1978

An Analysis of Teacher Evaluation Practices in the Chicago Public Schools

Alice C. Blair
Loyola University Chicago

AN ANALYSIS OF TEACHER EVALUATION PRACTICES IN THE CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

by

ALICE C. BLAIR

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Loyola University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education

April

1978

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation to my advisor, Dr. Phillip Carlin, who offered valuable suggestions and constructive criticism to improve this work.

I would also like to thank Dr. Jasper Valenti and Dr. Melvin Heller for their encouragement throughout the preparation of this study.

The writer warmly acknowledges the understanding and continuous assistance of a friend, Dr. Daisy Balsley.

I wish to thank Mr. Virgil Bock for typing the final draft of this study.

I especially wish to express my gratitude to my secretary, Mrs. Grace Mathis, who unselfishly gave of her time to help bring this effort into fruition.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Widespread criticism of schools, the accountability movement, and the recent trend toward state mandated evaluation are placing intense pressures on educators to evaluate.

Probably no aspect of education has been discussed with greater frequency, with as much deep concern, or by more educators and citizens than has that of teacher effectiveness--how to define it, how to identify it, how to measure it, how to evaluate it, and how to detect and remove obstacles to its achievement.

Separate facets of this problem have been studied, too, by state and local school systems, by individuals, and by teams of educational researchers at universities. However, findings about the competence of teachers are inconclusive and piecemeal, and little is presently known for certain about teacher excellence.

The problem is not an idle one. The domestic scene and world outlook both clearly demonstrate the urgent need for more and better education for all men. Of all societies, the free one depends most heavily on quality education for the fulfillment of its destiny. Thus the teacher and the quality of his teaching are of paramount importance.

One finds general agreement that the goal should be a highly competent teacher in every classroom and correspondingly

competent administrators and consulting specialists in all leadership positions in the school system. One finds considerably less agreement, however, on the meaning and evaluation of competence.

In recent years a major concern of school administrators, school board members, parents, and teachers has focused on ways and means of establishing merit salary schedules or methods to measure teacher performance. Unfortunately, discussions of teacher effectiveness are often fraught with more emotion than good sense. It is not unusual to hear such statements as, "It can be done if you have the courage.", or "It is all right in theory, but not in practice.", or "Such action will destroy the morale of teachers and wreck the profession." Well-known authors and speakers often appear as ardent champions of teacher evaluation or implacable foes of the menace being proposed, and many schemes for teacher evaluation have been proposed, adopted, defamed, defended, or dropped by concerned educators and school systems.

Nor have researchers been inactive. Recent summaries have revealed that literally thousands of studies have been conducted on teacher excellence since the beginning of the twentieth century. Investigators have looked at teacher training, traits, behaviors, attitudes, values, abilities, sex, weight, voice quality and many other characteristics. Teacher effects have been judged by investigators themselves, by pupils, by administrators and parents, by master teachers, by practice teachers, and by teachers themselves. The apparent results of teaching

have been studied, including pupil learning, adjustment, classroom performance, sociometric status, attitudes, liking for school, and later achievement. Yet, with all this research activity, results have been modest and often contradictory. Few, if any, facts are now deemed established about teacher effectiveness, and many former "findings" have been repudiated.

It is not an exaggeration to say that we do not today know how to select, train for, encourage or evaluate teacher effectiveness. Also, many educational researchers have abandoned the field of complex topics: the study of classroom interaction.

Such dismal results provide little comfort for the school administrator who is confronted with everyday, real problems in the field of teacher excellence. Practical decisions have to be made, and these decisions are dependent upon ideas about quality of teaching.[1]

Evaluation of school personnel is, by its very nature, a complex and difficult task. Yet, we should expect no less of an endeavor that requires us to judge human behavior in an objective and rational manner. However, it seems to us that much of the recent controversy concerning evaluation reflects our current confusion and disagreement on the goals and objectives of education. Although few of us would quarrel with the importance of evaluation as a basis for decision making that helps us progress toward certain goals and objectives, there is less

---

[1]Bruce J. Biddle & William J. Elleva, Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964), pp. 5-6.

concensus now on what those goals should be than at any time in our history. The problem is critical to the whole topic of evaluation, for as Robert Howsan points out:

> In the absence of substantial agreement on purpose, agreement on evaluation is impossible. It is this impression in educational objectives that has led to efforts to evaluate what the teacher is and what the teacher, or the pupil, does.[1]

Right now, attacks on the schools are taking place with unprecedented frequency and fury. Solutions range from doing away with them altogether to turning them over to big business (which, in the minds of many Americans, has assumed an almost mythological ability to get things done).[2]

Whereever there are human beings, there will be evaluation. Man is a valuing and a goal-seeking being. Even if he were to decide not to evaluate, he would end up evaluating how well he had succeeded in giving up evaluating.

Adequate evaluation has been a central concern of educators and researchers for many years. It remains so even though much progress, particularly in measurement, has been made. A reasonable prediction would be that ongoing instructional development of a rather radical nature will cause a continuation of the pressure. In addition, many more issues will emerge.

Never in the history of education in this country, has there been so much external demand for evaluation. Rising costs, troubles within schools, loud voices of criticism, the specific

---

[1]Robert B. Howsan, "Current Issues In Evaluation," National Elementary Principal (October 1973): p. 12.

[2]National Elementary Principal (October 1973): p. 1.

attention of the federal government, and the widespread emphasis on accountability are all factors contributing to the heightened interest. It would appear that responding to these pressures will be a major task of educators for some time to come.[1]

Principals tend to view evaluation like a mother-in-law--necessary, but sometimes difficult to live with. This is especially true when evaluation is used synonymously with accountibility. Are the two words synonymous? Are both interchangeable with appraisal?

Several writers have attempted to make a distinction by delineating the differences in dictionary fashion. However, usuage, not scholarly definition, determines word meaning. In point of fact, we do use these terms interchangeable, and I do not intend to devote any attention to the argument that each has colorations that make it unique. However, using all the terms synonymously permits me to draw on many sources to scrutinize the question, "How are we doing as principals?"

Evaluate, appraise, judge, determine, review, prove, measure, account--all are parts of speech whose identification as a particular word form varies with usage and placement within a clause. All suggest that the adults involved in the education of children are responsible for a relationship between the objectives promised, the resources utilized, and the outcomes realized. Evaluation should be a matching of intent to results, a comparison of what was expected to happen with what did happen.

The meaning and intent of these words varies considerably

---

[1]Howsan, p. 12.

from location to location. In one school system, principal evaluation can mean the method for determining rewards; in another, the device for meting out punishment; in a third, it can mean either, and in a fourth, it may be a meaningless exercise, full of sound and fury, but signifying nothing.

Hence, we must recognize early that administrative evaluation can have several distinct and significantly different purposes.

American education has always been accountable to the public (at least in theory) because in most school systems, the board of education represents the public and the public must approve taxes and other revenue sources that operate the schools. Recently a growing number of people have been voicing the belief that it is possible and desirable to hold school people accountable for the results of their activities. They are convinced that a process, a person, or an organization should be judged by the quality and quantity of its output, and that school administrators are no exception to this belief.

In this context, evaluation is an acknowledgment of our often uttered preachment that the principal is the single most important determiner of educational climate in the school. Evaluation, therefore, seeks to ascertain, "How well have you done?"[1]

Therefore, the issue is not whether there will be evaluation; rather it must involve questions such as: what, by whom, for what purpose, and with what consequence.

---

[1]William Pharies, "Evaluation of School Principals," National Elementary Principal (October 1973): pp. 36-37.

Since the principal has the primary responsibility for teacher evaluation, it is important he understands the purposes, the criteria, the approaches, and methods and procedures for teacher evaluation in the Chicago Public Schools.

A comprehensive survey of evaluation practices in the Chicago Public Schools provides the potential for communication between principals regarding evaluation practices. It can lead to a comparison of these practices with other principals and those described in the review of literature. This communication and literature review can lead to an improvement of teacher evaluation in the Chicago Schools.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Each elementary school system is confronted with complicated problems of providing the best education with the facilities available to them and under conditions unique to their situation.

An analysis of the evaluation practices of teachers by principals, their use and their effectiveness in their respective schools, is required. Also, an analysis of these studies by principals as a group is necessary. By studying the practices used in each school, administrators may be able to determine some fundamental guidelines to follow that will enable a principal to fulfill his role as an evaluator/administrator.

When does a principal know if his practices for teacher evaluation produce reliable, factual, usable information for studying the performance of a teacher?

In the Chicago Public Schools there are no system-wide

criteria to determine the evaluation practices for teachers.

Teacher evaluation is but an introductory tool for improving communication between principals and teachers. Educators as a mutual body need to share their expertise and incorporate it into methods that encourage maximum productivity and qualitative services in every school.

If nothing else, this study should indicate the strengths and pitfalls on evaluation practices and hopefully enlighten educators on the need for more comprehensive understanding of evaluation in all its forms.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The central purpose of the study is to compare teacher evaluation practices of outstanding principals and other elementary principals in the Chicago Public Schools with regard to criteria, frequency, purposes, approaches, methods and procedures, and to show how these practices aid the principal in fulfilling his role as evaluator/administrator.

Teachers are evaluated for a variety of purposes which may be subsumed under two major categories: (1) administrative purposes, and (2) instructional improvement purposes. Both categories of purposes are important in an educational organization, and although they are distinguishable, they are related. Teacher evaluation for administrative purposes may be undertaken to provide information for many kinds of administrative decisions, including those concerning tenure, teacher assignments, transfer, promotions or dismissals, and salary increases in merit salary plans. Such decisions have to be made in schools, and they require evaluations.

Evaluations for instructional improvement purposes is also an administrative responsibility, but its function is obviously different: the improvement of the teaching-learning situation in the school, and classroom instruction in particular.

While these two purposes are different, they need not, and should not, be incompatible. Indeed, if instruction improvement evaluation is carried out well, it should provide more and better information on which to base necessary administrative decisions. Consequently, it seems logical to conclude that the primary purpose of a program of teacher evaluation should be the improvement of teaching and learning in the schools.[1]

HYPOTHESES

1. There is no significant difference in teacher evaluation practices of outstanding elementary school principals as selected by their immediate superiors--and other elementary school principals in the Chicago Public School System.
2. There is no significant difference in the purpose of teacher evaluation (i.e., to improve instruction or to fulfill an administrative requirement) as determined by outstanding principals and other principals in the Chicago Public Schools.
3. There is no significant difference in the approaches to evaluation of outstanding principals and other principals with schools that have less than twenty

---

[1]John Roche, "Evaluating School Personnel," National Elementary Principal (October 1973): p. 43.

teachers compared with principals of schools with more than forty teachers.

4. There is no significant difference in the method and procedures used in evaluation by outstanding principals and other principals with less than six years as principal and those with more than six years as principal.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

For the purpose of the proposed study, the basic terms that are to be used can be defined as follows:

1. Elementary School: The schools legally classified by the Chicago Board of Education as K-6 and K-8.
2. Teacher Evaluation: The evaluations used to assess the improvement of instruction.
3. Administrative Experience: The number of years as an assigned principal. Less or more than six years. Tenure is granted after three years of assignment as a principal. Three years beyond tenure or six years is used as dividing line between more or less experience.
4. Outstanding Principals: Twenty-five district superintendents selected those principals they felt to be the most outstanding. A confidential list was compiled by the Deputy Superintendent of Field Services from these selections. This confidential list was shared with the researcher for purposes of this study. One outstanding principal from each district--from the

list so identified--was chosen randomly for the study.

5. Other Principals: Twenty-five names of principals were randomly selected from the 461 remaining elementary school principals. One principal was selected from each district.
6. All the others: One hundred sixty-seven principals, not included in outstanding or other principals, completed the CTEM questionnarire. The responses were used as additional support for hypotheses three and four.
7. Improve Instruction: The evaluation techniques used to improve teacher competence.
8. Administrative Requirement: The evaluations (ratings) required by the Chicago Board of Education.

LIMITATION

The following limitation is specified: Because of the complexity of the high school organization with its department chairmen, and variety of course offerings, only elementary school principals were studied.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to review literature pertinent to teacher evaluation--most especially as it pertains to: evolution of current practices, purposes, criteria, approaches, and methods of teacher evaluation.

EVOLUTION OF CURRENT PRACTICES

Methods of evaluating teacher competence currently used in public school systems have evolved from practices of many years ago. It seems clear that these evolving practices have been related to certain movements in government, in industry, and in psychological research.[1]

Formal evaluation of teaching, as practiced today, appears to have had its origin, in part, during late nineteenth century school practice as well as in the efficiency movement of the early twentieth century. A form in use in Milwaukee in 1896 consisted of a long list of unclassified traits.[2]

In the early 1900's, some of the large city systems were giving teachers numerical efficiency grades. Superintendent

---

[1]Bruce J. Biddle and William J. Elleva, Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964), p. 41.

[2]W. C. T. Adams, "Superintendents' Rating of Teachers," Journal of Education 90 (1919): pp. 288-298.

Cooley of Chicago, in 1907--with apparent amusement as well as exasperation--referred to the insistence of school principals on giving high marks to teachers.[1]

In 1920, Rugg, who had worked with Scott in developing the Man-to-the-Man Scale for Army officers, reported such a device for use in rating teachers. The reference shows a tie between teachers' ratings and the personnel rating movements and industry. However, Rugg later questioned the value of the scale for rating teachers.[2]

A landmark report on teacher rating in public school systems is the survey of the practice compiled by A. E. Boyce. The magic word "efficiency" in his title identified it with the forward looking educational thinking of the day. Boyce reported that the number of items on which teaching efficiency was judged ranged from as few as two items to as many as eighty. He identified four types of analyses: (1) descriptive reports dealing with specified points; (2) lists of questions to be answered by 'yes' or 'no'; (3) lists of items to be evaluated by a stated classification such as: excellent, good, medium, unsatisfactory, and (4) lists of items to each of which was assigned a definite numerical value representing the maximum score that might be given.

Boyce summarized the qualities evaluated in fifty of the

---

[1]National Education Association, Proceedings (Washington, D. C.: n.p., 1919), pp. 94-101.

[2]Biddle and Elleva, p. 48.

rating schemes, "Discipline" led all the rest, being found in ninety-eight percent of the forms. Next in frequency were "instructional skill" and "cooperation and loyalty," each mentioned in sixty percent of the forms.[1]

In 1924, Monroe and Clark summarized the researches of the preceding twenty years. They cited studies that had shown the lack of reliability of existing rating devices. They pointed up the existence of a halo effect from the rater's general estimate of the teacher--thus influencing the estimates of particular traits. These authors suggested that the chief value of score cards would be as a means of self-improvement when used by teachers to consider their own work. Monroe and Clark proposed, as a substitute for score cards or man-to-man ratings, a composite evaluation plan in which controlled educational measurements of pupil achievement would be given a substantial weight.[2]

A report to the National Education Association in 1925 mentioned three surveys that showed that at least three-fourths of the large city school systems were using some type of efficiency ratings.[3]

---

[1]A. C. Boyce, "Methods of Measuring Teachers' Efficiency," Fourteenth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, pt. 2 (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1915). p. 20.

