3 shows that in one way or another the purpose of evaluation was communicated to the teacher in the Adventist schools. It appears from the comments given on how evaluation should be improved in Michigan Conference elementary schools that the

way of communicating the purpose of teacher evaluation should be definite and clearer than it is now. According to most studies reported in the literature, teachers should be involved in identifying purposes for their evaluation (Barth, 1978; Wood, 1979; Stocker, 1971, McNeil, 1967; Noonan, 1981; Redfern, 1980; and Peterson, 1982). The results of Table 2 indicate that Adventist elementary school teachers are not involved in developing or formulating the purposes of their evaluation.

Formal Observation Schedules

Various writers (Vacc, 1982; Peterson, 1982; Shinkfield, 1977; Noonan, 1981; Redfern, 1980 and Hawley, 1976) have stated that teacher evaluation should be a systematic and on-going process not just a one-shot activity which may place a lot of burden on the teacher. In Michigan Conference elementary schools, Table 7 indicates that teacher evaluations in the classroom are done, in most cases, twice a year.

For the elementary schools, available research findings state that the principal is the primary evaluator of teachers in his/her school (Noonan, 1981; Peterson, 1982; Ryan and Hickcox, 1980; Hodel, 1979; Washington, 1977; Nield and Oldham, 1974; Goedken, 1969). Table 6 shows that the principal in Michigan Conference schools is not the key person in teacher evaluation.

Acheson and Gall (1980); Redfern (1980); Hawley (1976); and Hayman (1975) support the idea that the goals and

objectives of an evaluation of a teacher should be agreed upon by the teacher and the evaluator before an actual evaluation is carried out. From Table 8, it can be seen that most of the teacher evaluations done in the Michigan Conference elementary schools are unannounced.

Processes Used

Evaluation of teachers can be done through different methods and techniques (Redfern, 1980; Peterson, 1982; Noonan, 1981; Shinkfield, 1977; Anderson and Hunko, 1973; and Kleinman, 1966). These authors seem to agree that a variety of instruments and techniques should be employed in gathering data on teacher behavior, satisfaction of pupil needs, pupil-teacher relationships, and other factors affecting the teacher's efficiency in the classroom. Table 13 indicates that a variety of methods and techniques were used to obtain information during teacher evaluation.

Follow-up

There is agreement in the literature that one of the purposes of teacher evaluation is to provide feedback that helps teachers in their professional growth and improvement of instruction (Hague, 1981; Kowalski, 1978; Redfern, 1980; Herman, 1973). Follow-up practices in Adventist elementary schools in Michigan can be viewed from the results shown in Tables 10, 11, and 12. Table 10 shows that a conference is always held by the teacher following a formal classroom observation. Table 11 indicates that a written report of the

observation is always given. Table 12 shows that a teacher is given help after classroom observation for professional growth and improvement of instruction after an evaluation.

Summary of Evaluation Practices In the Adventist Schools

The research questions dealt with the purpose of teacher evaluation in the Michigan Conference elementary schools, current teacher evaluation practices, the perception of the principals toward present teacher evaluation practices, and the differences in teacher evaluation practices between Adventist schools and current practices found in research.

Professional improvement and improvement of instruction were identified as the primary purposes of teacher evaluation in the Michigan Conference elementary schools. In many of the schools (67.5%), the purpose of teacher evaluation developed by the Conference office of education is followed. It was found that the principals and teachers have little input in the development of the purpose of teacher evaluation. The purpose is normally communicated to the teacher through individual conferences and written correspondence. This is done by the principal in cooperation with the Conference Office of Education.

In the area of teacher evaluation practices, teaching techniques form the primary criteria for teacher evaluation in the Michigan Conference elementary schools. The assistant superintendent does most of the teacher evaluation in the

schools. The principal does teacher observation in the classroom but not to the extent expected due to the nature of his/her responsibility. The principals in Adventist schools carry both administrative and teaching responsibilities. The visits by the evaluators made to the teacher in the classroom are generally unannounced in Adventist schools. These visits normally take from 20 to 40 minutes. Following a classroom observation, a conference is usually held with the teacher and a written report is given. The evaluators generally consider the teacher's lesson plans and teaching materials used in the classroom to be the primary means of measuring the performance of teachers in Adventist elementary schools. Next in consideration is the information gained from the teachers' self-evaluation. Only two schools use locally developed instruments to evaluate teachers.

The principals (45%) are generally satisfied with the current teacher evaluation practices. But, 35% of the principals suggest a need to improve the present practices of teacher evaluation. The principals indicated the need for more time to be involved in overall educational leadership.

It was found that there are no differences in the purpose of teacher evaluation practices between Adventist elementary schools in the Michigan Conference and that found in research. While research indicates that a teacher should be involved in teacher evaluation plans from the beginning to the end, Adventist elementary teachers are normally not

informed of the evaluators' visits to the classroom. Current research findings indicate that the principal does the actual evaluation in elementary schools while in the Michigan Conference elementary schools, the principal does not play a primary role in evaluation.

There are agreements between research findings in teacher evaluation practices in terms of the techniques and methods used and those used in the Michigan Conference elementary schools. The procedures which follow classroom observation in the Michigan Conference elementary schools are in harmony with those found in research such as conducting seminars, inservice training, and providing resource materials for teachers.

Description and Context of Teacher Evaluation in the Michigan Conference Elementary Schools

Personnel and Resources Used

Evaluation of elementary school teachers in the Michigan Conference is done by the superintendent, assistant superintendent and school principals. Of these individuals, the assistant superintendent does most of the teacher evaluation in the schools.

In carrying out this task evaluators obtain information to assess teachers' performance from lesson plans and instructional materials used in the classroom. Information obtained from teachers' self-evaluation, achievement test scores, a checklist which describes teacher characteristics,

and contacts with parents is used to assess performance of teachers. In some schools, video-tape recordings are used to evaluate teachers.

Description of Schools and the Conference

The Seventh-day Adventist church operates a school system to ensure that its youths receive a balanced physical, mental, moral, social, and practical education in harmony with denominational standards and ideals with God as the source of all moral value and truth. The educational program of the church gives primary emphasis to character building and to the spiritual foundation of the life of its children and youth.

Concern for the individual is basic to the Seventh-day Adventist philosophy of education. The organization of a given school is designed to meet this objective and the needs of the church community it serves. It is the responsibility of the local school to determine its specific goals and objectives in terms of the needs and interests of its constituency.

The elementary school is a unit within the system operated by the Conference Office of Education. The Michigan Conference offers an organized educational program for children from the beginning level to the secondary level, and may be structured in a variety of ways in terms of community needs.

Authorization to operate as an elementary school is granted by the Conference Board of Education. For the

establishment and operation of a school, there are certain criteria that have to be met, (a) a demonstrated educational need in the community not currently met by presently established schools, (b) there should exist an adequate physical plant and equipment for an elementary school, (c) the church community should be in a position to prove their ability to provide adequate financial support, (d) curricular offerings are to be approved by the Conference Board of Education and adequate curricular materials are to be provided for the proposed offerings in addition to a denominationally-certified faculty of sufficient size to provide effective instruction, (e) a prospective continuing enrollment adequate for the financial and curricular needs of an effective educational program, (f) a principal whose teaching assignment is in proportion to his/her administrative duties, and (g) the teacher's load, subject offerings, class period time allotments, specific policies regarding organization, administration, finance, curriculum and personnel are to be in agreement with the policies of the Conference Board of Education. It should be noted here that in addition to the denominational certification, teachers are also required to hold valid state certification. Although the operation of the schools is the responsibility of the local constituency, the employment, assignment, and transfer of teachers is by the action of the Conference K-12 Educational Board upon the recommendation of

the Conference Educational Office in counsel with the local school boards.