[2]W. S. Monroe and J. A. Clark, "Measuring Teacher Efficiency," University of Illinois Bulletin; Educational Research Circular No. 25 (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1924). p. 30.

[3]National Education Association, Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: n.p., 1925). pp. 200-215.

Most detailed of these surveys was a study by Leroy A. King of the University of Pennsylvania. King, like Boyce, analyzed a sample of the rating instruments then in use in large public school systems. King compared the factors found in the forms he analyzed with the findings of Boyce. Of the fourteen categories named, only eight appear on both lists. However, King's "classroom management" and "class discipline" are both included in Boyce's "discipline." "Personality," as reported by King, may include both "manner" and "voice," as used by Boyce. However, King did not have a separate category for "manner" and "voice."[1]

In 1945, some twenty years after the King study, a comprehensive report on the evaluation of merit in city school systems was issued by Reavis and Cooper. These authors secured rating devices and accompanying instructions from 103 school systems. One of the many valuable features of this report is a discussion of terminology used by various students of the topic and the effort to produce a classification of mutually exclusive types of rating methods. They identified five: Check Scale, Characterization Report, Guided Comment Report, Descriptive Report, and Ranking Report. Reavis and Cooper then analyzed specific items in the rating forms. However, categories were so dissimilar from Boyce and King's as to make comparisons impossible. These investigators advanced the

---

[1]Leroy A. King, "The Present Status of Teacher Ratings," American School Board Journal 70 (1925): pp. 44-46.

theory that teacher ratings have value chiefly as measurement of a teacher's prestige, and that other devices should be used to measure other aspects of teaching success. Among these they mentioned observational records of classroom technique as a promising new development. However, they recognized that this device is still dependent to a large degree on subjective reactions.[1]

In 1961, the National Education Association's Research Division sent a questionnaire on personnel practices to a large number of school superintendents. The inquiry included a request for copies of forms used in the evaluation of teachers. This study brought reactions of bewilderment because of the infinite variety of rating techniques used. It also gave the researchers a greater awareness of the difficulties faced by previous investigators who have tried to present an ordered summary of such forms. The methods of evaluation found in the forms were classified on the basis of those used by Cooper and Reavis. Four types of evaluation were noted: (1) multiple-factor check scales, (2) general factor check scales, (3) structured comments, and (4) non-structured comments.[2]

PURPOSE OF EVALUATION

Beller suggested six purposes for the evaluation of teachers:

---

[1]William C. Reavis and Dan H. Cooper, "Evaluation of Teacher Merit in City School Systems," Educational Monograph No. 59 (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago, 1945). pp. 34-37.

[2]National Education Association, "Estimates of School Statistics, 1961-62," NEA Research Report 1961-62 (Washington, D.C.).

1. To determine whether the objectives of education are being achieved
2. To identify effective and ineffective teachers, to help administrators in the assignment, promotion or other changes in the status of teachers.
3. To improve education by providing a basis for in-service training and for supervisory activities
4. To motivate self-improvement of teachers
5. To give evidence of the quality of services rendered and thereby justify to the community the investment of public funds in educational institutions.
6. To determine to what extent educational programs produce changes which are compatible with the goals of the culture[1]

Evaluation of classroom teachers serves essential functions in public school administration. According to the National Education Association, evaluation is the most important basis for:

1. Improvement of instruction
2. Decisions on whether probationary teachers should be retained or released from the staff
3. Teacher assignment and transfer

---

[1]E. Kuno Beller, "Teacher Evaluation: Why, What, and How!" Peabody Journal of Education (January 1971): p. 125.

4. Approval of increments on the salary schedule.[1]

Babel stated that an appraisal system should be based on ". . . improving all staff members, systems, and processes."[2]

Getzels, Lipham, and Campbell emphasized the importance of agreement on purpose: "Role expectations for various members of an organization can be clarified only within the framework of the purpose of mission of the organization . . . . If agreement on organization purpose is to be reached, the organization must provide its members with some type of orientation."[3] These authors determined that the purposes of teacher evaluation must be derived from the purposes of the school.

A study of teacher evaluation in the State of Washington found that nearly 84% of those interviewed believed the primary purpose of teacher evaluation in their school systems was to improve the instruction of teachers in the classroom. Other reasons given, in a descending order of importance, were: (2) to determine the teacher's status for continued employment, (3) to select teachers for promotion, and (4) to determine a teacher's

---

[1]National Education Association, "What Teachers and Administrators Think About Evaluation," (Washington, D.C.: NEA Research Bulletin, XLII 4, 1964) p. 83.

[2]John Babel, Jr., "Teacher Appraisal: How To Make It More Meaningful," paper presented at the 104th AASA Annual Convention, Atlantic City, N.J., April 1972 pp. 12-16.

[3]Jacob W. Getzels, James M. Lipham, and Ronald F. Campbell, Educational Administration as a Social Process. (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), p. 332.

status on the salary schedule.[1]

A study of teacher evaluation in the State of Maryland revealed that 93.8 percent of superintendents reported the main accomplishment of their evaluation program was the elimination of incompetent teachers from the staff. Also, 81.3 percent of the superintendents reported that appointment of teachers not on tenure and recommendation of probationary teachers for permanent appointment are outcomes of their program. Identification of teachers for potential promotion was listed as an outcome by 75.0 percent of the superintendents; 62.5 percent felt that the improvement of instruction was an accomplishment of their evaluation program.

By contrast, principals in the same study listed the improvement of instruction as the most important accomplishment of their evaluation program. They also listed, in descending order of frequency: (1) better administrative planning, (2) productive rapport between administration and faculty, and (3) the elimination of incompetent teachers.[2]

A study comparing teacher evaluation practices in the State of Montana with those of a representative sample of districts from all over the country found that, basically, the

---

[1]R. Voege, "A Study of the Procedures for Evaluating Classroom Teachers in Certain School Districts in the State of Washington" (Ph.D. Dissertation, Washington State University, 1970), pp. 95-96.

[2]W. B. Ellinger, "A Study of the Procedures Used to Evaluate Professional School Personnel in the Public Schools of the State of Maryland" (Ph.D. Dissertation, George Washington University, 1968), p. 332.

responses were the same for the State of Montana and the representative sample groups. General agreement, as to the major purposes of evaluation, was found between the State of Montana and the representative sample groups. The major purposes of evaluation were found to be: (1) improvement of the educational program, (2) supportive role, and (3) the discharge or retention of a teacher about to be considered for tenure.[1]

In an analysis of teacher evaluation programs in the State of Michigan, the most frequently mentioned purposes were "to promote the professional development of teachers by helping them become aware of their strengths and weaknesses." Recognizing excellence in teaching was also mentioned as a purpose.[2]

In a survey of 213 school systems, teachers were asked why teachers should be evaluated. Responses were as follows:

1. To assist in improving teacher competence.....92.8%
2. To keep the administration aware of what is taking place in the classroom.....59.1%
3. To make teachers more responsive to the needs of their pupils.....56.0%
4. To make it possible to dismiss poor teachers....53.8%
5. To assist in the selection of teachers for promotion to other positions.....47.3%

---

[1]J. Hall, "Selected Aspects of Teacher Evaluation in the Public School Systems in the State of Montana as Compared with Public School Systems from Throughout the United States" (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Montana, 1967), p. 111.

[2]B. H. Litherland, "An Analysis of Programs for Evaluating Teachers for Tenure in Selected Michigan Public School Districts" (Ph.D. Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1968), p. 50.

6. To have a statement in the teacher's permanent record for future reference.....31.0%
7. To see if the curriculum is being followed.....22.9%
8. For advancement of the salary schedule.....17.3%
9. For the awarding of merit pay.....16.7%
10. Other.....02.4%

The two most frequently emphasized purposes of teacher evaluation in the literature were: (1) improvement of instruction (through improvement of teacher competence), and (2) facilitation of administrative decisions (such as tenure for probationary teachers). Once a school system has decided on the purposes of its teacher evaluation program, the next logical step is to determine the criteria upon which teachers will be evaluated in order to serve the purposes of the evaluation.

CRITERIA FOR TEACHER EVALUATION

The criteria for the evaluation of teachers should have a logical relationship to the purposes of evaluation and should be clearly understood by both evaluator and teacher.

In any organization the expectations need to be clearly stated. A major problem in many institutions in which merit rating has been tried is the lack of clarity in expectations. Often criterion statements have been unavailable or have been kept at such a level of generality that raters and rated have perceived their meaning differently. In the appraisal of work

---

[1]National Education Association, NEA Research Bulletin, (Washington, D.C.: October, 1969). p. 71.

performance, organizations need to make explicit the expectations held for staff members.[1]

According to the Committee on the Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness, "Criteria of teacher effectiveness must stand at the apex of any conceptual system for the development of scientific understanding, prediction, and administration of teacher personnel." The Committee formulated a job analysis of the teacher function:

> First the teacher formulates or selects the objectives of his teaching. . . . So the teacher must commit himself to an attempt to bring about certain effects on pupils and these effects are the objectives that the teacher sets up for his pupils and hence for himself. Involved in this step in some way must be an understanding by the teacher of the characteristics of his pupils in relation to the objectives. That is, to some degree . . . the teacher must evaluate his pupils' needs, readiness, and interest in attaining the objectives. A second step . . . is to formulate, perhaps with the pupils, the experiences through which pupils should go as means for their achieving the objectives. A third step in the teaching process is arranging for pupils to have the experience formulated in step two . . . . A fourth step . . . is evaluating the pupil's growth and achievement of objectives. A fifth step in teaching which provides a standpoint from which teachers may be viewed is the reappraisal of objectives and learning experiences in the light of the evaluation resulting from the preceding step.[2]

The Committee further identified sets of parallel logical steps for the participation of the teacher in the operation of the school and in school-community relations.

---

[1]Getzels, Lipham, and Campbell, pp. 336-337.

[2]A. S. Barr, "Report of the Committee on the Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness," Review of Educational Research XXII, 9 (1952): pp. 251-253.

Mitzel contends that valid criteria of teacher effectiveness must be logically related to the job analysis of the teacher. He noted:

> Calling a particular measure a criterion lends to it connotations of worth and value. Criteria cannot be trivial; otherwise evaluations are made against trivial standards. Teacher effectiveness as a concept has no meaning apart from the criterion measures or operational definitions of success as a teacher. These measures should possess four basic attributes: (a) relevance, (b) reliability, (c) freedom from bias, and (d) practicality.[1]

In a study for the NEA, Stemmock reported:

> The new evaluation plans which are superceding rating recognize the fact that performance appraisal, when focused on criteria developed mutually by evaluator and evaluatee, can be rewarding to everybody involved--including the principal, the teacher and the children.[2]

Beller also found that teachers are more likely to accept and actively support the decisions when they are an active part of the whole process of evaluation.[3]

Another NEA survey found that fewer then half of the teachers received copies of the evaluation policy. The survey also brought out the fact that:

> Only 61.4 percent of the principals surveyed reported that criteria had been established in their school systems, even though 75.7 percent made written evaluations of probationary teachers. Criteria were least likely to be established in the smaller systems.[4]

---

[1]Harold E. Mitzel, "Teacher Effectiveness," Encyclopedia of Educational Research (1960), p. 1481.

[2]Suzanne K. Stemmock. Evaluating Teacher Performance (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction, ED 033 488, 1969), p. 64.

[3]Beller, p. 138.

[4]National Education Association, "Programs for Evaluating Classroom Teachers," (Washington, D.C.: NEA Research Bulletin, XLII 3, 1964): p. 88.

The necessity to establish criteria for teacher evaluation is obvious. Those who have researched the area seem to agree that so far there has not been discovered one set of criteria that will be acceptable to all persons for all purposes:

> Throughout all history of education there has been no broad agreement on what constitutes good teaching or a good teacher. One reason for this is that there are many outcomes of education and different ways to achieve them. Some are difficult to measure, if they can be measured at all, and others cannot be known until long afterward.[1]

The same conclusion was reached by Brain who stated that "the findings to date about teacher effectiveness are inconclusive and incomplete."[2]

A similar observation was made by Barr who wrote:

> The simple fact of the matter is that, after forty years of research on teacher effectiveness during which a vast number of studies have been carried out, one can point to few outcomes that a superintendent of schools can safely employ in hiring a teacher or granting him tenure. . . .[3]

Although there is no one answer to the question of criteria, there are some indications in the research literature that there are criteria that have been shown to be relevant to teacher effectiveness. Mitzel identified three such types of criteria, each indicative of a particular approach to teacher

---

[1]Wilbur Schramm. Measuring Educational Development Through Classroom Interaction (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction, ED 067 892, 1949), p. 15.

[2]George Brain, "Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness," NEA Journal 2 (1965): p. 35.

[3]A. S. Barr, "Second Report of the Committee on Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness," Journal of Educational Research XLVI, 9 (1953): p. 657.

evaluation. Presage criteria are used to evaluate the teacher as a person in terms of characteristics possessed by that person that are assumed to relate to teaching effectiveness. Process criteria are used to evaluate the teacher's behavior in the performance of his role as a teacher. He is judged competent or incompetent on the basis of whether or not his behavior is that which research has shown (or someone has assumed) to be related to teaching effectiveness. Product criteria are used to assess the effectiveness of the teacher in bringing about desired changes in the pupil. The teacher is evaluated on measured gain in student learning.[1]

Presage Criteria

Barr discovered a number of differences between "good" and "poor" teachers of social studies. They are listed as:

1. Ability to stimulate interest
2. Wealth of commentarial statement
3. Attention to pupils' recitations
4. Topical or problem-project organization of subject matter
5. Well-developed assignments
6. Frequent use of illustrative materials
7. A well-established examination procedure
8. Effective methods of appraising pupils' work
9. Freedom from disciplinary difficulties
10. Knowledge of subject matter

---

[1]Mitzel, p. 1483.

11. Conversational manner in teaching
12. Frequent use of pupils' experiences
13. An appreciative attitude (as evidenced by nods, comments, and smiles)
14. Skill in asking questions
15. Definite study helps
16. Socialized class procedures
17. Willingness to experiment[1]

On the basis of his study of Junior High School social studies teachers, Barr suggested a list of "minimum essentials of teaching success" in which he included the above list and added, on the basis of analysis of expert opinion, "Provision for individual differences" and "Skill in measuring results." His suggested criteria are a mixture of presage and process criteria.[2]

In 1948, Barr reviewed 150 studies relating to the measurement and prediction of teaching efficiency that had been reported in the literature between 1900 and 1948. He found there is very much more agreement upon some characteristics than others. The results are all positive with only an occasional exception for considerateness, cooperation, buoyancy, reliability, drive, attractiveness, refinement, skill in teacher-pupil relations, instructional skill (general), knowledge of subject matter taught

---

[1]A. S. Barr, Characteristic Differences in the Teaching Performance of Good and Poor Teachers of the Social Studies, (Bloomington, Ill.: Public School Publishing Co., 1929), pp. 75-76.

[2]Ibid., pp. 117-118.

or activity directed, knowledge of professional practices and techniques, skill in speech, and health. The situation, while predominantly positive, is less clear for such items as intelligence, emotional stability and dominance. Barr cautioned that the possible lack of validity in the early studies should be taken into consideration.[1]

In 1960, Ryans published the results of a project that involved over 100 separate research projects and over 6,000 teachers in 1,700 schools in 450 school systems. The major purpose of the study was to compile information on significant teacher characteristics and to develop objective measures to be used in evaluating and predicting teacher behavior. Ryans summarized the findings of his comparison of teachers who were rated high and those who were rated low. The general tendency for high rated teachers was to: be extremely generous in appraisals of the behavior and motives of others; possess strong interests in reading and in literary affairs; be interested in music, painting, and the arts in general; participate in social groups; enjoy pupil relationships; prefer non-directive classroom procedures; manifest superior verbal intelligence; and be above average in emotional adjustment. The teachers rated low, on the other hand, tended generally to: be restricted and critical in their appraisals of other persons; prefer activities which do not involve close personal contacts; express less favorable opinions

---

[1]A. S. Barr, "The Measuremental and Prediction of Teaching Efficiency: A Summary of Investigation," Journal of Experimental Education XVI, 4 (1948): pp. 238-244.

of pupils; manifest less high verbal intelligence; show less satisfactory emotional adjustment; and represent older age groups.[1]

However, Ryans cautioned, "Concomitants (secondary criterion data) should not be employed for criterion measurement when directed measurement of behavior in process or the measurement of behavior in process or the measurement of isolable products of teacher behavior can be used conveniently."[2]

The following generalizations regarding the relationship between teacher characteristics, as predictors, and teacher effectiveness, as a criterion abstracted from various criterion measures reported in the literature seem to be in order. Measured intellectual abilities, achievement in college course, general cultural and special subject matter knowledge, professional information, student teaching marks, emotional adjustment, attitudes favorable to students, generosity in appraisals of the behavior and motives of other persons, strong interest in reading and literary matters, interest in music and painting, participation in social and community affairs, early experience in caring for children and teaching (such as reading to children, taking a class for the teacher), history of teaching in family, size of school and size of community in which teaching, cultural level of the

---

[1]David G. Ryans, Characteristics of Teachers: Their Description, Comparison, and Appraisal, (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960), pp. 359-362.

[2]David G. Ryans, "Prediction of Teacher Effectiveness," Encyclopedia of Educational Research (1957): p. 1488.

community, and participation in avocational activities, all appear to be characteristics of the teacher which are likely to be positively correlated or associated with teacher effectiveness in the abstract. Extensiveness of general and/or professional education, enrollment in particular professional courses, personal appearance, and grade or subject taught (with some exceptions) appear to bear very little relation to the abstracted criterion.

Age of the teacher and amount of teaching experience seem to manifest an over-all negative relationship with teaching effectiveness, although there is evidence of curvilinearity, increase in effectiveness being positively correlated with experience during the early years of teaching careers.

Ryans offered a word of caution in the use of such information in the evaluation of teachers:

> It is important here to recall that relationships are differences which have been noted are in terms of averages for groups of teachers and any obtained relationship is limited by, and may be expected to vary with, conditions. . . .
> The usefulness of research findings pertaining to the prediction of teacher effectiveness will be greatest when the results are considered in the acturial context, rather than in attempting highly accurate predictions for given individuals. . . .[1]

It is Von Haden's opinion that:

> The evidence indicates that estimates of personal qualities and of probable teaching success, arrived at from a study of such materials as interviews, autobiographies, and comments of instructors, are not closely associated with effectiveness as gauged by the evaluation of pupils or by residual pupil gain as measured by tests.

---

[1]Ibid., pp. 1490-1491.

> Among the personal qualities considered, work habits, initiative, and professional judgment seem to be the ones whose contribution to teaching success can be most effectively identified and evaluated.[1]

Dandes sought to investigate empirically the relationship between psychological health and the attitudes and values of teachers related to effective teaching. He said that if educational goals included "growth in self-directedness, personal and social responsibility, spontaneity, critical problem solving, that then a number of teacher characteristics emerge which seem to be associated with student development in these directions."

To test his hypothesis, Dandes administered a series of tests to 128 New York teachers. The tests used were the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) (to measure psychological health, the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (to measure permissiveness or warmth), Forms 40 and 45 of the California F-Scale to measure authoritarianism), Form E of the Dogmatism Scale (to measure openness-closedness of belief systems) and An Inventory of Opinions on Educational Issues (to measure liberalism-conservatism of educational viewpoints). Dandes found significant relationships between healthy scores on the POI and permissiveness, absence of authoritarianism, absence of dogmatism, and liberalism of educational viewpoint.[2]

---

[1]Herbert I. Von Haden, "An Evaluation of Certain Types of Personal Data Employed in the Prediction of Teaching Efficiency," Journal of Experimental Education XV, 1 (1946): p. 83.

[2]Herbert M. Dandes, "Psychological Health and Teaching Effectiveness," The Journal of Teacher Education XLI, 3 (1966): p. 302.

Patton and Desena found that the three teacher characteristics most highly valued by high school students were: a sense of humor, mastery of subject matter, and ability to communicate clearly.

Koskenniemi et al. found negative attitudes toward children, weakness in logical planning and thought, and previous unsuccessful careers to be characteristic of unsuccessful teachers, but they did not find any set of traits characteristic of successful teachers.[2]

Veldman and Kelly, in a study of student teachers, found that effective teachers were more friendly, exercised strict control, had more positive attitudes, provided a meaningfully structured classroom atmosphere, and displayed an "unusual willingness to accept traditional authority patterns." The ineffective teacher lacked self-assurance and social skills and was uncomfortable with the school authority structure.[3]

Joyce et al. found that the more open-minded teachers were more aware of alternatives and more able to receive cues from and react to children.[4]

---

[1]Walter J. Patton and Leon Desena, "Measures of Teacher Effectiveness," Journal of Teacher Education 3 (1968): p. 275.

[2]Jay Koskennieme, Arthur Brent and Phillip Murray, "Factors in Teaching Competence," Educational Leadership (1973): p. 46.

[3]Jerome C. Veldman and James A. Kelly, "Characteristics of Student Teachers," The Journal of Experimental Education (1967): p. 103.

[4]Herbert Joyce, Edward Barnes and Milton Kirkpatrick, "What Makes a Successful Teacher?" School and Society 77 (September, 1959): p. 357.

Heil et al. studied the effects of three types of teachers on students. The researchers compared effects of the turbulent teacher, the self-controlled teacher, and the fearful teacher. They found that the achievement of the majority of the children was significantly greater under the self-controlled teacher than under either the turbulent or the fearful teacher. The self-controlled teacher also produced less active resistance and hostility and more friendliness in children.[1]

Scott observed children of teachers who fell at both extremes of an effectiveness continuum as judged by superiors. He found effective teachers exhibited more positive and less negative emotional feeling tone in their contacts with children and were more involved and showed more spontaneity than ineffective teachers.[2]

Flanders and Simon cited examples of research on predictor criteria and teacher effectiveness. The research failed to substantiate links for such characteristics as intelligence, age experience, cultural background, socio-economic background, sex, martial status, scores on aptitude tests, job interest, voice quality, and special aptitudes. There were slight positive correlations shown between scholarship and teaching effectiveness, although no particular course or group of courses has been shown

---

[1]Bruce A. Heil, Carl G. Adams, and Ben Cohn, "A Study of Teacher/Pupil Behavior," The Journal of Teacher Education 1 (1971): p. 72.

[2]Jerome P. Scott, "Evaluating Teacher Performance," Journal of Educational Psychology 54 (1963): p. 289.

to be a predictor, particularly of teaching performance. It was also found that teachers with discipline problems were aloof, unbusinesslike, and poor problem solvers. Teachers with problems in setting expectations for pupils were teacher-centered, cool, and poor problem solvers.[1]

In 1971, Ryans reported that recent factor analytic studies not yet reported in the literature supported some of the findings of the earlier Teacher Characteristics Study. The factors thus identified were:

1. Warm sympathizing teacher behavior
2. Business-like, task-oriented teacher behavior
3. Original, motivating teacher behavior
4. Attitude toward pupils and other persons contacted in schools
5. Academic focused educational viewpoints
6. Permissive, pupil-centered educational viewpoints.
7. Verbal/semantic facility in language in which teaching is accomplished
8. Social adjustment
9. Commitment/dedication to teaching as a profession
10. Teaching associated activities, i.e., participation in cultural, community, and similar activities frequently expected of, and often attractive to teachers.[2]

---

[1]Ned A. Flanders and Anita Simon, "Teacher Effectiveness," Encyclopedia of Educational Research (1969): pp. 1423-1437.

[2]David G. Ryans. Teacher Evaluation Research, Part I: Consideration of Critical Issues, Feasibility of Collaborative Research and Overall Design. Final Report (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction, ED 055 991, 1971), p. 37.

Process Criteria

The validity of all the teacher effectiveness studies done in the first half of this century was questioned by Medley, because he felt they depended to a great extent on so-called "expert opinion."

> The fact that the expertise of these people seems to have consisted mainly in familiarity with lists of traits compiled either by other experts or by pupils gave the whole enterprise a circular quality that seems obvious today but largely escaped the notice of researchers of the time. . . . The use of the structured rating scale in teacher evaluation seems to have begun at about the same time. . . . There were almost as many characteristics listed as there were rating devices. . . .The basic defect in this entire line of research is. . .that nowhere in the entire process was any actual measure of teacher effectiveness introduced, no measure of changes in pupils attributable to their teachers. . . .Among over a thousand publications on teacher effectiveness published in a half century, not more than 20, or two percent, involved actual measures of teacher effectiveness. It also suggests why the research done up to around 1960 was so unproductive. . . .A review of later studies which correlated "expert" rating on effectiveness with mean gains of their pupils found all of them unanimous, in concluding that ratings and effectiveness are not significantly correlated.[1]

The emphasis in teacher effectiveness studies shifted from "presage" to "process" in the 1960's. Mitzel's distinction between the two was illustrated by Flanders and Simon.

> To measure a teacher's trait of warmth toward pupils is to consider a characteristic which existed before the teaching starts; this is a presage variable. The corresponding process variable would be some behaviorally specified measure of warm acts while teaching. The distinction, then, is not one of values but one of measurement, degree of objectivity, and proximity to the ultimate or "product" criterion.[2]

---

[1]Donald M. Medley, "Closing the Gap Between Research in Teacher Effectiveness and the Teacher Education Curriculum," Journal of Research and Development in Education VII, 1 (1974): pp. 40-42.

[2]Flanders and Simon, pp. 425-426.

Anderson and others studied preschool, primary and elementary school classrooms involving five different teachers and extending over several years. They found:

> (1) The dominative and integrative contacts of the teacher set a pattern of behavior that spreads throughout the classroom; the behavior of the teacher more than any other individual, sets the climate of the class. The conclusion is that when either type of contact predominates, domination stimulates further domination, and integration stimulates further integration. . . .The pattern a teacher develops in one year is likely to be continued by him the following year with different pupils.
> (2) When a teacher establishes a higher proportion of integrative contacts, pupils show more spontaneity and initiative, voluntary social contributions, and contributions to problem solving.
> (3) When a teacher has a higher proportion of dominative contacts, the pupils are more easily distracted from school work and show greater compliance to, as well as rejection of, teacher domination.[1]

Flanders and Simon also studied the effects of integrative and dominative teacher behavior. They found that a sustained dominative pattern was consistently disliked by pupils and it reduced their ability to recall the material studied, and produced disruptive anxiety as indicated by galvanic skin responses and changes in heartbeat rates. The opposite trends were noted in pupil reactions to integrative contacts.[2]

Amidon and Flanders conducted a two-year study to determine the effect of direct and indirect teacher influence and various conditions of goal perception on student achievement.

---

[1]H. H. Anderson, J. E. Brewer, and M. F. Reed, "Studies of Teachers' Classroom Personalities," Applied Psychology Monograph III, 11 (1946): p. 18.

[2]Flanders and Simon, p. 1435.

During the first year the concepts of teacher influence and goal perception were used with eighth grade students in geometry and social studies. The second year involved a field study with 900 students participating: half of whom were seventh grade social studies students and half eighth grade geometry students. The 32 teachers, 16 in each subject area, were the regular classroom teachers. The results of the first and second year studies were found to be essentially the same wherever significant differences were found.

First a prediction was made that the more indirect teachers would act most indirectly when goals were being clarified and when new content material was being introduced, and act most directly after goals had been clarified and work was in progress. Data from the second year of the study indicate that his prediction was accurate.

Second, it was predicted that in general students of the more direct teachers would learn less as measured by written achievement tests than students of indirect teachers. Also, the prediction was made that certain types of students would learn more working with direct teachers. Results indicated that all types of students learned more working with the more indirect teachers than with the more direct teachers.

Third, in both content areas the students of the more indirect teachers scored higher on achievement tests than did students of the more direct teachers.

The researchers concluded from this study that "The concept of teacher flexibility was more predictive of teaching

success than was the concept of direct-indirect influence.

> It was found that the teachers of classes in which achievement was above average differed from the teachers of below average classes in their ability to shift their behavior as it was necessary. They could be just as direct as any teacher in certain situations, but they could be far more indirect in other situations. . . .
> The direct teachers did not use those social skills of communication that are involved in accepting, clarifying, and making use of the ideas and feelings of students. . . .When the most direct teachers were compared with the most indirect, it was found that the direct teachers gave directions twice as frequently as the indirect teachers; for criticism, the contrast increases to 8 to 1.[1]

A study by Amidon and Giammatteo attempted to find out if certain patterns of verbal behavior were characteristic of superior teachers. The study involved 153 elementary school teachers from Pennsylvania school districts. A comparison was made, using the Flanders system of Interaction Analysis, between the verbal patterns of teachers rated "superior" by their supervisors and those of a control group of randomly selected teachers.

The results indicate that the verbal-behavior patterns of superior teachers differ substantially from those of average teachers. The superior teachers talked about 40 percent of total class time, while the normative group talked about 52 percent of the time. The superior teachers were more accepting of pupil initiated ideas, tended to encourage these ideas more, and made a greater effort to build on these than the average teachers did. The superior teachers dominated their classrooms less, used

---

[1]Edmund J. Amidon and Ned A. Flanders, The Role of the Teacher in the Classroom (Minneapolis, Minn.: Paul S. Amidon & Associates, 1963), pp. 55-59.

indirect verbal behavior more, and used direction-giving and criticism less than the normative group of teachers did. The superior teachers asked questions that were broader in nature than those asked by the normative group, and their lectures were interrupted more by questions from the pupils. There was about 12 percent more pupil participation in the classes of the superior teachers than in the classes of the average teachers.[1]

Sprinthall, Whitely, and Mosher found that the dimension of cognitive flexibility-rigidity may represent a critical and differentiating factor in teaching practices of student teachers that:

> Perhaps the most serious implication from this study was the lack of behavior change within the group of apprentice teachers identified as most rigid and hence predicted to be most ineffective in the classroom. . . . The "rigid" student teachers did not change even after intensive supervision by master teachers.[2]

Rosenshine reviewed eight studies on the teacher's ability to explain. In each study, the teachers were given identical new material to present in a specified length of time. Pupils took a comprehension test after the presentation, and test scores were adjusted for the initial abilities of the students. The adjusted class mean scores were used as a measure of teacher effectiveness.