The territory of the Michigan Conference of Seventh-day Adventists comprise the entire state of Michigan. The Conference headquarters is located in Lansing. Of the many departments carrying out various church missions within the Michigan Conference Organization, the Conference Board of Education is a body authorized by the Conference Executive Committee to administer K-12 school system. One of the objectives of the Conference Office of Education for carrying out an effective elementary school program is to evaluate the teachers. The policy on teacher evaluation states that both formal and informal procedures are to be used.

Current Teacher Evaluation Practices

Purpose

The primary purpose of teacher evaluation in the Michigan Conference elementary schools is currently two-fold: (a) professional development, and (b) improvement of instruction. In most schools, the purpose is developed by the Conference Office of Education and communicated to the teacher through a written correspondence and individual conferences.

Process of Teacher Evaluation

In the Michigan Conference elementary schools, the evaluators use various criteria to assess the performance of teachers. The most frequently used criteria are teaching techniques. Other criteria used include student achievement, teacher characteristics and beliefs, teacher knowledge and professional goals.

Most teachers on continuing contract are evaluated twice a year. The probationary teachers are observed in the classroom three to four times a year. Most of these observations are not scheduled with the teachers on continuing contract, instead the evaluator normally comes in the classroom unannounced. For probationary teachers some prior planning is made with the teacher. Formal classroom observations in the Michigan Conference elementary schools last from about 20 to 40 minutes. A conference is always held with the teacher after classroom observation and written report is normally given.

After a formal classroom observation, various follow-up procedures are used. These procedures may include teachers setting goals for improvement, providing needed resources, workshops, seminars, and in-service training.

In the Michigan Conference elementary schools, it was found that the most frequently used models in evaluating teachers are lesson plans and the materials used in the classroom by the teacher followed by a checklist describing teacher characteristics. The principals indicated a need for

more time to assist teachers in their endeavors to improve classroom instruction. They also stated a need for a formal teacher evaluation instrument.

Organizational Factors Impinging on Teacher Evaluation

Within the organizational structure of the elementary schools in the Michigan Conference, are certain factors that impinge on teacher evaluation. One of these is that the principal also carries a teaching load. This double responsibility, principal-teacher, makes it difficult for the principal to spend adequate time to help teachers through classroom observations. The fact that the Conference educational personnel, far removed from the school and day-to-day needs of teachers, do most of the teacher evaluation makes the program less effective in fulfilling its purpose. The size of the territory to be covered by the superintendent and his/her assistants makes it difficult to visit the teachers as often as should be. The Conference educational personnel who do most of the teacher evaluation are not always on-site as is the school principal who is answerable to the local school boards in matters pertaining to day-to-day activities of the teacher both inside and outside the classroom in school. If the Conference policy of carrying out both formal and informal evaluation of teachers is to be effective, the principal, who is closer to the teacher in the school than the Conference educational personnel, has to do most of the task.

CHAPTER V

A PROPOSED TEACHER EVALUATION DESIGN FOR THE MICHIGAN CONFERENCE OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

The purpose of this chapter is to present a design for teacher evaluation which could be used by the Michigan Conference of Seventh-day Adventist elementary schools. The proposed design has been developed according to a specific design process. The data base for this design included the synthesis of research on teacher evaluation and the analysis of conditions, related to teacher evaluation, prevalent in the schools, where the design will be used. This design is organized according to context and knowledge base and includes, (a) rationale and purpose of teacher evaluation, (b) procedures and elements of teacher evaluation, (c) follow-up and staff development, (d) assumptions underlying the proposed design, and (e) a proposed plan for evaluating the design.

The program for teacher evaluation is one in which the entire professional staff must assume certain duties and responsibilities. The superintendent, principals, and teachers are all concerned with improving the instructional program in schools. Instruction is the only reason a school system has for existing. Democratic organization demands

that the teachers help establish policies for teacher evaluation. It is, therefore, important that there be direct contact between those people responsible for carrying out teacher evaluation programs and the teaching staff. Teacher evaluation programs should be formulated cooperatively as an expression of the combined thinking of the Conference Office of Education personnel, principals, and teachers. The program should provide a planned, effective system of communication including adequate records, information retrieval, and policy systems, through which all members can be kept informed. Other considerations to take into account have to do with who will have access to the results of teacher evaluation and what resources are available for conducting the evaluation. This proposed plan can provide a basis for conducting this kind of joint planning effort.

Rationale and Purpose for Conducting Teacher Evaluation

Teacher evaluation is a management tool for monitoring and maintaining the quality of instruction within a school and should be viewed as part of the process of making decisions and planning for action. The expectation from using this practice is that student learning and development will meet the goals set by the school and the needs of the students.

Evaluation, along with all other major aspects of the educational system, has as its goal the improvement of learning for all those who take part in educational

programs. Evaluation focuses upon the improvement of instruction. It is concerned with the wider realization of the human dynamics for learning and for cooperative effort, and with the nurturing of a creative approach to the problems of teaching.

The duties and responsibilities of teachers should be continually evaluated in relationship to the primary task of the school--that of improving learning opportunities for boys and girls. Evaluation of teaching should be broadly looked at as a part of the entire school program evaluation, and must not be done in isolation. Given these expectations, the purpose(s) guiding the evaluation system need to be established and agreed to by the parties involved.

The primary purpose of teacher evaluation is to safeguard and improve instruction received by students. To accomplish these outcomes, teacher evaluation should serve these multi-purposes, (a) to improve instruction, (b) to improve performance of teachers by correcting teaching, management, or other deficiencies, (c) to humanize instruction, (d) to increase overall accountability on the part of teachers and school administrators, and (e) to improve the overall growth of the teaching staff.

In order for these purposes to be achieved, there must be some kind of organization in the schools that encourages teachers to use evaluation data of staff improvement by stating their problems, by devising ways of seeking solutions, by participating in decision-making, and by

accepting responsibility for the outcome. A systems approach to problem solving could be applied in developing specific solutions to staff and instructional development.

In order to involve teachers in effective professional and instructional development activities, the following approach could be followed:

1. Build a relationship with the client(s)--establish communication lines, develop empathy and dialogue.

2. Pre-plan for needs assessment to determine the difference between the knowledge, skills, and attitudes required and those that presently exist.

3. Analyze the objectives to determine the primary type of learning specified, instructional strategy necessary, and materials to be used.

4. Develop an evaluation phase which serves two major purposes (a) to determine if the learner did achieve, and (b) to determine the validity of the instructional strategy, and its components.

5. Provide for teacher development.

6. The last phase would be plans for program revision.

In the research literature, there is agreement that the primary purpose of teacher evaluation is to safeguard and improve instruction received by students (Sergiovanni and Starrat, 1983; Ryan and Hickcox, 1980; Hawley, 1975; and Bolton, 1973). Redfern (1973) viewed teacher evaluation as a tool to help teachers become more competent in their performance. Peterson (1982) also stated that teacher

evaluation should help school administrators in making judgments concerning the professional accomplishments and competencies of certified employees. Sergiovanni (1975) indicated that teacher evaluation should be viewed as an intrinsic element in both teaching and learning.

An effective professional development program for teachers is one that permits teachers to grow in their own way at their own pace. There is a consensus in the research literature that the ultimate purpose of professional development programs is in the learning of children and youth (Griffin, 1983; Klopf, 1979; Sergiovanni and Elliot, 1975). In order for professional programs to be meaningful and relevant to teachers, they must be involved in the planning stages. As planning takes place, "teachers must take the responsibility for assessing their own strengths and weaknesses" (Marshall and Caldwell, 1984, p. 24). The needs of those involved in the program should determine its course.