---

[1]Edmund Amidon and Michael Giammatteo, "The Verbal Behavior of Superior Teachers," The Elementary School Journal (February 1965) pp. 284-285.

[2]Normal A. Sprinthall, John M. Whitely, and Ralph L. Mosher, "A Study of Teacher Effectiveness," The Journal of Teacher Education 27 (1966): p. 104.

Rosenshine found that:

> In four out of five studies there was a significant, positive correlation between the ratings of the clarity of the lesson and/or the rating of the teacher's skill in presenting the lesson and the adjusted pupil achievement scores. . . .
> There were five specific behaviors which the high-achieving teachers in two subject areas were rated as using more frequently: (a) introductions involving an overview or analogy; (b) the use of review and repetition; (c) praise or repetition of pupil answers; (d) patience to wait for a response and (e) integration of pupil response into the lesson. . . .
> The lectures of the high-ranking teachers contained significantly more gestures and movements, rule-example-rule patterns of discourse and explaining links.[1]

In 1973, Soar summarized his process research outcomes:

> There are suggestions that some teacher behaviors are more likely to produce valued outcomes. The following generalizations are among those which might be cited: indirectness of teacher behavior tends to be associated positively with assessment growth, favorableness of pupil attitudes, and creativity growth.
> Teacher flexibility tends to be associated positively with achievement gain. Teacher criticism tends to be negatively related to achievement gain. . . .
> Observational systems provide explicit, behavioral, low inference measures of teaching behavior and, as such, provide a vocabulary and a set of concepts for communicating about teaching as well as a method of measuring it. . . .
> For the attainment of higher level objectives, or more slowly developing objectives, the more appropriate procedure appears to be to measure the behavior of the teacher and compare it to behavior which is thought to be related to the development of higher level objectives in pupils.[2]

Moskowitz and Hayman conducted a study in which "best" teachers were selected on the basis of student opinion. The

---

[1]Barak Rosenshine, "To Explain: A Review of Research," Educational Leadership II, 3 (1968): pp. 304-305

[2]Robert S. Soar, "Accountability: Assessment Problems and Possibilities," Journal of Teacher Education 24, 3 (1973): pp. 209-210.

Flint Interaction Analysis System and anecdotal records were used to record teacher behavior. The study showed that successful teachers set standards and expectations at the start of school, while beginning teachers were more engrossed in administrative and routine procedures. Compared to experienced teachers, new teachers used more direct behaviors at the beginning and increased in their use over time. "Best" teachers used a greater variety of audio-visual aides than did first year and typical teachers. "Best" teachers were noted to smile a lot, to bring in up-to-date topics and materials, and not to raise their voices or yell when disciplining. Some joked when they were being critical. They generally took no nonsense, criticizing any slightly deviant behavior before it got off the ground.[1]

Several observation systems have been developed to measure process variables. Some of these are considered in the section of this chapter concerned with a review of the literature on instruments.

Product Criteria

The validity of presage and process criteria depend on their relationship to the ultimate criterion of teacher effectiveness, and the change in pupil behavior that can be attributed to the influence of the teacher. Again, the difference is not one of values, but of measurement. It is not a difference in what is

---

[1]Gertrude Moskowitz and John L. Hayman, Jr., "Interaction Patterns of First Year, Typical, and "Best" Teachers in Inner-City Schools," The Journal of Educational Research 5 (1975): pp. 224-225.

expected of the teacher, but rather a difference in which is considered acceptable evidence that the teacher has accomplished what was expected. In any case, the desired outcome is in some way related to the learning of the student. In the use of presage criteria, it is assumed that the mere possession of a particular trait, the measurement of which is at best subjectively estimated, is evidence of the effect of the teacher on the subject. In the use of process criteria, which can be measured more objectively, it is assumed that if the teacher is using behavior which has been shown to have certain effects on students that then the teacher will have those particular effects on his students.

Before product criteria can be used to judge teacher effectiveness, it is necessary to specify the desired outcomes in pupil behavior. Therefore, it is logical to expect that even with the use of presage and/or process criteria the type of pupil learning to take place must be specified, since these criteria depend on their relationship to product criteria for their validity.

> Product criteria depend for definition upon a set of goals toward which teaching is directed. These goals are most economically stated in terms of changes in behavior on the part of students. . . .These effects are variously called student changes, but they all involve measurement of change attributed to the influence of individual teachers. Whether a particular operational defined measure is or is not a product criterion depends on the answer to the question, "Is student change in this trait or characteristic an appropriate goal for our schools?" It can be seen that there are different degrees of ultimateness in the answer to this question.[1]

---

[1]Mitzel, p. 1483.

In 1953, the Committee on Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness examined the influence teachers exert on pupils, schools, and on school/community relations. An analysis of their investigation showed that:

> The ultimate criteria of teacher effectiveness are posited to be in terms of changes in pupil behavior, changes in the operation of the school, or changes in the community in relation to the school. Conceivably, the changes may be more significant as criteria long after formal schooling had ceased than at the time of the teacher's performance. Realistically, it seems necessary to assume that changes at the time the pupil is under the teacher's influence are sufficient to serve at least as a first approximation in evaluating teacher effectiveness.[1]

Nelson et al. agreed that the ultimate criterion of teacher effectiveness is the progress made by pupils toward desirable educational goals, but found three major difficulties with the use of this criterion for the evaluation of teacher effectiveness:

> The first difficulty encountered in using the ultimate criterion for the evaluation of teaching effectiveness is centered in the fact that educational outcomes measurable in terms of pupil growth or behavior change cannot be attributed to a given teacher, since many are attributable to other elements in the pupil's past and present school, home and community environment. Also involved are the inherent growth potentials of the individual pupils with teachers in the differing instructional situations found in secondary classrooms.
> A second difficulty. . .arises from the fallibility of the measures of pupil progress toward desirable educational goals as well as from the lack of agreement among educators as to what these goals should be. Furthermore, many of the goals of education do not lend themselves to objective evaluation, and, indeed, many cannot be evaluated until several years after leaving school.
> A third difficulty arises when one attempts to use the ultimate criterion in a study of secondary schools teachers

---

[1]Barr, "Second Report of the Committee on Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness," p. 642.

> in various subject areas. Either one must fragment his study in such a way as to compare the effectiveness of plane geometry teachers only with the effectiveness of other plane geometry teachers, or he must devise some means of equating growth in plane geometry with growth in musical knowledge, and with all other subject areas.[1]

McNeil, however, felt that these difficulties could be overcome. He recommended a type of evaluation that he called "Supervision by Objectives." This plan called for the supervisor and teacher to agree in advance as to what they would accept as evidence that the teacher had or had not been successful in changing the behavior of his students. The agreement is drawn up before the teacher acts and is designed to counter the prevailing practice of trying to make an ex post facto judgment of ends. The contract is tentative to the extent that at any time the two parties can renegotiate it.

Supervision by Objectives requires a shift from judging a teacher's competency by the procedures followed in the classroom to judgment of the teacher in terms of the results he is producing in children. McNeil conducted experiments to test his theory concerning the benefits of Supervision by Objectives. He found that pupil gain was significantly greater for those students whose teachers were being evaluated on the basis of accomplishment of objectives:

> The emphasis and use of operational definitions of instructional goals, including specification of criterion measures, in the supervisory process is accompanied by more favorable assessment of teachers by supervisors and greater gain in desired directions on the part of learning.

---

[1]Kenneth G. Nelson, Gohn E. Bicknell, and Paul A. Hedlung, Development and Refinement of Measures of Teaching Effectiveness. (Albany: The University of the State of New York and the State Education Department, 1956), p. 16.

> The practice of supervision by objectives with its emphasis upon obtaining results with pupils does not appear to produce undue pressures upon teachers. This is true at least under the conditions of this study where teachers determined the appropriateness of results in terms of the deficiencies of their own pupils and were not compared with other teachers on an absolute scale of pupil gain. Further, the focus upon specific objectives for particular learners does not appear to restrict pupils' advancement to only the objectives stated but leads to increased achievement in a range of desirable directions. . . .
> Teachers are almost unanimous in believing that the criterion results, in terms of pupil gain, is the best of five basis for evaluating instructional effectiveness.[1]

Popham devised teacher performance tests based on the accomplishment of objectives. However, the validity of the tests is questionable if one considers the development of objectives as a legitimate part of the teaching process, since the tests provide the objectives and the teacher merely teaches to the objectives provided. In Popham's experiments he found that, in all instances, experienced teachers performed better than their inexperienced counterparts. This type of measure of teacher proficiency is divorced from what the teacher does in an actual situation when not under experimental conditons. As Popham himself said:

> Most experienced researchers in this field now recognize that the quality of learning in a given instructional situation is the result of particular instructional procedures employed by a particular instructor for particular students with particular goals in mind.[2]

---

[1]John D. McNeil, "Concomitants of Using Behavioral Objectives in the Assessment of Teacher Effectiveness," The Journal of Experimental Education I (1967): pp. 71-73.

[2]James W. Popham, "The Performance Test: A New Approach to the Assessment of Teaching Proficiency," The Journal of Teacher Education 2 (1968): pp. 217-221.

Justiz described an experiment with student teachers that he felt demonstrated the reliability of assessing teacher effectiveness based on pupil gain. Student teachers each taught classes in two different subject areas with which they were not familiar. They were given identical objectives to accomplish. Most of those who were effective in one subject were effective in the other as well. Again, the value of such findings for the evaluation of teaching effectiveness in a real situation is questionable because of the experimental conditions, particularly the removal of the teacher's responsibility for the formulation of suitable objectives for his students.[1]

Studies by Peck and Feldman call into question the practice of using achievement test scores of students as criteria of teacher effectiveness. They found that:

> Whatever achievement test gains represent as a desirable sign of pupil learning, and therefore of effective teaching they do not measure whatever it is that the classroom observers and the psychological assessors mutually agreed upon in this study, as important aspects of effective teaching (and pupil learning, by inference). Second, those variables in the assessment battery whose scores correlated significantly with the MAT gain scores formed a highly consistent and not altogether reassuring pattern: self-doubting, psychologically passive, somewhat unhappy women appeared more likely to generate high pupil gains on achievement tests. Women with children of their own, confident of their own attractiveness and prone to cope with problems in an active, self-reliant way, did produce large MAT gains.[2]

---

[1]Thomas B. Justiz, "A Reliable Measure of Teacher Effectiveness," Educational Leadership (October, 1969): pp. 44-45.

[2]Robert F. Peck and Donald J. Feldman. Personal Characteristics Associated with Effective Teaching (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction, ED 078 028, 1973) p. 14.

Lucio, after a survey of the literature, found that students of teachers who were evaluated on results gained significantly more in cognitive learning than did students of teachers who were evaluated on some other basis.[1]

In a later study by Popham, he compared the performance of credentialed and experienced teachers with that of persons neither credentialed nor experienced. He found that ". . . test results revealed that the experienced teachers did not markedly out perform the non-experienced teachers on any of the three teaching performance tests."[2]

The combined results of the several studies on the use of objectives in teacher evaluation raise several questions: Is it the fact that teachers are being evaluated on results that have increased student gain, or is it rather the fact that the teachers have clearly stated objectives to guide them in the teaching process? Is the formulation of objectives, apart from the attainment of the objectives, a significant consideration in the appraisal of teacher competence? To what extent should supervisors and administrators share the responsibility for the formulation and/or attainment of objectives? And how is the teacher to be judged on long-term results and on results in those areas of learning for which objective measures have not yet been developed?

---

[1]William H. Lucio, "Pupil Achievement as an Index of Teacher Performance," Educational Leadership 1 (1973): p. 75.

[2]James W. Popham. Designing Teacher Evaluation Systems: A Series of Suggestions for Establishing Teacher Assessment Procedures as Required by the Stull Bill (AB 293), 1971 California Legislature (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction, ED 070 716, 1971), p. 51.

Studies of Criteria Used

A study by Hall of criteria used for teacher evaluation in Montana public schools revealed that each of the following criteria were used in at least ninety percent of the school systems:

1. Knowledge of subject matter
2. Effective daily planning and preparation
3. Recognizes and allows for individual differences
4. Maintains adequate pupil control for the learning environment
5. Maintains and improves professional competence
6. Acceptance of school responsibilities
7. Observes professional ethics
8. Is concerned about the welfare of her pupils, fellow teachers and the community[1]

Litherland, in a review of teacher evaluation practices in the Michigan public schools, found that the most often mentioned criteria were:

> (1) Effective classroom management and (2) desirable personal characteristics; the next three criteria were: (3) adequate knowledge of subject matter, (4) effective use of appropriate teaching methods and techniques, and (5) satisfactory interpersonal relationships. Next were: (6) organization of work and preparation of daily lesson plans, (7) providing for individual differences in pupils, (8) use of instructional and audio-visual materials, (9) development of such personal attributes in pupils as critical thinking, creativity, personal habits of health, cleanliness and courtesy, (10) regard for the physical, social, emotional, and mental well-being of pupils, (11) participation in faculty meetings, curriculum development, and faculty committees, and (12) professional attitudes.[2]

---

[1]Hall, p. 102.

[2]Litherland, pp. 51-52.

Ellinger analyzed twenty-one teacher evaluation forms from nineteen counties in Maryland on the basis of the number of times the criteria used to evaluate teachers appeared on the forms. Those criteria appearing on over forty percent of the forms were:

> Appearance of classroom (71.4%); pupil-teacher rapport (66.7%); classroom discipline (61.9%); establishes procedures for routine procedures (42.9%); command of language and voice (57.1%); personal appearance (42.9%); accepts the responsibility for professional growth through reading, college courses, inservice education, etc. (76.2%); prompt and accurate in performing duties (57.1%); maintains a good relationship with parents (47.6%); willingly accepts non-teaching assignments (47.6%); participates actively in professional organizations (42.9%); works harmoniously with superiors (42.9%); knowledge of subject matter (66.7%); long range and daily planning (66.7%); and evaluation of pupil growth (42.9%).[1]

The views of teachers and administrators regarding criteria of teacher evaluation was compared in a study by Klonecky. Of several factors ranked, teachers felt that the most important teaching effectiveness factor was "communicates well with students," while the administrators ranked "maintains good control, develops self-discipline, character, and respect for others" as their most important teaching effectiveness factors. Both teachers and administrators ranked "carries a reasonable share of out-of-class responsibilities" as the least important teaching effectiveness factor.

The second question in the survey concerned personal traits. Both teachers and administrators agreed that the most recommended factor was "fulfills responsibilities without

---

[1]Ellinger, pp. 360-365.

constant supervision. They both ranked as the lowest two factors "understands the strengths and problems of the school community" and "completes necessary paper work promptly and accurately."

The third consideration was agreement on professional traits. The professional trait which teachers most strongly recommended was "understands and follows school policies and procedures." Administrators listed "demonstrates a high standard of ethics" as their most strongly recommended professional trait. Both teachers and administrators listed "supports professional organizations" as the least strongly recommended professional trait. The following conclusions were drawn from the study:

> . . .The largest portion of the evaluation form should be devoted to evaluating teaching effectiveness characteristics. Less emphasis should be placed on personal and professional trait categories. . . .Also, administrators need to be provided with more time to do the job of teacher evaluation more effectively.[1]

From a review of the literature on criteria of teacher evaluation it is apparent that there is no one set of criteria that can be used under all circumstances and regarded as valid and reliable by both evaluator and evaluatee. It is necessary, therefore, that the criteria to be used in any given school system be developed, or at least adapted, by those concerned with teacher evaluation in that system.