According to the survey results, the primary purpose of teacher evaluation in the Michigan Conference elementary schools is currently two-fold: professional development and improvement of instruction. In the policy statements of the Conference Office of Education, it is stated that the primary objective of teacher evaluation is to assist the teacher in becoming more professional in his/her work.

Based on research findings and the current practices as carried out in the Michigan Conference elementary schools, I

would propose that the Conference Office of Education adopt the following two purposes as the basis of teacher evaluation. One, the professional development of teachers which focuses primarily on the teaching staff in attempts to provide the means for the total staff to meet the students' needs--the academic, personal, social, intellectual, and career objectives that are perceived as essential to the goals of students and society. Two, the improvement of instruction which concentrates more on the objectives concerned with curriculum and instruction.

In teacher evaluation, there should be planning, coordination, and growth of teachers. Only when teacher evaluation is organized both as a creative art and as a science will instruction and instructional procedures be improved. The following goals are proposed as the basis for this teacher evaluation system:

1. Help the professional staff see more clearly the goals of education and of the school.

2. Help teachers see the problems and needs of children and youth they will be teaching.

3. Provide effective democratic leadership in promoting the improvement of the school and its activities, and in fostering harmonious and cooperative staff relations.

4. Help the professional staff develop greater competence in teaching.

5. Aid teachers in the diagnosis and remediation of learning difficulties.

Procedures and Elements of Teacher Evaluation

Teacher evaluation requires a great deal of planning and organizing. In planning for teacher evaluation, there are a variety of political and organizational decisions to be made such as, (a) who is to be involved in carrying out the evaluation, (b) the specific outcomes to be evaluated, and (c) the process of carrying out the evaluation. These issues are discussed in this section.

Evaluation of the teacher can be done through different methods and techniques. In Chapter II, the evaluation processes were identified. These include administrative ratings, student ratings, peer ratings, self-ratings, student achievement tests, teaching performance objectives, teaching performance tests, performance objectives, and clinical supervision. Under administrative ratings are various techniques which can be used by the administrators, i.e. systematic observation procedures, rating scales, checklists, and narrative reporting.

According to the data collected for this study, the Michigan Conference currently uses the following evaluation processes, (a) lesson plans and materials used by teachers, (b) teacher self-evaluation, (c) a checklist describing teacher characteristics, (d) specific detailed observation by an evaluator of the teacher's or children's verbal and non-verbal behavior, (e) student achievement tests, (f) teacher and principal set goals, (g) parents' contacts, (h) student ratings, and (i) peer ratings.

From research literature and the current practice of teacher evaluation in the Michigan Conference, it can be said that the two are in harmony with regards to evaluation processes. The only process that is not currently used but could be incorporated in the program is clinical supervision. This process is focused upon the improvement of instruction by means of systematic cycles of planning, observation, and intensive intellectual analysis of actual teaching performance. It has been found that the clinical supervision process often ends up producing a professionally responsible teacher who is analytical of his/her own performance, open to help from others, and is self-directing.

Personnel to be Used

Results gained from the collected data indicate that the superintendent, assistant superintendent and principals are currently involved in teacher evaluation. Of these evaluators, the assistant superintendent does most of the teacher evaluation in the schools. Since the principal is the instructional leader of the school, he/she should be more involved with teacher evaluation. Since in Adventist schools, the principal is also involved in teaching he/she may wish to arrange for a substitute teacher to permit time for classroom visitations, conferences, and supervisory activities. Because of the size of the schools, this could be done at least twice a year. In the case of a one teacher

school, self-evaluation should be encouraged and this could be compared with the formal evaluation.

Specific Outcomes to be Evaluated

In carrying out this process, the following areas are to be evaluated:

1. Teacher knowledge which is the extent the teacher is knowledgeable in a given subject area and planning and preparation for that area.

2. Teacher characteristics and beliefs.

3. Teacher competence which takes into account the way a teacher asks questions, how instructional objectives are stated, and techniques of instruction.

4. Teacher performance which is how a teacher uses his/her competence in an actual situation and the response of students to the teacher and classroom management.

5. Teacher effectiveness which is the result of teaching based on student achievement.

6. Teacher decision making.

7. Teacher responsibilities and functions.

8. Professional goal setting.

In order to evaluate the above outcomes effectively, it should be remembered that before an evaluation is carried out, decisions must be made concerning, (a) the evaluation design, (b) data collection, (c) methods of analysis, and (d) presentation of results.

Evaluation Design

In designing the evaluation process the following components should be clearly described, (a) how often the teacher is to be observed in the classroom and the approximate length of each classroom visitation by the evaluator, (b) the instruments to be used in the observation, and the kind of information to be gathered and how that information will be analyzed, and (c) presentation of the results to the teacher.

Teachers want an evaluation process that is well planned, constructive, and democratically applied. In order for these expectations to be realized, the following criteria should be met:

1. Classroom observation visits should focus on all elements of the teaching-learning situation, not merely on the teacher.

2. The chief purpose of classroom observation, visits should be the improvement of learning. The visits should be inspirational and instructive rather than inspectional and repressive.

3. Classroom observation visits should afford each teacher a definite and concrete basis for improvement.

4. The evaluator's first concern should be for the safety, welfare and development of the students; and then for the safety, welfare and development of the teacher.

5. The evaluator should help the teacher use various measures of self-evaluation.

6. Teachers should feel free to discuss their problems and to make suggestions.

Data Collection

There are various methods that can be used to gather information on an individual during an evaluation process. These include, (a) classroom observations, (b) previously collected data including reports and the teacher's personnel file, (c) consultation with individuals who may provide information about the teacher, (d) structured interviews for generic or specific purposes, (e) lesson plans, and (f) students' work. When multiple methods and sources are used to obtain information, the data collected will back up any final decision made affecting the teacher. The data being described here pertain to information that an evaluator will have to gather when using this proposed design and are different from the data collected for this study.

Specific measurement of a teacher's performance may be obtained by direct observation, inventories, and interview data. Assessment of the teacher should not be based on impressions but on close observations of what a teacher does in the classroom. In addition, the evaluator should use self-report measures, written records and impressions of others about the teacher to write a full and complete report on the teacher.

I would recommend that the Office of Education personnel involve the principals and teachers in the preparation of an instrument(s) to be used for recording

data during an observation. These instruments could take the form of checklists, rating scales, or open ended forms. These forms should focus on individual or team goals. I would suggest they be developed cooperatively following the establishment of jointly agreed upon Conference and school criteria.

Schedule and Process for Collecting Data

Data should not be gained from only one source of information. Data can be obtained from the students, peers, self-evaluation, parents of the children, and classroom observations.

In planning for classroom observation, the evaluator should be acquainted with techniques for classroom observations and conferences. Careful planning by the evaluator should precede a classroom observation. When planning for a classroom observation, I would propose the following should be taken into account; the purpose of the observation, who initiated the visit, techniques to be used in data collection and duration of the visit, and plans for a post-conference.

Before an observation is conducted, I would recommend that the teacher be informed about the visit. Many teachers fear a visit by the evaluator and with good reason. They dislike having to defend methods and techniques that they have found unsuccessful. They also fear being rated by someone who drifts into and out of the classroom on an unannounced; unplanned visit.

Teacher evaluation should not be viewed as a one-time prediction activity, but rather as continuous throughout one's teaching career. Continuous assessment permits inspection of the teaching process. Because of this continuity, I am recommending that continuing contract teachers be formally observed in the classroom twice a year for about forty minutes. Probationary teachers should be observed four times during the probationary year and thereafter twice a year. This continuous process allows the evaluator to assess a teacher's progress relative to (a) achieving goals, (b) effectiveness of the teaching strategy, (c) acquisition of the desired behavior change(s), and (d) making decisions concerning alternative goals and the teaching strategy or method. This on-going process would then take into account all of a teacher's over-all performance and progress between periods of observation.

These data collection procedures should allow the teacher and the evaluator to work as a team and to concentrate on important classroom observations in the most practical way of collecting data about the teacher. It involves the intentional and methodical view of the teacher and students. Observing involves planned, carefully focused, and active attention by the observer. It involves all the senses and not just sight or hearing and should be a critical task of the observer. Classroom observation is considered one of the factors that contributes positively to teacher evaluation. For these reasons, I would propose that

a carefully planned classroom observation should be carried out with every teacher in the Conference.

Guidelines for Observation

In planning for classroom observations, I would recommend that the following outline be used as a guideline for observation:

1. The teacher's role in the classroom
    a. Maintains adequate student records
    b. Communicates with and motivates students. (See Good and Brophy (1978).)
    c. Plans, organizes and prepares instructional activities.
    d. Demonstrates skills in classroom management. (See Good and Brophy (1978).)
    e. Uses career education resources and concepts in teaching (resource people, trips, etc.)
2. The teacher as an individual
    a. Participates in achieving Conference and school standards and monitoring objectives.
    b. Assists in school program and activities.
    c. Is prompt in arriving at work and starting/ ending classes on time.
3. Recommendations

    This section is to be used to state the evaluator's recommendations for a teacher's improvement.

Method of Analysis

The data gethered are to be analyzed in terms of the goals set for teacher evaluation to see if these goals are being met and to determine areas of need. The analysis could be done under the following headings; goals of education and of the school, problems and needs of children and youth, teacher competence, and school improvement.

Analyzing the data under these headings makes it easier and clearer for the teacher to see areas of strengths and weaknesses. It also takes away the guesswork when the information is communicated back to the teacher. The analysis should also be done on the specific outcomes to be evaluated to see how those are being met and to determine the kind of follow-up the teacher would need.

Guidelines for Conferencing and Feedback

The goal of a follow-up conference between an evaluator and the teacher should be by cooperative planning, not the imposition of a plan on the teacher. A conference is an attempt to reach a union of minds and of purposes. The individual conference is the most important supervisory technique for use in the specific improvement of instruction. Below are certain proposed criteria to be followed by the evaluator in the formal follow-up conference:

1. First, the evaluator should establish rapport with the teacher at the beginning of the conference.

2. The evaluator should include a general commendation of the lesson as a whole, and specific aspects of the lesson.

3. The evaluator should commend the teacher on his/her skills.

4. The evaluator should help further the teacher's confidence in him/herself and his/her work.

5. the evaluator should include constructive suggestions whereby the teacher's good work can be further improved.

Teacher evaluation is not complete until the evaluator and the teacher have held the final conference to discuss the results of the data. This should be done at the end of the work day when the two can sit together and talk over what took place. When the evaluator has developed the final report of observation, the teacher should see and be given a chance to reply to it. A conference is the most important aspect of any appraisal. It provides an opportunity for the parties involved to plan for follow-up that is needed. This follow-up should be related to the identified needs of the teacher and the best methods or ways by which these needs can be met.

Follow-up and Professional Development

The rapidly changing scene in the instructional program is a challenge to instructional leadership in schools. It must be met with increased skill and understandings through

professional growth. Professional growth is promoted through the kind of organization that encourages members to exert leadership by stating their problems, by devising ways of seeking solutions, by participating in decision-making, and by accepting responsibility for the outcome. Teacher growth is promoted when teachers exchange ideas and when they are encouraged to test the hypotheses they establish.

Programs of curriculum improvement constitute in-service training. Too frequently it has been assumed that in-service education and curriculum development are separate functions. As teachers work on identifying inadequacies in the present program, they are growing in insight and in teaching skills. They themselves improve as they improve the program.

Underlying any program of improvement is a belief in people. If staff development is to be successful, then there must be a belief that teachers can grow. Here are some goals for carrying on such an effective staff development program:

1. Staff development training is not something that is provided by the official leader for members of the staff; he/she must also participate.

2. Staff development training must not be haphazard. The first task of the official leader is to learn what type is needed. A second source of guidance is the direction the Conference education program is taking.

3. Staff development is more profitable when it is centered on improving the Conference program.

4. Staff development should not be confined to experiences that provoke only academic growth.

5. Staff development needs to contribute to a growing together of the teachers in the Conference.

The staff development program should include all activities of school personnel that contribute to their continued professional growth and competence. Also it should be a program in which both supervisors and teachers grow in improving the learning situation of children. The basic goals of staff development should be improving instruction and the instructional program. In planning for staff development, the first problem is to determine needs then the next move is to determine how the teacher can be helped.

There is no single best method to use. The following are some techniques that could be used in staff development programs for personnel growth and improvement in educational program:

I. Group devices

A. Doing techniques

1. Workshops

2. Cbmmittees

B. Verbal techniques

1. Staff meeting

2. Group counseling

3. Course work

4. Documentary aids

5. Directed reading

C. Observational techniques

1. Directed observation

2. Field trips

3. Travel seminars

4. Audio-visual aids

II. Individual devices

A. Active techniques

1. Participation in the total teaching act.

2. Individual problem-solving

B. Verbal techniques

1. Individual conferences

2. Adjustment counseling

C. Observational techniques

1. Directed observation

2. Intervisitation

I would also indicate here that there are other techniques that could be recommended to the teacher. These include experimental studies, a course in tests and measurement, if needed, and the use of a professional library and learning or instructional centers.

Schedule for total process

In carrying out this whole process, the following schedule could be used for one year to see if this is a program that can be implemented permanently.

1. Schedule for classroom observation.

2. Visit the classroom for observation and data collection.

3. Conference and feedback.

A conference should be held with the teacher following a classroom observation to provide feedback on the teacher's performance and suggest follow-up activities.

4. Follow-up

The follow-up should use the technique that is appropriate and meets the needs of the individual teacher. The follow-up should be provided based on the identified needs. There is no single best method for a follow-up but the most appropriate method or technique should be used.

Assumptions Underlying Teacher Evaluation

The assumptions identified here were derived from the proposed design:

1. The most common and the most fundamental assumption about the purpose of teacher evaluation is that evaluation contributes to the professional development of teachers and the improvement of instruction (Ryan and Hickcox, 1980; Peterson, 1982; Sergiovanni and Starrat, 1983; and Hawley, 1976).

2. Salary increment, layoffs, promotions, or recommendations are not major purposes of teacher evaluation (Ryan and Hickcox, 1980).

3. An evaluation process should include many sources of evidence, so that there can be a valid base for decisions,

and an evaluation instrument should be used. (Peterson, 1982; Redfern, 1980; Bolton, 1973; Wiles and Lovell, 1975).

4. Experienced teachers do not need as much supervision as do probationary teachers. (Ryan and Hickcox, 1980; Vacc, 1982; Shinkfield, 1977; Redfern, 1982; and Peterson, 1982).

5. Observation of the teacher should be planned for and arranged before the actual observation takes place (Noonan, 1981; Hauge, 1981; Hayman, 1975; Hanko, 1973; Shinkfield, 1977).

6. A conference should be held with the teacher following classroom observations (Redfern, 1980; Hauge, 1981; Kowalski, 1978).

7. Staff development helps teachers grow professionally and improves their instructional performance (Howey and Vaughan, 1983; Griffin, 1983; Klopf, 1979; Sergiovanni and Elliot, 1975; and Howey, 1985).

Evaluation of the Design

The design can be evaluated using the following criteria to see if the stated goals are met:

Are these realistic goals?

What kind of data are collected to meet the stated goals? It is important that the goals be looked at in terms of data collection procedures.