First of all, the desirable educational outcomes must be decided upon. Then a list of criteria based on the relationship

---

[1]H. M. Klonecky, "The Relationships of Teacher and Administrator Views of the Component Parts of Teacher Evaluation" (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Southn California, 1972), pp. 123-153.

of the criteria to desired outcomes must be developed. The validity and reliability of the criteria should be agreed upon in advance by the evaluator and the evaluatee, or at least by representatives of both. Once the purposes of teacher evaluation have been determined and the criteria for teacher evaluation have been agreed upon, the next logical step is to decide who shall conduct teacher evaluation.

Evaluators Of Teachers

The decision as to who should evaluate teachers would, of course, depend to some extent on the purposes of evaluation. If the purpose were to facilitate an administrative decision, for instance, the administrator charged with the responsibility of making the decision would be the logical agent of evaluation. If the purpose were to plan appropriate in-service training, the evaluator would necessarily have to be someone with the skills and knowledge to do such planning.

Cook and Richards conducted a study in which 236 teachers were rated independently by their principals and supervisors on 23 scales generated data that were more a reflection of the rater's point of view than of a teacher's actual classroom behavior.[1]

Musella found that personal characteristics of the rater and ratee are related to the rating of teachers by principals. Closed principals were influenced to a certain extent by the

---

[1]Mart A. Cook and Herbert C. Richards, "Dimensions of Principal and Supervisor Ratings of Teacher Behavior," Journal of Experimental Education 2 (1972): pp. 111-114.

similarity or dissimilarity of belief-disbelief structure; that is they tend to select teachers on the basis of similarity, dissimilarity of the perceptual-cognitive style referred to as closemindedness. Conversely, evidence indicated that the similarity-dissimilarity of belief-disbelief structure had no effect on the decisions of the open principals. It was found that differences existed between open and closed principals in the description and rating of those teachers selected as most and least effective. The open principals displayed more differentiation and variability than did the closed principals. The latter group were inclined to describe and rate all most effective teachers as the "same" and all least effective teachers the "same."[1]

Amidon and Flanders emphasized the importance of the participation of the teacher in the evaluation of his own behavior if the purpose of the evaluation is to change that behavior.[2]

Poliakoff concluded, on the basis of a review of the literature, that there is a trend toward a partnership between administrator and teacher in the evaluation of teachers, including the self-evaluation of teachers.[3]

A National Education Association study found that in over ninety percent of all school systems with written evaluations, the principal signed the evaluation report and thus was responsible.

---

[1]Donald Musella, "Open-Closed Mindeness as Related to the Rating of Teachers by Elementary School Principals," The Journal of Experimental Education 3 (1967): pp. 75-79.

[2]Amidon and Flanders, pp. 1-4.

[3]Lorraine L. Poliakoff, Evaluating School Personnel Today (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction, ED 073 045, 1973), p. 16.

for the evaluation report. In elementary schools, the responsibility was shared with instructional supervisors (mainly in the larger systems) and with the superintendent (mainly in the smaller systems). More secondary school principals than elementary school principals reported sharing responsibility for evaluation with an assistant principal or department head in addition to the other officials mentioned.[1]

Stemmock reported on a study the National Education Association did in 1969 as a follow-up to their 1964 study. In the follow-up study, it was found that:

> The principal is the sole person responsible for completing evaluations for teachers in 115 of the 213 responding systems. The principal and the assistant principal jointly prepare the teachers' evaluations in 13 systems, and in an equal number of systems evaluations are jointly completed by the principal and supervisor. Twelve respondents said the principal and supervisor each prepare a separate evaluation for each teacher.[2]

Tolor conducted a study which compared the rating of teachers by students, parents, administrators and teachers:

> Results indicated moderate agreement between different rating groups. Administrators and faculty had the most similar perceptions of teacher performance, whereas faculty and parents agree least. Students showed no significant agreement with any of the other rating groups regarding least effective teachers. Students' judgments were related to class level and self-reported academic achievements suggesting that teacher evaluations represent a complex interactional process necessitating the specification of rater characteristics.[3]

Barr concluded that "Whatever supervisors look for it

---

[1]National Education Association, "Programs for Evaluating Classroom Teachers," pp. 84-85.

[2]Stemmock, p. 4.

[3]Alexander Tolor, "Evaluation of Perceived Teacher Effectiveness," Journal of Educational Psychology 1 (1973): p. 98.

is not that considered of prime importance by pupils in their evaluation of teachers or that measured by tests of pupil achievement."[1]

A study by Lins found that:

> The three criteria of teaching efficiency (a composite of five supervisory ratings, pupil gain, and pupil evaluations) are not related to greater degree than can be attributed to change. Whatever, then, is measured by each of the criteria, at least it appears evident that these criteria do not measure the same aspects of teaching efficiency.[2]

All of the comparisons of raters illustrate the need for agreement on criteria to minimize rater bias and lack of understanding between evaluator and evaluatee. The principal appears to be the key person in formal teacher evaluation and thus, logically, should be involved to some extent in the development of criteria and methods and procedures of teacher evaluation.

Methods, Procedures and Instruments for Teacher Evaluations

Methods, procedures and instruments for teacher evaluation must be adopted, adapted or developed, based on the purposes, and utilizing the agreed upon criteria, evaluator(s) and frequency of teacher evaluation. According to the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, a plan involving the following should be developed:

> Methods and procedures for evaluating teaching services must be cooperatively and locally involved since objectives set by one group will not be exactly similar to those set by any other group.

---

[1]A. S. Barr, "Summary and Comments," Journal of Experimental Education 1 (1946): p. 99.

[2]Leo Joseph Lins, "The Prediction of Teaching Efficiency," The Journal of Experimental Education 1 (1946): p. 59.

> To say that methods and procedures of appraisal must be evolved by the groups which use them is to place responsibility for their selection, development and use upon all persons directly concerned with the outcome of the program. This should ensure that the techniques selected will be in harmony with the overall objectives of the educational program.[1]

Amidon and Flanders recommended five steps to help the teacher who wishes to change his role:

1. Collect observation data about his existing classroom behavior pattern
2. Analyze his pattern in light of his own goals, determining what seem to be strengths and weaknesses
3. Experiment with specific areas of the matrix that seem to present problems, substituting alternative behavior for that previously used
4. Evaluate through further observation data his success in specific attempts to change his pattern
5. Continue to work on unchanged portions of the matrix in which change is considered desirable[2]

Musella listed the advantages of teacher self-evaluation and suggested that the use of coding techniques for abstracting and displaying teacher-pupil interaction could provide the teacher and rater with certain common dimensions for reviewing behaviors.

Niedermeyer and Klein described the Staff Performance and

---

[1]Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Better Than Rating: New Approaches to Appraisal of Teaching Services (Washington, D.C.: National Education,1950), p. 69.

[2]Amidon and Flanders, pp. 63-66.

[3]Musella, pp. 20-21.

Appraisal Plan (SPI&A), a teacher accountability system developed in the Newport-Mesa Unified School District in Southern California The SPI&A plan used pupil performance as the primary criterion for evaluation and decision-making.

Essentially, SPI&A consists of two cycles: the "appraisal cycle" and the "improvement cycle." During an appraisal cycle (normally once a semester), a teacher submits instructional objectives covering two subject areas for the principal's approval. At the end of the semester, data are submitted documenting the extent to which the objectives were attained by the teacher's pupils. During an improvement cycle (one or more during each appraisal cycle), a teacher submits a lesson plan containing preassessment data and instructional objectives to a team of fellow teachers. The team then observes the lesson, meets to decide if the objectives were attained, and finally confers with the teacher who gave the lesson. Information from the appraisal cycles, but not from the improvement cycles, is then used by the principal at the end of the year as part of the teacher's formal evaluation statement.

A survey was taken to determine the reaction of principals and teachers to the SPI&A method of teacher evaluation:

> Overall, teachers and principals perceived their accountability and evaluation system more positively than non-SPI&A teachers as an aid in improving teacher performance, in modifying instructional methods, and in clarifying what is expected of teachers. They were also more positive than non-SPI&A teachers and principals in judging their system sensible, systematic, fair and objective.[1]

---

[1]Fred Niedermeyer and Stephen Klein, "An Empirical Evaluation of a District Teachers' Accountability Program," Phi Delta Kappan 2 (1972): pp. 100-102.

A report by one of the teachers using the SPI&A system of evaluation and decision making confirmed the positive reaction of teachers to the system.[1]

Grasha recommended a system of evaluation which emphasized the teacher's particular goals and the extent to which he accomplished them or, at least, the attempt that he made to accomplish them. Grasha stressed the importance of feed back to the teacher so that the teacher could improve his efforts and the importance of what the student got out of the course.[2]

A guide has been developed by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare offering suggestions for the observation of classroom teachers in nongraded primary school. The guide considered six areas:

1. Identifying individual differences
2. Pacing instruction
3. Materials of instruction available
4. Library services
5. Adjusting learning time
6. Classroom organization[3]

The National Educational Association has prepared a report consisting of abstracts of thirteen different teacher

---

[1]Susan K. Miller, "The Teacher's View of S.P.I.& A.," Phi Delta Kappan 2 (1972): p. 104.

[2]Anthony F. Grasha, Evaluating Teaching: Some Problems (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction, ED 071 582, 1972), p. 5.

[3]United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education. Nongraded Primaries in Action: (A Guide for Observing Classroom and Classroom Teaching in Nongraded Schools (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction, ED 073 127, 1973), p. 9.

Evaluation systems. This report includes a description of each system and its purpose, an outline of criteria, and an explanation of how it works and where to get further information. The document assures that each of the systems mentioned has been researched over a considerable period of time.[1]

Lawrence described teacher rating scales as high-inference measures, "requiring the rater to make an inferential leap from a number of bits of observed behavior to global value judgements . . . .Teachers rating instruments have been shown to have poor capacity to predict teacher influence on pupil gain of any kind."[2]

In using low inference measures, on the other hand, the measurer is asked to report sensory data (events, facts, behaviors) and include little or no inferring as to the meaning or value of the data. Low-inference data have the virtue of conveying the same or similar messages to different people.

Lawrence reported that those records of demonstrated competencies and measurement procedures appropriate for competency portfolios included the following types: data gathered by systematic observation instruments; samples of pupil products and descriptions of pupil achievements attributable to the teacher; data gathered by diagnostic tools that measure change in pupil

---

[1]National Education Association. Evaluation Systems for Descriptive Abstracts (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction, ED 079 282, 1973), p. 31.

[2]Gordon Lawrence, "Delineating and Measuring Professional Competencies," Educational Leadership (January, 1974): p. 301.

attitudes, perceptions of self and others, motivations, feelings, etc., as these reflect teacher influence; and records of concrete accomplishments of the teacher according to stated criteria.[1]

A nationwide study by the National Education Association found that formal rules and regulations did not govern the evaluation process for about half of the reporting principals. The most usual method of reporting evaluations was by a written analysis or rating form for each teacher evaluated. This practice was followed in a higher percent of large districts than of small, and more for elementary school teachers than for secondary school teachers. More than half the superintendents and principals replying to the questionnaire sent in samples of the evaluation forms used in their school systems. When these forms were analyzed, it was found that:

> . . .80.4 percent featured a list of criteria on which the teacher was to be rated item by item (usually at one of five levels). Most forms also required the evaluator to make comments in his own words. The evaluator's comments only, usually on certain specified factors, were called for on 17.9 percent of the forms. About a third of all forms examined called for the teacher to receive a general rating other than just "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory." Only 28.7 percent of the teachers who received a written evaluation actually were given their own copy of the evaluation report; 28.1 percent were shown a copy, but not given it to keep. The remaining teachers comprised 27.9 percent who did not see their evaluation report at all, and 5.3 percent who did not reply to the questionnaire.[2]

Results of a 1969 National Education Association study showed that the most frequent evaluation procedure involved observation(s) with post-observation conference(s) with the eval-

---

[1]Ibid., p. 302.

[2]National Education Association, "Programs for Evaluating Teachers," p. 86.

uator unilaterally rating the evaluatee against prescribed standards. The most frequent appeal procedure open to teachers was a request for a conference with the evaluator's superior. The most frequently used type of evaluation form was a word or number rating on a list of defined factors plus overall narrative, nonstructured comments.

The methods and procedures of teacher evaluation must be consistent with the purposes and criteria. They must be used by evaluators who are qualified to use them, and they must conform to state law regarding the rights of the teacher.[1]

In the seventies, the trends in evaluating school personnel focus on the participation of the evaluatee and on his needs and rights as a professional and human being. These trends do not solve the age-old problem of defining and measuring teacher effectiveness.[2]

An analysis of the literature review indicates that numerous difficulties have been encountered over the years in attempts to evaluate the relative merits and qualifications of teachers. Evaluation has, it appears, always been an extremely difficult and complex task. The very complexity of modern times has tended to add new dimensions to the evaluation problem. However, this very complexity cries out for some basic point of reference,with regard to evaluation, which alone can supply

---

[1]National Education Association, Research Bulletin (1969): pp. 6-7.

[2]John Roche, "Evaluating School Personnel," National Elementary Principals, (October 1973): p. 43.

stability in these rapidly changing times. What we know about the past can serve as a springboard for the future.

The literature reviewed in this chapter can provide such a springboard. Success in the future, however, is largely contingent upon clarity of perspective in the present. This research is designed, in general, to help bring clarity to the present-day educational scene. Specifically, the study focused on presenting and analyzing teacher evaluation practices now employed by principals in Chicago Public Schools.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Explanation - Part I and II

An Interview Guide, Part I, was developed to analyze the evaluation practices and purposes of teacher evaluation of twenty-five outstanding principals and twenty-five randomly selected principals in the Chicago Public Schools. One outstanding principal was selected from each of the twenty-five school districts in the City of Chicago based upon a recommendation by their District Superintendent. One other principal was randomly selected from each school district in the City of Chicago.

The fifty principals selected to take part in this study were contacted by telephone. Appointments were made with them in order to explain the purpose of the study and to conduct the necessary interviews. The interviews were scheduled over a three week period.

Each of the twenty-five outstanding and twenty-five randomly selected principals agreed to participate in the study. However, two of the outstanding principals and two of the randomly selected principals did not provide sufficient information to permit an analysis. Therefore, the responses of only forty-six principals have been used in Part I of this study.

A survey instrument, the Certified Teacher Evaluation Methods (CTEM), Part II, was developed to analyze the status of assigned teacher evaluation practices of twenty-five outstanding and twenty-five randomly selected principals in the Chicago Public Schools.

This instrument was given to the fifty principals at the time of the interview. Four principals provided insufficient information at the time of the interview; consequently, their CTEM responses were not analyzed.