What kind of professional development activities are to be provided for those who do not meet the goals? Answering

this question would also determine if these are goals that should be stated for the design.

How are stated goals going to be achieved? This is a question that should be looked into to see if the goals identified can be met.

Are these goals going to improve teacher effectiveness? Provisions should be made in which the information gained can help a teacher grow and develop as a professional in a supportive way with formal professional opportunities.

Implementation of the Design

In implementing this design, the following is an outline as to how to proceed.

Purposes

The evaluation of teachers in the Michigan Conference should have two purposes. One, the professional development of teachers which focuses primarily on the teaching staff in attempts to provide the means for the total staff to meet the students' needs--the academic, personal, social, intellectual, and career objectives that are perceived as essential to the goals of students and society. Two, the improvement of instruction which concentrates more on the objectives concerned with curriculum and instruction. Complete details on these two purposes are found in Marks, Stoops, and King-Stoops (1978, pp. 163-241); Wiles and Lovell (1975, pp. 121-187; 217-245); and Stoops, Rafferty and Johnson (1975, pp. 141-162).

Expected outcomes

These are the expected outcomes or goals of this proposed evaluation design system:

1. Help the professional staff see more clearly the goals of education and of the school.

2. Help teachers see the problems and needs of children and youth they will be teaching.

3. Provide effective democratic leadership in promoting the improvement of the school and its activities, and in fostering harmonious and cooperative staff relations.

4. Help the professional staff develop greater competence in teaching.

5. Aid teachers in the diagnosis and remediation of learning difficulties.

Additional information on expected outcomes can be obtained from Marks, Stoops and King-Stoops (1978, pp. 76-115; 289-336) and Ryan and Hickcox (1980).

Instruments

Different instruments may be used to observe behavior in the classroom. They may be classified in various ways but should have the following characteristics (a) a purpose or reason for the observation, (b) a recording procedure that specifies when and in what units behaviors are to be observed, and (d) methods of analyzing data. Complete details on various instruments may be obtained from McNergney and Carrier (1981, pp. 73-119); Borich (1974); and Marks, Stoops, and King-Stoops (1978, pp. 211-242; 289-336).

Apart from direct classroom observation of the teacher, other methods of data collection should be used. Information could be obtained from sources such as student evaluation of the teacher, teacher self-evaluation, peer evaluations, and evaluation of children's parents.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to present (a) a summary of the study, (b) conclusions drawn from the findings of this study, and (c) recommendations based on the results of this study.

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was two-fold; first, to investigate the current teacher evaluation practices and the perceptions held toward those practices by elementary school principals in the Michigan Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, and second, to design a proposed evaluation system for the Conference.

The research questions for this study were grouped into two categories; (A) how the Adventist schools in the Michigan Conference currently evaluate their elementary teachers, and (B) process for designing an educational practice--teacher evaluation.

A. How Adventist Schools Currently Evaluate Teachers

The first purpose of this study was to provide information on how Adventist schools currently evaluate their teachers. The research questions were:

1. What is the purpose of teacher evaluation in Seventh-day Adventist schools?

2. What are the current teacher evaluation practices being used in the Seventh-day Adventist elementary schools?

3. What is the Adventist elementary school principal's perception toward current teacher evaluation practices?

4. Are there differences in teacher evaluation practices between Seventh-day Adventist schools and current practices found in research?

B. Process for Designing an Educational Practice

The question to be answered in this section dealt with whether the formal process used here results in the incorporation of research findings into educational practice.

The population of this study consisted of all fifty-five elementary school principals in the Michigan Conference. The survey instrument and the cover letters were sent to the principals by first class mail, and seventy-three percent of the principals responded.

Data analysis was done by a tabular arrangement of the items with an account of the number of observations for each

item. The account given was based on the number of responses for each item computed into percent.

A proposed design of educational practice--teacher evaluation--that could be used by the Michigan Conference was developed. The research synthesis and contextual data formed the base for this design.

A summary of significant findings dealing with how elementary schools in the Michigan Conference currently evaluate teachers is presented according to the four research questions and general areas investigated in this study, (a) purpose of teacher evaluation, (b) current evaluation practices, (c) Adventist elementary school principal's perception toward current teacher evaluation practices, and (d) differences in teacher evaluation practices between the Michigan Conference elementary schools and those found in research.

Purpose of Teacher Evaluation

What is the purpose of teacher evaluation in the Michigan Conference elementary schools? The responses to this question showed that there was a dual purpose of teacher evaluation; professional development, and improvement of instruction as indicated by 82% and 75% of the respondents respectively. Layoffs, promotion and tenure were checked less frequently as purposes for evaluation.

The principals also reported that teacher evaluation was not used as a basis for salary raises. This purpose was checked less frequently by those responding to the survey.

Current Evaluation Practices

What are the current teacher evaluation practices being used in the Seventh-day Adventist elementary schools? Teaching techniques and student achievement ranked high as criteria for classroom observation. The least used criteria was professional goals.

The principal, superintendent, and assistant superintendent all observed teachers in the classroom but the assistant superintendent does most of the observations in the schools.

The most frequently used sources of information when observing teachers in the classroom were found to be lesson plans and materials used by the teacher. The least used source was video-tape recording. Probationary teachers were observed in the classroom from three to four times a year while continuing contract teachers were observed twice a year.

For the continuing contract teachers, most of the classroom visits were unannounced whereas for probationary teachers, there were prior arrangements made before the observation was done. And, these classroom observations last anywhere from 20 to 40 minutes.

A conference was always held with both probationary and continuing contract teachers following classroom observation and it was also indicated that a written report of the observation was always made.

Follow-up information was provided as deemed necessary and it was found that only two schools currently used a local school instrument for teacher evaluation.

Adventist Elementary School Principal's Perception

What is the Adventist elementary school principal's perception toward current teacher evaluation practices? Thirty-five percent of the principals responding indicated that the present teacher evaluation practices "need to improve" while 45% felt "generally satisfied." Most of the principals saw the emphasis on criteria used in teacher selection as consistent with teacher evaluation practices. Sixty-six percent of the principals responding to the open-ended item indicated that there was a need for formalized teacher evaluation procedures.

Differences in Teacher Evaluation Practices

Are there differences in teacher evaluation practices between Seventh-day Adventist schools and current practices found in research? It was found that there were no differences with regards to the purpose of teacher evaluation.

For the elementary schools, available research findings state that the principal is the primary evaluator of teachers in his/her school (Noonan, 1981; Peterson, 1982; Ryan and Hickcox, 1980; Hodel, 1979; Washington, 1977; Nield and Oldham, 1974; and Goedken, 1969). In the Michigan

Conference schools, it was found that the principal is not the key person in teacher evaluation.

Evaluation of teachers can be done through different methods and techniques (Redfern, 1980; Peterson, 1982; Noonan, 1981; Shinkfield, 1977; Anderson and Hanko, 1973; and Kleinman, 1966). In the Michigan Conference, a variety of methods and techniques were employed. The only technique that was not used was clinical supervision.

Process for Designing and Educational Practice

To answer the (B) section of the research questions, a design of an educational practice was developed that could be used by the Michigan Conference. This design was organized according to the contextual factors and knowledge base and included, (a) rationale and purpose of teacher evaluation, (b) procedures and elements of teacher evaluation, (c) follow-up and staff development (d) assumptions underlying the proposed design, and (e) a proposed plan for evaluating the design.

Conclusions

The conclusions of this study are based on the review of related literature, the data collected from the elementary school principals who responded to the survey instrument administered for this investigation, and the process for designing and educational practice.

Principals in the Adventist schools were not involved in the process of teacher evaluation as they should. The

responses received indicated principals were actually involved in only 18% of the schools, while in reality, the principal should be the main evaluator. In elementary schools, "principals are regarded as the primary evaluators" (Noonan, 1981, p. 160).

Teacher evaluation in the Michigan Conference was perfunctory. In most cases the formal classroom observations were unannounced and the purpose of the visit is not made known to the teacher. Also the results of the evaluation process were not used for such things as promotion, layoffs or salary increments. The purpose of evaluation was developed by the Conference Office of Education without the involvement of the principals or the teachers and in some instances this purpose was not communicated to the teachers.

Concerning the design for an educational practice, it can be concluded that the formal process used resulted in the incorporation of research findings into educational practice. The design process proposed here was built on the research or knowledge base found in Chapter II which acted as the foundation for the whole design. This design process provided a means "by which theory/research can be directly related to practice providing a means for modifying practices based on research" (Hatfield, 1984, p. 122).

Recommendations for Further Study

The findings, summary, and conclusions of this study resulted in the following recommendations for further study:

1. A similar study be conducted to determine the perceptions and attitudes of teachers regarding formal evaluation practices.

2. Replication of the present study should be conducted with a larger population involving more Conferences within the Adventist Organizational system.

3. More studies need to be done that incorporate research findings into educational practice.

4. Research needs to be conducted to determine the inservice needs of elementary school principals which would enable them, through teacher evaluation, to assist teachers in improving classroom instruction.

REFERENCES

Acheson, K.A. & Call, M.D. (1980). Techiniques in the clinical supervision of teachers. New York: Longman.

Adams, E. (ed.) (1975). In-service education and teachers' centers. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Adelman, C. & Alexander, R.J. (1982). The self-evaluating institution. London: Methuen.

Alkin, M.C.; Richard, D. & Peter, W. (1979). Using evaluations. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, Inc.

Anderson, C.C. & Hunko, S.M. (1964). Teacher evaluation: Some problems and a proposal. Harvard Educational Review, 34, 74-75.

Baker, E. (1984). Can educational research inform educational practice? Yes. Phi Delta Kappan, 65(7), 453-455.

Barth, R.S. (1978). Teacher evaluation and staff development. Principal. 54, 74-77.

Becher, T.; Erant, M. & Knight, J. (1981). Policies for educational accountability. London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Beecher, R. (1979). Staff evaluation: The essential administrative task. Phi Delta Kappan, 60, 515-517.

Bell, T.H. (1974). A performance accountability system for school administrators. West Nyack, N.Y.: Parker Publishing Books.

Blumberg, A. (1974). A private cold war. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Bolton, D.L. (February, 1973). Collecting evaluation data. National education elementary principal, 52(5), 76-86.

Bolton, D.L. (1973). Selection and evaluation of teachers. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Borg, W.R. (1973). Educational research and development and educational change. In J.K. Hemphill & F.S. Rosenau (eds.). Educational development. Eugene, Oregon: Center for Advanced Study of Educational Administration.

Borg, W.R. (1973). The balance between research and development. In Hemphill & Rosenau. Ibid.

Borich, G.D. & Madden, S.K. (1977). Evaluating classroom instruction: A sourcebook of instruments. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Borich, G. (ed.) (1974). Evaluating educational programs and products. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Teaching Technology Publications.

Brandt, R.M. (1973). Toward a taxonomy of observational information. In W. Charles & R.M. Brandt (ed.). Observational methods in the classroom. Washington, D.C., Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Brody, J.A. (July, 1977). A good teacher is harder to define than to find. The American School Board Journal. 164, pp. 25-28.

Brophy, J. & Evertson, C. (1976). Learning from teaching. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Buchmann, M. (1983). The use of research knowledge in teacher education and teaching. (Occasional Paper No. 71). East Lansing, MI: Institute for Research on Teaching, MSU, 1983.

Carroll, J. (1981). Faculty self-evaluation. In J. Millman (ed.). Handbook of teacher evaluation. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.

Cogan, M. (1973). Clinical Supervision. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Coker, H.; Medley, D.; & Soar, R. (1980). How valid are expert opinions about effective teaching? Phi Delta Kappan, 62, 131-135.

Cooley, W. & Lohnes, P. (1976). Evaluation research in education. New York: Irrington Publishers.

Dillon-Peterson, B. (ed.) (1981). Staff development/ organization development perspective. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Yearbook. Alexandria, Virginia: ASCD.

Doyle, K. (1983). Evaluating Teaching. Lexington, Massachusets.

Duck, L. (1981). Teaching with charisma. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Duke, D. & Corno, L. (1981). Evaluating staff development. In B. Dillon-Peterson (ed.). Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Yearbook. Alexandria, Virginia: ASCD.

Eble, K.E. (ed) (1980). Improving teaching styles. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

_____. (1975). Evaluation handbook. Fairfax, Virginia: Fairfax County Public Schools.

Eisner, E. (1984). Can educational research inform educational practice? Phi Delta Kappan, 65(7), 447-452.

Flanders, N.A. (1970). Analyzing teaching behavior. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Gage, N.L. (1978). The scientific basis of the art of teaching. New York: Teachers College Press.

Galloway, M. (1973). The nonverbal realities of classroom life. In Charles W. Beegle & Richard M. Brandt (ed.). Observation Methods in the Classroom. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development in Education, 43-45.

Goldhammer, R. (1969). Clinical observation. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Good, T. & Brophy, J. (1978). Looking in classrooms. NY: Harper and Row, 1978.

Gray, J. (1979). Reading progress in English infant schools: Some problems emerging from a study of teacher effectiveness. British Educational Research Journal. 5(2), pp. 141-157.

Griffin, G. (ed.) (1983). Staff development. 82nd Yearbook of the NSSE, Part 2. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hatfield, R. (1984). Functions and tasks of teaching. East Lansing: Unpublished manuscript.

Hatfield, R. (1984). The structure and development of knowledge for educational practice. East Lansing: Unpublished manuscript.

Hauge, B. (1981). A study of teacher evaluation practices and perceived attitudes of those practices by elementary school principals in the twin cities. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Minnesota.

Hawley, R.C. (1976). Evaluating teaching: A handbook of positive approaches. Amherst, Massachusetts: Education Research Associates.

Hemphill, J. & Rosenau, F. (eds.) (1973). Educational development. Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration.

Hemphill, J. (1973). Educational research, educational development and evaluation. In Hemphill, J. & Rosenau, F. (eds.). Educational Development. Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration.

Hemphill, J. (1973). Educational development. In Hemphill, J. & Rosenau, F. (eds.). Educational development. Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration.

Herman, J.J. (1973). Developing an effective school staff evaluation program. West Nyack, NY: Parker Publishing Company.

Hite, H. & Howey, K. (1977). Planning inservice teacher education: Promising alternatives. ERIC.

Hodgkinson, H.L.; Hurst, J.; & Levine, H. (1975). Improving and assessing performance. Berkeley, CA: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education.

Holzner, B. & Marx, J. (1979). Knowledge application: The knowledge system in society. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

House, E. (ed.) (1973). School evaluation: The politics and process. Berkeley, CA: MuCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Howey, K. (1985). Six major functions of staff development: An expanded imperative. Journal of Teacher Education, 36(1), 58-64.

Howey, K. & Vaughan, J. (1985). Current patterns of staff development. In G. Griffin (Ed.). Staff development, 36(1), 58-64.

Howsan, R.B. (1976). Current issues in education. Natural Elementary Principal, 52(5), 12-17.

Hughes, M.M. (1959). Assessment of the quality of teaching in elementary schools. University of Utah.

Hyman, R.T. (1975). School administrator's handbook of teacher supervision and evaluation methods. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Jones, A.S.; Bagford, L.W.; & Wallen, E.A. (1979). Strategies for teaching. Metuchen, NJ.