In addition to the fifty principals utilized for this study, the CTEM and a cover letter was sent to all principals assigned to elementary schools in the City of Chicago as listed in the Directory of the Chicago Public Schools for September, 1976. If a school was headed by an interim principal, the CTEM was mailed only if the interim principal held a Chicago Principals' Certificate.

After two weeks, a follow-up letter and a cover letter was sent to each non-respondent.

The responses from those principals not included in the study of the twenty-five outstanding principals and twenty-five randomly selected principals were used to provide additional information for Hypothesis Three and Hypothesis Four.

Part I - Interview Guide

The interview guide was developed after a review of the literature in order to analyze the evaluation practices of the twenty-five outstanding and twenty-five randomly selected prin-

cipals participating in this study.

The interview guide consisted of eleven questions. The first question was designed to determine what criteria the twenty-five outstanding principals and twenty-five randomly selected principals used personally in the evaluation of their teachers.

Question two included: As an evaluator/administrator do teacher evaluations enable you to communicate more honestly with your teachers? Do they enable you to be more aware of your teachers' problems? Do they enable you to more easily assess a teacher's performance? This question was designed to determine how evaluation practices aided the principal in fulfilling his role as evaluator/administrator.

Question three was designed to determine the frequency of assigned teacher evaluation.

Question four was designed to determine whether the principal discusses the criteria for evaluation with teachers.

Question five was designed to determine where these discussions took place: (A) At staff meetings, (B) Private conferences, (C) Others (specify).

Question six wanted to know how teachers reacted to these discussions, as perceived by the principal.

Questions seven through ten were designed to determine the principal's perception of the quality of his staff.

Question eleven asked the respondent what three criteria were of primary importance in evaluating teachers. He was asked

to list them in priority order:

A. Tends to be self-motivating

B. Indicates desire to improve

C. Is able to accept advice, criticism, and help from others

D. Attains high level of achievement from students

E. Manages classroom effectively

F. Follows a definite study plan for each student

G. Disciplines students without degrading them

H. Maintains accurate and current records

I. Files regular reports with principal's office

J. Creatively presents his subject and related materials

K. Endeavors to communicate regularly with the principal

L. Endeavors to communicate regularly and well with other teachers

M. Encourages high school standards such as sportsmanship, friendship, fairness, and politeness

N. Encourages high personal standards such as neatness, honesty, cheerfulness, courage, humility, fortitude, and creativity.

The first question of the interview guide was designed to determine the purpose(s) of teacher evaluation for the principals participating in this study.

The purposes of teacher evaluation were based on the studies by Jones (1972); Beller (1971); Green (1971); Voege (1970); Hall (1967); Klonecky (1972); Ellinger (1969); Litherland (1968) and Torreson (1967). These studies emphasized the

---

The studies listed above have been mentioned previously in the text of this paper.

importance of establishing the purposes of teacher evaluation.

The second question was designed to determine the way evaluation aids the principal in fulfilling his role as an evaluator/administrator and was based on the study by Ellinger (1968). This study questioned the importance of teacher evaluation in aiding the principal to fulfill his role as evaluator/administrator.

Question three asked for the frequency of evaluation by the participating principals and was based on the studies done by the National Education Association (1964, 1969) and Voege (1970).

Question three asked for the frequency of evaluation by the participating principals and was based on the studies done by the National Education Association (1964, 1969) and Voege (1970). These researchers asked about the frequency of teacher evaluation.

Questions four, five, and six were designed to determine how teachers were involved in the evaluation practices, and the basis for the questions were the studies by Getzels (1968); Barr (1952) and Beller (1971).

Questions seven through ten dealt with the perception the

The studies listed on this page have been cited previously in the text of this paper except for the following: Anthony S. Jones "A Realistic Approach to Teacher Evaluation," The Clearning House, April 1971): p. 474; Jae E. Greene, School Personnel Administration (Philadelphia: Chilton Book Company, 1971), p. 368; D. Torreson, "A Comparative Study of Evaluation Procedures for Non-Tenure Teachers in Selected Urban School Systems" (Ph.D. Dissertation, Indiana University, 1967), p. 154.

evaluator/administrator had of his staff, and were based on the studies of Cook and Richards (1972); Musella (1967) and Sinatra (1975).

Question eleven dealt with the criteria of teacher evaluation and was based on the studies of Barr (1929); Ryans (1960); Hall (1967); Litherland (1968) and Lill (1970). These researchers developed major studies concerned with this one aspect of teacher evaluation.

As a validation on the interview guide, the questions were submitted to a panel of experts for examination and review.

Part 2 - Certified Teacher Evaluation Methods in the Chicago Public Schools (CTEM Questionnaire)

The Certified Teacher Evaluation Methods in the Chicago Public Schools (CTEM) form was the instrument used to analyze teacher evaluation practices of fifty principals in the Chicago Public Schools.

The CTEM was divided into three sections. Section I asked for: background information, i.e., sex, age, race, years as principal, type of school, size of school, and the number of teachers in the school.

Section II was designed to determine the criteria used

The studies listed on this page have been mentioned previously in the text of this paper except for the following: W. Sinatra, "An Investigation Into the Relationship Between Teacher Evaluation and the Interpersonal" (Ph.D. Dissertation, State University of New York, 1975), p. 26; G. Lill, "A Study of Non-Tenure Elementary School Teacher Evaluation Programs in Selected New Jersey School Districts" (Ph.D. Dissertation, New York University, 1970) p. 101.

in teacher evaluation, which criteria was the most important, and did criteria change with the length of service.

This section was also intended to determine the frequency of classroom observations, whether these observations were prearranged, and whether a log was kept after each observation.

The principals were also asked how frequently conferences were held individually or as a group. They were asked whether the evaluation, problems or shortcomings, and suggestions for improvement were made at these conferences.

The respondents were asked in the final questions of Section II about who designs, defines, and determines the criteria and methods used for teacher evaluation.

Section III is an analysis of evaluation practices by principals. It was designed to determine the purposes, criteria, frequency, approaches, and the methods and procedures of teacher evaluation practices.

The principals were directed to state the purpose(s) for which teacher evaluation was conducted in their schools. The question was also intended to determine the criteria for teacher evaluation. The principals were asked to state whether or not there were written criteria upon which teachers were evaluated in their schools. They were also asked who had determined the criteria on which teachers were evaluated, whether teachers were informed in advance of the criteria upon which they were to be evaluated and, if so, in what way. The principals were also asked to state the criteria on which teachers were evaluated in their schools.

This section also asked how often assigned teachers were evaluated in the school.

Question four dealt with the principals' approaches to evaluation in their schools and to identify the one approach used to the greatest extent in their schools. The three approaches listed were: (1) on the basis of teacher characteristics, (2) on the basis of measurement of pupil gain, and (3) on the basis of observation of teaching activities and assessment of teacher competence.

Question five asked the principals to check any methods and procedures used for teacher evaluation in their schools. The methods and procedures listed were:

1. Formal classroom observation with a predetermined instrument
2. Informal classroom observation without an instrument
3. Rating scales
4. Self evaluation forms
5. Conference/interview
6. Observation outside of classroom
7. Records/reports
8. Informal feedback from students and/or teachers
9. Other(s) - please specify.

The principals were asked to state whether teachers in their schools were usually informed of the results after an evaluation had been conducted.

Part II - Section I of the CTEM requested background information that would allow the researcher to make comparisons

among principals with less than six years as a principal and those with more than six years as a principal.

Part II - Section II of the CTEM concerned the criteria and methods used in teacher evaluation. Barr (1929) and Ryan (1960) studied this aspect of teacher evaluation. Hall (1967), Litherland (1968), and Lill (1970) asked who developed the program of teacher evaluations. Hall (1967), Lill (1970), and Voege (1970) showed concern with teachers being informed in advance of the criteria upon which they were to be evaluated. Hall (1967), Litherland (1968), Torrison (1967), Burron (1968), and Lill (1970) questioned the criteria used in teacher evaluations.

The methods and procedures of teacher evaluation were based on questions asked by Hall (1967), Ellinger (1968), and Litherland (1968). Ellinger (1967), Voege (1970), and Klonecky (1972) questioned whether or not teachers were informed in advance of teacher observations. Hall (1967), Torreson (1967), Ellinger (1968), Litherland (1968), Voege (1970), and Klonecky (1972) all questioned whether teachers were informed about the results of evaluation.

The questions on the frequency of evaluations were based on studies by the National Education Association (1964, 1969). Voege (1970) also questioned the frequency of teacher evaluation.

The studies listed above have been mentioned previously in the text of this paper except for the following: A. Burron, "The Relationship of Selected Pre-Service Biographical Factors and Administrator-Evaluated Competence or Incompetence in Teaching." (Ph.D. Dissertation, Ball State University, 1969), p. 130.

The question asking whether or not a log was kept by the principal was based on recommendations made by Amidon and Flanders (1973).

The next group of questions were intended to determine the frequency of teacher conferences, the regularity of principal-teacher discussions, and what was discussed. These questions were based on a National Education Association study done in 1965.

The final questions asked who designs, defines, determines, and utilizes the evaluation criteria and these questions were based on studies by Amidon and Flanders (1963) and the National Education Association (1964 and 1969). All of these studies stressed the importance of having each teacher participate in the evaluation of his teaching practices.

Section III contains an analysis of evaluation practices by principals and it was designed to review the previous sections. A review of the literature on which the questions relating to criteria, frequency and methods and procedures used in evaluations has already been discussed.

Questions concerning the purposes of teacher evaluation were asked by Voege (1970), Hall (1967), Klonecky (1972), Ellinger (1968), and Literland (1968). The importance of establishing purposes of teacher evaluation was emphasized by Jones (1972), Beller (1971), and Greene (1971).

The studies listed above have been mentioned previously in the text of this paper.

Questions regarding the necessity of developing written policies in connection with teacher evaluation were asked by Litherland (1968), Lill (1970), and Voege (1970).

The questions regarding the approaches to teacher evaluation used by principals were based on studies by Torreson (1967), Ellinger (1968), and Voege (1970). These three studies questioned who it was that evaluated teachers.[1]

As a final check on the CTEM, the questions were submitted to a panel of experts for examination, criticism, and review.

Research Methods and Procedures

Background Information on Respondents

The CTEM was mailed to 461 principals, and 288 or 62 percent were returned. Of these, 217 or 47 percent of the questionnaires were completed. Although only 46 principals were used in the study, the background information on principals who responded to the CTEM--but not included in the study--were included in the description and tabulation in Table 1.

TABLE 1

RESPONSES

CTEM's Mailed	Number Returned	Percent of Returns	Completed Returns	Percent of Completed Returns
461	288	62%	217	47%

[1]The studies listed on this page have been cited previously in the text of this paper.

The respondents comprised three groups designated in the narrative description and in the tables as: (1) Others, not included in outstanding and not randomly selected; (2) Outstanding, and (3) Randomly selected.

Section I of Part II of the CTEM was designed to gather information concerning the backgrounds of the respondents. They were asked to indicate their sex, race, age, years of experience as principals, the type of school in which each was employed, and the size of the school. Each item of background information is reported under its respective index.

Sex Index. The number and percent of CTEM respondents who completed the questionnaires when grouped according to sex are as follows: Of the Others, not included in outstanding and randomly selected, 104 or 60.8 percent were male; 67 or 39.2 percent were female; of the Outstanding principal's group, 13 or 56.5 percent were male; 10 or 43.5 percent were female; of the other principals Randomly selected group, 15 or 65.2 percent were male, and 8 or 34.8 percent were female. (Reported in Table 2.)

TABLE 2

PRINCIPALS GROUPED ACCORDING TO SEX

	Male	Percent	Female	Percent	Total
1. Others, not included in outstanding and not randomly selected.....	104	60.8	67	39.2	171
2. Outstanding.....	13	56.5	10	43.5	23
3. Randomly selected.....	15	65.2	8	34.8	23
Total.....	132		85		217

Race Index. The number and percent of CTEM respondents who completed the questionnaires when grouped according to race are as follows: Of the Others, not included in outstanding and not randomly selected. 55 or 32.1 percent were black; 116 or 67.8 percent were white; of the Outstanding principals, 7 or 30.4 percent were black; 16 or 69.6 percent were white; of the other principals Randomly selected, 8 or 34.8 percent were black, and 15 or 65.2 percent were white. (Reported in Table 3.)

TABLE 3

PRINCIPALS GROUPED ACCORDING TO RACE

	Black	Percent	White	Percent	Total
1. Others not included in outstanding and not randomly selected.....	55	32.1	116	67.8	171
2. Outstanding.....	7	30.4	16	69.6	23
3. Randomly selected.....	8	34.8	15.	65.2	23
Total.....	70		147		217

Age Index. The number and percent of CTEM respondents when grouped according to age are as follows: Of the Others, not included in outstanding and randomly selected, 1 or .6 percent were under 30; 32 or 18.7 percent were between ages 35-44; 94 or 55.0 percent were between the ages of 45-54, and 44 or 25.0 percent were over 55 years of age. Of the Outstanding principals, 0 percent were under age 30; 9 or 39.1 percent were between the ages of 35-44; 7 or 30.4 percent were between the ages of 45-54, and 7 or 30.4 percent were over 55 years of age. Of the other

principals Randomly selected, 0 percent were under 30; 6 or 26.1 percent were between the ages of 35-44; 13 or 56.5 percent were between the ages of 45-54, and 4 or 17.4 percent were over 55 years of age. (Reported in Table 4.)

TABLE 4

PRINCIPALS GROUPED ACCORDING TO AGE

	Under 30	Percent	35-44	Percent	45-54	Percent	Over 55	Percent	Total
1. Others not included in outstanding and not randomly selected.....	1	0.6	32	18.7	94	55.0	44	25.0	171
2. Outstanding.....	...	...	9	39.1	7	30.4	7	30.4	23
3. Randomly selected.....	...	...	6	26.1	13	56.5	4	17.4	23
Total.....	1		47		114		55		217

Experience Index. The number and percent of CTEM respondents when grouped according to years of experience are as follows: Of the Others not included in outstanding and not randomly selected, 6 or 3.5 percent had less than 1 year experience; 28 or 16.4 percent had between 1-4 years of experience; 40 or 23.4 percent had between 5-9 years of experience; 60 or 35.1 percent had between 10-19 years of experience, and 37 or 21.5 percent had over 20 years experience. Of the Outstanding principals, 0 percent had less than 1 year of experience; 5 or 21.6

percent had between 1-4 years of experience; 9 or 39.1 percent had between 5-9 years of experience; 7 or 30.4 percent had between 10-19 years of experience, and 2 or 8.7 percent had over 20 years of experience.

Of the other principals Randomly selected, 3 or 13.1 percent had less than 1 year of experience; 5 or 21.7 percent had between 1-4 years of experience; 10 or 43.5 percent had between 5-9 years of experience; 4 or 17.4 percent had between 10-19 years of experience, and 1 or 4.3 percent had over 20 years of experience. (Reported in Table 5.)

Type of School Index. The number and percent of CTEM respondents when grouped according to type of school are as follows: Of the Others not included in outstanding and not randomly selected, 157 or 91.7 percent were elementary school principals; 9 or 5.3 percent were upper grade principals; 3 or 1.8 percent were Education and Vocational Guidance Center (EVGC) principals; 1 or .6 percent were middle school principals, and 1 or .6 percent were principals of other schools.