Johnson, E.W. (1979). Teaching school. Boston: National Association of Independent Schools.

Johnson, C.E.; Okey, J.R.; Capie, W.; Ellett, C.; & Adams, P.T. (1978). Identifying and verifying genetic teacher competencies. Athens, GA: College of Education University of Georgia.

Kleinman, G.A. (April, 1966). Assessing teacher effectiveness: The state of the art. Science Education, 50(3), 234.

Klopf, G. (1978). The principal and staff development in the elementary school. Bank Street College of Education.

Klopf, G. (1979). The principal and staff development in the school. Bank Street College of Education.

Kniker, C.R. & Naylor, N.A. (1981). Teaching today and tomorrow. Columbus: Charles E. Merril Publishing Company.

Kounin, J.S. (1970). Discipline and group management in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Washington.

Kowalski, J.P.S. (1978). Evaluating teacher performance. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

Lancaster, O.E. (1974). Effective teaching and learning. New York: Gordon and Breach.

Manatt, R.P.; Palmer, K.; & Hidlebaugh, E. (1976). Teacher performance evaluation with improved rating scales. The Bulletin, NASSP, 60(401), 21-24.

Marks, J.; Stoops, E; & King-Stoops, J. (1978). Handbook of educational supervision, Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Marshall, J. & Caldwell, S. (1984). How valid are formal and informal needs assessment methods for planning staff development programs? NASSP Bulletin, 68(475), 24-30.

McGreal, T. (1980). Helping teachers set goals. Educational Leadership, 37(5), 414-419.

McNeil, J.D. (1967). Concomitants of using behavioral objectives. Journal of Experimental Education. 31(1).

McNergney, R.F. & Carrier, C.A. (1981). Teacher development. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co.

Medley, M. (1973). Closing the gap between research in teacher effectiveness and the teacher education curriculum. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 7, 39-46.

Medley, M. (1982). Teacher competency testing and the teacher educator. Charlottesville, VA: Bureau of Educational Research.

Merenbloom, E. (1984). Staff development: The key to effective middle level schools. NASSP Bulletin, 68(474), 25-32.

Millman, J. (ed.) (1981). Handbook of teacher evaluation. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Mohan, M. & Hull, R.E. (1975). Teaching effectiveness: Its meaning, assessment, and improvement. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Education Technology Publications.

Ness, M. (1980). The administrator as instructional supervisor. Educational Leadership, 37(5), 404-406.

Noonan, J.A. (1981). An analysis of perceptions of Michigan superintendents, principals, and teachers in regard to present versus preferred teacher evaluation systems, Doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University.

Oldham, N. (1974). Evaluating teachers for professional growth. Arlington, VA: National School Public Relations Association.

_____. (January, 1975). Observation procedures, in Staff evaluation skills, pp. 3.32 g/h 1-2. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators, National Academy for School Executives.

Olds, R. (1973). Self-evaluation for teachers and administrators. Washington, Ohio: School Management Institute.

Peterson, C.H. (1982). A century's growth in teacher evaluation in the United States. New York: Vantage Press.

Peterson, P.L. & Walberg, H.J. (1979). Research on teaching. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Peterson, D. & Ward, A. (1980). Due Process in Teacher Evaluation. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America.

Popham, W.J. (November, 1974). Pitfalls and pratfalls of teacher evaluation. Educational Leadership, 32, 141-146.

Popham, W. (May, 1972). Found: A practical procedure to appraise teacher achievement in the classroom. Nations School, (89).

Redfern, G.B. (1980). Evaluating teachers and administrators: A performance objectives approach. Boulder: Westview Press.

Remmers, H.H. (1963). Rating methods in research on teaching. In N.L. Gage (Ed.). Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 329-378.

Rose, C. & Nyre, G.F. (1977). The practice of evaluation. ERIC.

Rose, G.W. (November, 1963). The effects of administrative evaluation. National Elementary principal, 43, 50-56.

Rossi, P. & Freeman, H. (1982). Evaluation: A systematic approach. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Roy, J.J. (February, 1979). Teacher evaluation in an era of educational change. The Clearing House, 52, 275-276.

Rubin, L. (1978). Perspectives on preservice and inservice education. Syracuse, NY: National Disseminational Center.

Ryan, D.W. & Hickcox, E.S. (1980). Redefining teacher evaluation. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Ryans, D.G. (1960). Characteristics of teachers. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Sargent, R. (February, 1979). An appraisal scheme for teaching. Schoolmaster and career teacher, 37-39.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (Ed.). (1975). Professional supervision for professional teachers. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Sergiovanni, T.J. & Elliot, D. (1975). Educational and organizational leardership in elementary schools. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Sergiovanni, T.J. & Starrat, R.J. (19830. Supervision: Human perspectives. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Shinkfield, A.J. (1977). The professional improvement of teachers through positive appraisal techniques. Doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University.

Simon, H. (1969). The sciences of the artificial. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Simpson, R.H. (1966). Teacher self-evaluation. New York: MacMillan.

_____. (1967). The evaluation of teaching. Washington, D.C.: Pi Lambda Theta.

Soar, R.; Medley, D.; & Coker, H. (1983). Teacher evaluation: A critique of currently used methods. Phi Delta Kappan, 65(4), 239-246.

Tinkuoff, W. & Ward, B. (1983). Collaborative research on teaching. The Elementary School Journal, 83(4), 453-468.

Trump, J. & Miller, D. (1979). Secondary school curriculum improvement: Meeting changes of the times. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Vacc, N.A. (1982). A conceptual framework for continuous assessment of clients. Measurement and evaluation in guidance, 15(9), 30-35.

Walberg, H.J. (1974). Evaluating educational performance. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Washington, E. (1971). Expert teacher action program. Belmont, CA: Fearon Publishers/Lear Siegler, Inc.

Weller, R.H. (1971). Verbal communication in instructional supervision. New York: Teachers' College Press.

Wiles, K. & Bondi, J. (1980). Supervising a guide to practice. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co.

Wiles, K. & Lovell, J. (1975). Supervision for better schools. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Wilson, D. (1981). The relative impact of two forms of assessment data feedback on a teacher's perceived strengths and needs for improvement. Michigan State University, Unpublished Dissertation.

Yarger, S.; Howey, K.; Joyce, B. Inservice teacher education Palo Alto, CA: Booksend Laboratory.

Appendices

Appendix A

Cover Letter and Questionnaire

July 28, 1985

Dear Principal,

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research study on "Teacher Evaluation Practices." Presently, I am a Ph.D. candidate in the Teacher Education Department at Michigan State University. I am currently on assignment to join the faculty of the University of Eastern Africa, Kenya.

You have been selected to be an important part of this survey. I, therefore, personally invite you to participate in this research study by taking a few minutes of your valuable time to complete and to return the attached survey instrument. Without your response, it is impossible to complete this study.

The Michigan Conference Office of Education has expressed great interest in the results of this study which may be used in the improvement of teacher evaluation practices. As a professional educator, the results of this study will also be beneficial to you. The time required to fill out this survey is only fifteen minutes.

All the data collected will be treated with strict confidentiality. To ensure you confidentiality, the information received will be used for overall analyses only and you will not be identified individually or by school. If you or your school wants a copy of the final results of this study, it will be provided. Please return the completed survey and the requested forms, if available, in the enclosed, stamped, self-addressed envelope.

I must thank you in advance for giving this matter your top priority since I am expected at the place of my appointment, Kenya, by December, 1985. Please return the information requested by August 24, 1985. Thank you very much for your prompt, professional assistance.