Of the Outstanding principal's group, 19 or 82.6 percent were elementary school principals; 1 or 4.3 percent were upper grade principals; 1 or 4.3 percent were EVGC principals; 1 or 4.3 percent were middle school principals, and 1 or 4.3 percent were principals of other schools.

Of the Randomly selected principal's group, 18 or 78.3 percent were elementary school principals; 1 or 4.3 percent were upper grade principals, and 4 or 17.4 percent were principals of other schools. (Reported in Table 6.)

TABLE 5

PRINCIPALS GROUPED ACCORDING TO YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

	1 Year or Less	Percent	1-4 Years	Percent	5-9 Years	Percent	10-19 Years	Percent	20 Years or More	Percent	Total
1. Others not included in outstanding and not randomly selected.....	6	3.5	28	16.4	40	23.4	60	35.1	37	21.6	171
2. Outstanding....	...	...	5	21.7	9	39.1	7	30.4	2	8.7	23
3. Randomly selected.....	3	13.6	5	21.7	10	43.5	4	17.4	1	4.3	23
Total	9		38		59		71		40		217

TABLE 6

PRINCIPALS GROUPED ACCORDING TO TYPE OF SCHOOL

	Elementary	Percent	Upper Grade	Percent	EVGC	Percent	Middle School	Percent	Other	Percent	Total
1. Others not included in outstanding and not randomly selected....	157	91.7	9	5.3	3	1.8	1	.6	1	.6	171
2. Outstanding...	19	82.6	1	4.3	1	4.3	1	4.3	1	4.3	23
3. Randomly selected....	18	78.3	1	4.3	...	...	...	...	4	17.4	23
Total.....	194		11		4		2		6		217

Size of School Index. The number and percent of CTEM respondents when grouped according to size of school are as follows: Of the Others not included in outstanding and not randomly selected, 47 or 27.5 percent were principals of schools with a student body under 500; 94 or 55.0 percent were principals of schools with a student body between 500-999, and 30 or 17.5 percent were principals of schools with a student body of over 1,000. Of the Outstanding principal's group, 3 were principals of schools with a student body of under 500; 14 or 60.9 percent were principals of schools with a student body between 500-999, and 6 or 26.1 percent were principals of schools with a student body numbering 1,000 and over. Of the Randomly selected principal's group, 2 or 8.7 percent were principals of schools with a student body of under 500; 10 or 43.5 percent were principals of schools with a student body of 500-999, and 11 or 47.8 percent were principals of schools with a student body numbering 1,000 and over. (Reported in Table 7.)

TABLE 7

PRINCIPALS GROUPED ACCORDING TO SIZE OF SCHOOL

	Under 500	Percent	500-999	Percent	1,000 and Over	Percent	Total
1. Others not included in outstanding and not randomly selected.....	47	27.5	94	55.0	30	17.5	171
2. Outstanding.....	3	13.0	14	60.9	6	26.1	23
3. Randomly selected.	2	8.7	10	43.5	11	47.8	23
Total.....	52		118		47		217

Statistical Procedure

The results from the Interview Guide and the CTEM Questionnaire were keypunched and analyzed at the Bogel Back Computer Center, Northwestern University.

Percentages and the Chi square for the Social Sciences (SPSS), Version 6.52 were programmed for an analysis of the data.

The Interview Guide was designed to analyze the teacher evaluation practices of twenty-five outstanding principals and twenty-five randomly selected principals in the Chicago Public Schools.

The CTEM Questionnaire was designed to analyze the criteria, frequency, purposes, approaches, methods and procedures of evaluation practices for fifty principals in the Chicago Public Schools. Only 46 were used in the actual study.

The responses to the Interview Guide were analyzed, using frequencies, percentages, and the Chi square formula, wherever applicable, to determine whether or not there was a significant relationship between responses of Outstanding principals and Others not included in the Outstanding principals.

The responses to the CTEM Questionnaire were analyzed using frequencies and percentages to determine significant relationships. Frequencies and percentages were utilized because the responses were too varied to permit a Chi square analysis.

Method of Reporting

The findings are reported in Chapter IV, entitled Presentation and Analysis of Data. The four hypotheses form the bases for the four sections comprising Chapter IV. Each section

begins with the statement of the hypothesis under investigation followed by the identification of the section of the Questionnaire used for testing the hypothesis in question.

Chi square analyses was used to ascertain whether or not the Outstanding Principals Group and the Other Principal's Group were in significant agreement or disagreement in their evaluation practices as demonstrated by their responses to the Interview Guide, Part I.

The Chi square value at or beyond the .05 level of confidence was established as the criterion for a rejection of a null hypothesis.

A Chi square analysis was not applicable for Questions 1, 3, 7, 8, 9, and 10. The responses were listed as they were reported. Percentages and frequencies were calculated for Questions 3, 7, 8, 9, and 10 where applicable. If no percentages were computed, the responses were listed as written. A percent difference at or beyond 10 percent was established as the criterian for the rejection of a null hypothesis.

When the interview questions were presented to the principals, no attempt was made by the interviewer to structure the responses. In some instances, the principals used the conference to express opinions about matters that did not relate to practices.

This problem could probably have been corrected if the questions had been standardized by using a sample group of principals. The responses of the sample could have been tabulated. These responses then could have been structured for the interview, and the principals could have selected from

the responses in a priority order.

This was not done, however, so the responses for questions 1, 3, 7, 8, 9, and 10 are recorded as they were presented. These questions are:

1. What criteria do you use personally in evaluating a teacher?
3. How often are the assigned teachers evaluated in your school?
7. What percent of your teachers do you consider outstanding?
8. What do you do to encourage outstanding teachers?
9. What percentage of the teachers in your school are unsatisfactory?
10. What do you do about unsatisfactory teachers?

Frequencies and percentages were calculated to determine whether there was agreement or disagreement in the principal's evaluation practice responses to the CTEM Questionnaire, Part II. The judgments based on percent of difference to each response by Outstanding principals and Others not included in Outstanding were made because the variation in responses did not lend itself to statistical treatment.

A Chi square analysis was used for one section, Part II, Question 1, that asked for the purposes of teacher evaluation.

The purpose of the study was to bring into one view for purposes of comparison the criteria, frequency, purposes, approaches, methods and procedures used in evaluating teachers by two groups of principals in the Chicago Public Schools--one designated as Outstanding by selection of immediate superiors

and the other designated as Others. The null hypothesis stated that there is no difference in the practices of teacher evaluation of the two groups and that the two variables, length of experience,and size of school, made no significant difference.

Responses to all the questions used to test Hypotheses I, II, III, and IV were validated by a survey of teachers in 15 schools. Teachers were asked the same questions. Of the 70 teachers surveyed, 62 or 88.5 percent responded as the principals responded to the CTEM Questionnaire. Another 5 or .07 percent refused to answer, and 3 or 4.0 percent said that principal responses were incorrect.

A description of the data collected will be presented in Chapter IV. The description will be followed by the analyses as it related to each hypothesis.

Recommendation and implications, and a summary statement regarding each hypothesis will be presented in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Section I

Hypothesis I

The first hypothesis under investigation states that there is no significant difference in teacher evaluation practices as employed by elementary school principals designated as Outstanding by their superiors and other elementary school principals in the Chicago Public Schools.

The questions used for testing this hypothesis were: (A) those comprising the Interview Guide, and (B) those comprising Section II of the CTEM. The description of the data and the analysis of the responses to the Interview Guide are given first, and they are followed by the description and analysis of the data from the CTEM.

Part A

Description and Analysis of Data from Interview Guide

The Interview Guide was comprised of eleven questions to which each participant of the Outstanding Principal's Group and the Other Principal's Group responded.

The questions and a listing of the responses from each group are given. The responses of the Outstanding Principal's

Group are presented first for each question, followed by the responses from the Other Principal's Group.

Question 1

What criteria do you use personally in evaluating a teacher?

Presentation of Data

The twenty-three members of the Outstanding Principal's Group admitted that they almost invariably made evaluations of teachers from a purely personal point of view. They all denied, however, that they permitted personal preferences or biases to take precedence over objective data in the over-all rating of an individual teacher. None of the members of the group could give a clear definitive method by which they arrived at conclusions. Three of the members of the Outstanding Principal's Group felt that evaluation from personal observation should replace objective methods totally. One principal reported that he made classroom visitations frequently. The remainder thought that the personal method would and should continue to supplement objective procedures. Of this group, three said that appearance influenced their impression. One said that he occasionally examined lesson plans from which he formed judgments of the teacher's qualifications, interest in her work, and degree of dedication.

The responses of the Other Principal's Group concurred with those of the Outstanding Principal's Group in general. It was a little more difficult to keep the responses of this group focused on the question. They seemed more inclined to discuss a variety of personnel matters when Question 1 was posed.

Analysis of Data

A tabulation of answers to Question 1 was not made since the responses from both groups were extremely varied. This question, therefore, was not valid.

Question 2A

As an evaluator/administrator do teacher evaluations enable you to communicate more honestly with your teachers?

Presentation of Data

Of the 23 members of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 18 or 78.1 percent thought that teacher evaluations enabled them to communicate more honestly with a given teacher than would have been possible without it; whereas 5 or 21.7 percent thought that teacher evaluations did not enable them to communicate more honestly with a given teacher.

Of the 23 members of the Other Principal's Group, 13 or 56.5 percent thought that teacher evaluation enabled them to communicate more honestly with a given teacher than would have been possible without it; whereas 10 or 43.5 percent said that it did not enable them to communicate more honestly with the teacher.

Analysis of Data

78.1 percent of the Outstanding Principals stated that evaluations helped them communicate more honestly and 56.5 percent of the Other Principals were in agreement. The resultant Chi square value of 1.583 was significant at the .208 level, a value of no significance. The null hypothesis regarding item 2A was, therefore, supported. There was no measurable difference

between the two groups as to their assessment of the value of evaluation as a communications facilitator between teacher and principal. Both groups of principals agreed that evaluation helped them communicate more honestly.

Question 2B

As an evaluator/administrator do teacher evaluations enable you to be more aware of your teachers' problems?

Presentation of Data

Of the 23 members of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 20 or 87.0 percent said that teacher evaluations enabled them to be more aware of the teachers' problems; whereas 3 or 13.0 percent felt that evaluations did not enable them to be more aware of teachers' problems.

Of the 23 members of the Others Principal's Group, 13 or 56.5 percent said that teacher evaluations enabled them to be more aware of the teachers' problems; whereas 10 or 43.5 percent felt that teacher evaluations did not enable them to be more aware of the teachers' problems.

Analysis of Data

Of the Outstanding Principals, 87.0 percent reported that evaluations made them more aware of teachers' problems; whereas only 56.5 percent of the Other Principals were in agreement. The Chi square value of 3.860 is significant at the .094 level, a value of significance. Therefore, the null hypotheses with regard to item 2B was not supported. There were large differences in the responses of the two groups on the question of whether evaluations made them more aware of teachers' problems.

The findings seem to suggest that evaluation aids the Outstanding Principals in becoming aware of teachers' problems. The findings also suggest that Other Principals did not utilize evaluation as a means of understanding teachers' problems.

Question 2C

As an evaluator/administrator do teacher evaluations provide you with a means of readily judging a teacher's performance?

Presentation of Data

Of the 23 members of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 20 or 87.0 percent felt that evaluation practices provided them with a means of readily judging a teacher's performance; whereas 3 or 13.0 percent did not consider it a means of readily judging a teacher's performance.

Of the 23 members of the Other Principal's Group, 13 or 56.5 percent thought that teacher evaluations provided a ready means of judging a teacher's performance.

Analysis of Data

87.0 percent of the Outstanding Principals reported that evaluations provided ready means of judging teachers; whereas 56.5 percent of the Other Principals reported that they did. The Chi square value of 3.860 is significant at the .04 level which is a value of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis with regard to item 2C was not supported. A large variation was found in the responses of the two groups on the question of whether the evaluations provided ready means of judging teachers. The positive difference was on the side of the Outstanding Principals.

The findings tend to suggest that teacher evaluation provides

a valuable tool for assessing teacher competence. Perhaps the Other Principals use haphazard or inconsistent methods when judging teachers.

A compilation of responses to Question 2A, 2B, and 2C is presented in Table 8.

TABLE 8

FREQUENCIES, PERCENTAGES AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS OF HOW EVALUATION AIDS COMMUNICATION BETWEEN PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

Condensed Version of Interview	Outstanding Principals	Percent	Other Principals	Percent
2. Evaluations:				
A. Enable them to communicate more honestly				
Yes.....	18	78.1	13	56.5
No.....	5	21.9	10	43.5
Total.....	23		23	
Chi Square = 1.583	Significance = .208 - Not Significant			
B. Make them aware of problems				
Yes.....	20	87.0	13	56.5
No.....	3	13.0	10	43.5
Total.....	23		23	
Chi Square = 3.860	Significance = .049 - Significant			
C. Provides a ready means of judging teachers				
Yes.....	20	87.0	13	56.5
No.....	3	13.0	10	43.5
Total.....	23		23	
Chi Square = 3.860	Significance = .049 - Significant			

Question 3

How often are the assigned teachers evaluated in your school?

Presentation of Data

All principals interviewed indicated that observations were conducted regularly, although Board policy required formal evaluation once a year. All principals evaluated once a year.

Analysis of Data

All principals comprising both groups reported that observations were conducted on a regular basis, and that formal evaluation was conducted once a year. The null hypothesis for item 3 was supported.

Question 4

Do you discuss with your teachers the criteria for evaluation?

Presentation of Data

Of the 23 members of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 22 or 95.7 percent reported that they did discuss the criteria for evaluation with the teachers to be evaluated; whereas 1 or 4.3 percent said that he did not discuss the criteria prior to evaluation.

Of the 23 members of the Other's Principal's Group, 17 or 73.9 percent said that they discussed criteria prior to evaluation with the prospective subject; whereas 6 or 26.1 percent said that they did not.

Analysis of Data

The percentage of positive responses to the question as to whether criteria were discussed with the teachers was higher for the Outstanding Principals than for the Other Principals:

95.7 as opposed to 73.5. However, the Chi square value of 2.696--significant at the .101 level--is a value of no significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis with regard to item 4 was supported. There was no noticeable difference between the two groups on the question of whether or not criteria were discussed with the teacher.

Although the findings suggest no major difference, a difference does exist. The findings tend to suggest that more of the Outstanding Principals Group discussed the criteria for teacher evaluation than do members of the Other Principal's Group.

A compilation of responses to Question 4 is presented in Table 9.

TABLE 9

FREQUENCIES, PERCENTAGES, AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSES OF PRINCIPALS WHO DISCUSS OR DO NOT DISCUSS CRITERIA OF EVALUATION

Condensed Version of Interview	Outstanding Principals	Percent	Other Principals	Percent
4. Discuss Criteria				
Yes.....	22	95.7	17	73.9
No.....	1	4.3	6	26.1
Total.....	23		23	

Chi Square = 2.696 Significance = .101 - Not Significant

Question 5

If you do discuss the criteria for evaluation, under what circumstances are they discussed?