Sincerely,

Grace H. Ongwela

Enclosure

MICHIGAN CONFERENCE
of Seventh-day Adventists

Phone (517) 485-2226
P.O. Box 19009
Lansing, Michigan 48901

June 18, 1985

ELEMENTARY AND JUNIOR ACADEMY PRINCIPALS
Michigan Conference

Dear Friends:

Today I had the pleasure of meeting with Dr. and Mrs. Gado Ongwela. They are currently under appointment to join the staff of our Adventist college in Kenya, the University of Eastern Africa.

Mrs. Ongwela is completing the requirements for her Ph.D. Degree in Teacher Education at Michigan State University. As part of her thesis research she would like each of you to assist her by completing the short questionnaire she has prepared. Your prompt reply will be greatly appreciated.

May the Lord's blessings be yours as we work together to finish His work.

Sincerely,

T. Alvin Astrup

T. Alvin Astrup
Superintendent of Education

lsr

A STUDY OF TEACHER EVALUATION PRACTICES

This survey shall refer to classroom teachers who are employed on a full-time contract in grades K-8 in Michigan Conference of Seventh-day Adventist.

Please complete each question as indicated on the survey.

1. What is the purpose of teacher evaluation in your school? (please check those which apply)

___Tenure
___Salary increament
___Dismissal
___Professional improvement
___Other (please specify)
___Promotion
___Improvement of instruction
___Layoff

2. How was this purpose developed?

___By the conference office of education
___By the school board and teachers
___By the principal and teachers
___Don't know
___Other (please specify)

3. How is the purpose made known to the teacher?

___Individual conference
___Policy statements
___Written correspondence
___Other (please specify)
___Not made known
___Faculty meeting

4. What criteria do you use for teacher evaluation?

___Teacher knowledge
___Teacher beliefs and characteristics
___Student achievement
___Teaching techniques
___Professional goals
___Other (please specify)

5. Who does the actual observation of the teacher in the classroom?

___Principal
___Superintendent
___Assistant superintendent
___Other (please specify)

	Tenure/continuing contract teachers	Probationary teachers
6. Which of the following best describes how information is obtained for evaluation? (please check one in each column)		
A checklist which describes teacher characteristics is used in the classroom observation	____	____
Teacher and principal set goals before classroom observation...	____	____
Achievement test scores are used to evaluate teacher performance.....	____	____
Students rate their teachers...	____	____
Lesson plans and materials are used.....	____	____
Parent contacts.....	____	____
Use of video-tape recording to evaluate teacher performance...	____	____
Teachers formally evaluate each other's performance in written report.....	____	____
Specific detailed observation of teacher's or children's verbal and non-verbal behavior is collected.....	____	____
Other (please specify).....	____	____
7. How often is the teacher formally observed in the classroom? (Please check one in each column)		
Once a week.....	____	____
Once a month.....	____	____
Once a year.....	____	____
Twice a year.....	____	____
Once every two years.....	____	____
Other (please specify).....	____	____

	Tenure/continuing contract teachers	Probationary teachers
8. Which of the following best describes the means by which formal classroom visits are scheduled? (please check one in each column)		
Teacher request.....	____	____
Principal request.....	____	____
Unannounced.....	____	____
Other (please specify).....	____	____
9. What is the approximate length of the formal classroom observation? (please check one in each column)		
10 minutes.....	____	____
20 minutes.....	____	____
30 minutes.....	____	____
40 minutes.....	____	____
Other (please specify)	____	____
10. A conference is held with the teacher following the formal classroom evaluation. (please check one in each column).....		
Always.....	____	____
Sometimes.....	____	____
Never.....	____	____
11. Is a written report made of the observations? (please check those which apply in each column)		
Always.....	____	____
Sometimes.....	____	____
Never.....	____	____
12. What type of follow-up information do you provide the teacher with after a classroom observation? (please check one in each column)		
Provide resources.....	____	____
Workshops, seminars, in-service training.....	____	____
Set goals for improvement.....	____	____
Other (please specify).....	____	____

13. Is teacher evaluation in your school based on student achievement?

___Yes ___No ___Partially

14. Do you use a local school developed instrument for evaluation of teachers?

Tenured/continuing teachers	___Yes	___No
Probationary teachers	___Yes	___No

15. How do you feel about your present teacher evaluation practices?

___Not satisfied
___Need to improve
___Generally satisfied
___Completely satisfied

16. Do you see the emphasis on criteria used in teacher selection as consistent with your evaluation practices?

___Yes ___No

17. Please indicate your comments and suggestions for the improvement of your present teacher evaluation practices.

_____

_____

_____

18. If the following copies are available, please enclose.

	Enclosed	Not available
School evaluation instrument.....	____	____
Student evaluation forms.....	____	____
Self-evaluation instrument.....	____	____
Peer evaluation instrument.....	____	____
Other instruments/forms.....	____	____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR SINCERE COOPERATION IN COMPLETING THIS SURVEY!

Appendix B

Conference Statements on Teacher Evaluation

TEACHER EVALUATION PROGRAM

It is the objective of the Office of Education to evaluate the teachers periodically as determined by the Office of Education. Both formal and informal evaluation procedures will be used. The primary objective of the evaluation is to assist the teacher in becoming more professional in his/her work. Teachers of larger schools may be evaluated by their principals in cooperation with the Office of Education.

The steps in a formal evaluation are:

A. Visit by the evaluator in the classroom for at least one hour with the teacher.

B. Comparison of self-evaluation and evaluation by evaluator.

C. Establishment of objectives for improvement and date for completion.

D. Return by evaluator after completion date for objectives for a visit of at least one hour.

E. Conference between evaluator and evaluatee for an evaluation of the work completed on the objectives.

F. Complete the report which is signed by both evaluator and evaluatee with a copy going to the files of the Office of Education.

An informal evaluation will be a brief visit, which may or may not bring forth a written report, but usually has some dialog between teacher and evaluator.

Appendix C

School Evaluation Instrument

BATTLE CREEK ACADEMY

TEACHER EVALUATION

Teacher _____ School _____

Subject Area _____ Evaluator _____

BASIC PURPOSE: The purpose of this form is fourfold: (a) for the improvement of instruction, (b) for the professional growth of the teacher, (c) to insure optimum learning opportunities for the student, (d) and to provide for teacher self-evaluation.

Directions: [+] Commendable [-] Area of Concern
[S] Satisfactory [ ] Leave box empty when evaluation cannot be made

CLASSROOM

Appearance [ ]
Physical Comfort [ ]
Display of Learning Material [ ]

AFFECTIVE CLIMATE

Democratic Control [ ]
Positive Rapport [ ]
Student Respect [ ]

PROFESSIONAL MANNER

Appropriate Professional Behavior [ ]
Enthusiasm [ ]
Fair Mindedness [ ]

Classroom Practices Consistent with SDA Philosophy [ ]

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Goals Clearly Stated [ ]
Objectives Appropriate to Goals [ ]
Activities Directed Toward Goals and Objectives [ ]

TEACHING PROCEDURES

Active Response [ ]
Appropriate Practice [ ]
Individual Differentiation [ ]
Perceived Purpose [ ]
Graduated Sequence [ ]
Knowledge of Results [ ]
Appropriate Evaluative Procedures [ ]

GENERAL TEACHING "METHOD"

_____

INSTRUCTIONAL MEDIA USED

_____

GENERAL OBSERVATION: _____

_____

_____

_____ Evaluator's Signature: _____ Date: _____

TEACHER'S OBSERVATION: _____

_____

_____

Date of Consultation*: _____ Teacher's Signature **: _____

* The consultation is based upon _____ number of classroom visits on the following dates on which this evaluation form was used: _____. The teacher's signature is required on the form used at the time of the consultation.

** Signature does not necessarily imply agreement with the evaluation given.

White Copy - School Yellow Copy - Teacher