Presentation of Data

Of the members of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 1 or

4.3 percent said that he discussed criteria at staff meetings and indicated that the discussions occurred more than once before a prospective evaluation period. Of the Outstanding Group, 10 or 43.5 percent said that the discussion of criteria took place during private conferences. Of this group, 12 or 52.2 percent said that they used other methods which included both. Two said that they distributed an evaluation form which explained the criteria to all of the teachers at the beginning of each school year. One reported that criteria for teacher evaluation were adopted in April, 1972 by the faculty of his school and were revised in 1975. He reported that there were three components among the criteria: (1) Teacher self-evaluation; (2) Principal's evaluation and (3) Report of the classroom visitation. These forms were distributed at the beginning of each school year and discussed in staff meetings and at individual conferences. One of the Outstanding Group reported that he used a modified standard rating scale which was revised with the co-operation of the teachers and which was distributed at the beginning of the school year. The remaining eight said that they used both the staff meetings and private conferences to discuss the criteria for evaluation with the teachers.

Of the Other Principal's Group, 3 or 15.0 percent said that they used staff meetings as the place to discuss the criteria for teacher evaluations. Private conferences were preferred by 3 or 15.0 percent for the discussion of criteria for teacher evaluation. Of the remainder, 14 or 70.0 percent said that they used other methods for discussing criteria of teacher evaluation, including the methods just described. One principal reported using a rating

scale and bulletin board displays as a basis for individual conferences. Another reported that he discussed criteria with the teacher in an informal setting when he observed the teacher performing below an acceptable standard. The other 11 reported using both staff meetings and private conferences for discussing teacher evaluation criteria.

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 10 or 43.5 percent used private conferences as a place for discussing criteria for teacher evaluation; whereas in the Other Principal's Group, 3 or 15.0 percent made use of private conferences for discussing these materials. Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 12 or 52.2 percent used other means of discussing teacher evaluation, including both staff meetings and private conferences; whereas, the Other Principal's Group indicated that 17 or 74.0 percent used other means which included both staff meetings and private conferences for discussing criteria.

A compilation of responses to Question 5 is included in Table 10.

TABLE 10

FREQUENCIES, PERCENTAGES, AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSES OF PRINCIPAL RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION OF WHERE CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION IS DISCUSSED

Condensed Version of Interview	Outstanding Principals	Percent	Other Principals	Percent
5. Where evaluation criteria is discussed				
A. Staff Meetings....	1	4.3	3	13.0
B. Private Conference	10	43.5	3	13.0
C. Other-Specify (Include Both of the Above)	12	52.2	17	74.0
Total.....	23		23	
Chi Square = 4.737	Significance = .094 - Not Significant			

Analysis of Data

A total of 52.2 percent of Outstanding Principals indicated that they used both private conferences and staff meetings for discussing criteria for teacher evaluation. 43.5 percent named private conferences alone. Of the Other Principals, 70.0 percent used both private conferences and staff meetings. The Chi square value of 4.737 is significant at the .094 level, a value of no significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis with regard to item 5 was supported. There was no noteworthy difference between the two groups regarding their choice of place for discussing criteria for evaluation with the teachers. The findings tend to imply that where criteria is discussed is not important to either the Outstanding Principal's Group or the Other Principal's Group.

Question 6A

Do teachers respond to discussions of teacher evaluations by offering criticism of the criteria?

Presentation of Data

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 18 or 78.3 percent reported that the teachers did offer criticism of the criteria when they were discussed with them; whereas 5 or 21.7 percent reported that they did not offer criticism of the criteria.

Of the Other Principal's Group, 7 or 30.4 percent reported that teachers offered criticism when the criteria were discussed with them; whereas 16 or 69.6 percent reported that the teachers did not offer criticism.

Analysis of Data

The responses of the Outstanding Principals Group showed that a much higher number of teachers in their schools offered criticism of the criteria than was reported by the Other Principal'

Group. 78.3 percent of the Outstanding Principal's Group reported that teachers offered criticism; whereas 30.4 percent of the Other Principal's Group reported that teachers offered criticism. The Chi square value of 8.76 was significant at the .003 level of confidence, a value of substantial significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis for item 6A was not supported.

The findings indicate that principals should include teachers in the formulation of criteria for teacher evaluation. The findings also indicate that the Other Principal's Group did not seek such teacher participation.

Question 6B

Do teachers suggest ways for improving the methods of teacher evaluation?

Presentation of Data

Of the 23 members of the Outstanding Principal's Group interviewed, 18 or 78.3 percent reported that teachers did suggest ways for improving the methods of teacher evaluation; whereas 5 or 21.7 percent reported that teachers did not suggest ways for improving the methods.

Among the Other Principal's Group, 6 or 26.1 percent reported that teachers did suggest ways for improving the methods of teacher evaluation; whereas 17 or 73.9 percent reported that teachers did not suggest any ways for improving the methods of teacher evaluation.

Analysis of Data

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 78.3 percent reported that teachers offered suggestions; whereas 26.0 percent of the Other Principal's Group reported that teachers offered

suggestions. The Chi square value of 10.5 was significant at the .001 level, which represents a high level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis, with regard to item 6B, was not supported. The findings show that there was noticeable difference between the reports of the two groups concerning the extent to which teachers suggested ways for improving the methods of teacher evaluation. The positive difference between the responses was decidedly in favor of the Outstanding Principal's Group.

These findings also indicate that teachers should be involved in the formulation of the methods for evaluation. These findings also indicate that less successful principals do not involve their teachers in evaluation.

Question 6C

Do they offer solutions to problems that they have that their evaluations have revealed or emphasized?

Presentation of Data

Of the 23 members of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 20 or 87.0 percent reported that teachers did suggest solutions to their own problems; whereas 3 or 13.0 percent reported that teachers did not suggest solutions.

Of the members of the Other Principal's Group, 9 or 39.1 percent reported that teachers did suggest solutions to their own problems; whereas 14 or 60.9 percent reported that teachers did not suggest solutions.

The responses of the 23 members in each group indicated that 87.0 percent of the Outstanding Principals reported that teachers did offer solutions to their own problems as revealed by evaluation; 39.1 percent of the Other Principals reported that teachers offered solutions to their own problems.

Analysis of Data

Of the Outstanding Principals, 87.0 percent reported that teachers did suggest solutions to their own problems; whereas only 39.4 percent of the Other Principals reported that teachers suggested solutions to their problems. The Chi square value of 8.762 is significant at the .002 level of confidence, a very high level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis for item 6C was not supported. There was a decided difference between the reports of the two groups concerning the extent to which teachers offered solutions to their own problems. The positive difference was strongly on the side of the Outstanding Principals.

These findings suggest that when teachers are involved in the evaluation process, they will solve their own problems. Teachers who work for those principals classified as Other do not permit participation by the teachers in solving their own problems.

Question 6D

Do the teachers work with you to improve a situation or to overcome a handicap?

Presentation of Data

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 18 or 78.3 percent said that teachers did cooperate with them to improve a situation or overcome a handicap; the remaining 5 or 21.7 percent reported that teachers did not work with them to improve a situation or overcome a problem.

Of the Other Principal's Group, 6 or 26.1 percent reported that teachers did cooperate in working for their own improvement; whereas 17 or 73.9 percent reported that teachers did not work toward their own improvement.

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 78.3 percent said that teachers worked for improvement; whereas only 26.1 percent of the Other Principal's Group reported this tendency.

Analysis of Data

In the Outstanding Principal's Group, 78.3 percent said that teachers worked for improvement; whereas only 26.1 percent of the Other Principal's Group reported that teachers worked for their improvement. The Chi square value of 10.5 was significant at the .001 level, which reflects a decided difference. Therefore, the null hypothesis for item 6D was not supported. There was a wide margin of difference between the reports of the two groups concerning the extent to which teachers offered solutions to their own problems. The positive difference was strongly on the side of the Outstanding Principal's Group.

The findings again suggest that when teachers are involved in the formulation of the evaluation criteria, they will then seek ways to solve mutual problems. The findings also suggest that the teachers working for the Other Principal's Group will not try to solve their mutual problems.

Question 6E

Do they contribute to the discussion when their shortcomings are discussed?

Presentation of Data

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 20 or 87.0 percent said that the teachers did contribute to the discussions when their shortcomings were discussed; whereas 3 or 13.0 percent said that the teachers did not contribute.

In the Other Principal's Group, 9 or 39.1 percent said that the teachers did contribute to the discussions when their

shortcomings were being discussed; whereas 14 or 60.0 percent said that the teachers did not.

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 87.0 percent answered in the affirmative when asked if teachers contributed to the discussion when their shortcomings were being reviewed; whereas only 39.1 percent of the Other Principal's Group answered in the affirmative.

Analysis of Data

87.0 percent of the Outstanding Principal's Group reported that teachers did contribute to the discussion of their shortcomings. However, only 39.1 percent of the Other Principal's Group said that teachers discussed their own shortcomings. The Chi square value of 9.33 was significant at the very high level of .002. Therefore, the null hypothesis for Item 6E was not supported. There was a wide margin of difference between the reports of the two groups relevant to the extent that teachers contributed to the discussions of their own shortcomings. The positive difference in the responses was strongly on the side of the Outstanding Principal's Group.

The findings indicate that the Outstanding Principal's Group involve teachers in a discussion of their shortcomings to a much greater degree than do members of the Other group.

Question 6F

Do the teachers take criticisms, advice or suggestions seriously but not defensively?

Presentation of Data

Of the 23 members of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 22 or 95.7 percent said that teachers did take criticism, advice,

or suggestions seriously but not defensively; whereas 1 or 4.3 percent said that they did not.

Of the members of the Other Principal's Group, 20 or 87.0 percent said that teachers did take criticisms, advice, or suggestions seriously but not defensively; whereas 2 or 13.0 percent said that they did not.

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 95.7 percent answered in the affirmative when asked whether or not teachers took criticism, advice, or suggestions seriously but not defensively; whereas only 87.0 percent of the Other Principal's Group answered in the affirmative.

Analysis of Data

There was no appreciable statistical difference between the responses of the two groups as to the manner in which the teachers accept criticism. Both groups gave positive responses to the question. The Chi square value of .274 at a .601 level is of no significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis with regard to item 6F was supported. There was no appreciable difference between the two groups with regard to their report of the manner in which teachers accepted criticism.

The findings suggest that teachers were able to accept criticism without becoming defensive irrespective of whether they were associated with the Outstanding Principal's Group or the Other Principal's Group. The findings for item 6E indicates that 60.0 percent of the teachers reported by the Other Principal's Group did not discuss their shortcomings as determined during an evaluation. The high percentage of Other Principals who evaluate teachers who are not defensive about their criticism may find

this was caused by their not being permitted to express an opinion.

A condensed summary for the data comprising responses to Questions 6A, 6B, 6C, 6D, 6E, and 6F is presented in Table 11.

TABLE 11

FREQUENCIES, PERCENTAGES, AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSES OF PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION: "HOW DO TEACHERS RESPOND TO THE DISCUSSION OF EVALUATION CRITERIA?"

Condensed Version of Interview	Outstanding Principals	Percent	Other Principals	Percent
6. Responded by:				
A. Offering Criticisms				
Yes.....	18	78.3	7	30.4
No.....	5	21.7	16	69.6
Total.....	23		23	
Chi Square = 8.762	Significance = .003 - Significant			
B. Suggesting Improvements				
Yes.....	18	78.3	6	26.1
No.....	5	21.7	17	73.9
Total.....	23		23	
Chi Square = 10.542	Significance = .001 - Significant			
C. Offering Solutions to Revealed Problems				
Yes.....	20	87.0	9	39.1
No.....	3	13.0	14	60.9
Total.....	23		23	
Chi Square = 9.331	Significance = .002 - Significant			

TABLE 11 - Continued

Condensed Version of Interview	Outstanding Principals	Percent	Other Principals	Percent
D. Working for Improvements				
Yes.....	18	78.3	6	26.1
No.....	5	21.7	17	73.9
Total....	23		23	

Chi Square = 10.542 Significance = .001 - Significant

E. Contributing to Discussion				
Yes.....	20	87.0	9	39.1
No.....	3	13.0	14	60.0
Total....	23		23	

Chi Square = 9.331 Significance = .002 - Significant

F. Taking Sug-testions-Not Defensively				
Yes.....	22	95.7	20	87.0
No.....	1	4.3	3	13.0
Total....	23		23	

Chi Square = .274 Significance = .601 - Not Significant

Question 7

What percent of the teachers in your school do you consider outstanding?

Presentation of Data

Of the 23 members of the Outstanding Principal's Group, only 19 responded to this question. Of this number, 1 or 5.3 percent thought that 5 percent of the teachers in his school were outstanding; 3 or 15.8 percent considered 10 percent outstanding; 1 or 5.3 percent considered 12 percent outstanding; 2 or 10.5 percent thought 15 percent were outstanding; 2 or 10.5 percent thought 20 percent were outstanding; 5 or 26.3 percent thought 25 percent were outstanding; 1 or 5.3 percent thought 38 percent were outstanding; 3 or 15.8 percent thought 40 percent were outstanding, and 1 or 5.3 percent thought 50 percent were outstanding.

Only 18 of the 23 members of the Other Principal's Group responded to this question. Of these, 3 or 16.7 percent did not perceive any teachers as outstanding; 1 or 5.6 percent thought that 5 percent were outstanding; 1 or 5.6 percent thought that 7 percent were outstanding; 3 or 16.7 percent thought that 10 percent were outstanding; 1 or 5.6 percent thought 14 percent were outstanding; 1 or 5.6 percent thought 15 percent were outstanding; 2 or 11.1 percent thought 20 percent were outstanding; 1 or 5.6 percent thought 25 percent were outstanding; 2 or 11.1 percent thought 30 percent were outstanding; 1 or 5.6 percent thought 38 percent were outstanding; 1 or 5.6 percent thought 40 percent were outstanding, and 1 or 5.6 percent thought 55 percent were outstanding.

A compilation of the responses to Question 7 is presented in Table 12.

TABLE 12

PERCENT OF TEACHERS PERCEIVED TO BE OUTSTANDING AND THE FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF THE PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES

Condensed Version of Interview	Outstanding Principals	Percent	Other Principals	Percent
7. Percent of Teachers Outstanding				
0	0	0	3	16.7
5	1	5.3	1	5.6
7	0	0	1	5.6
10	3	15.8	3	16.7
12	1	5.3	0	0
14	0	0	1	5.6
15	2	10.5	1	5.6
20	2	10.5	2	11.1
25	5	26.3	1	5.6
30	0	0	2	11.1
35	0	0	1	5.6
38	1	5.3	0	0
40	3	15.8	1	5.6
50	1	5.3	0	0
55	0	0	1	5.6
Total	19*		18**	

* 4 did not respond
** 5 did not respond

Analysis of Data

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, the range in which the majority of outstanding teachers fell was from 5.0 to 25.0 percent. For the Other Principal's Group, the range for the majority was from 0 to 15.0 percent. Of the Other Principal's Group, 16.7 percent did not perceive any of their teachers as outstanding. A preponderence of outstanding teachers was found among the Outstanding Principal's Group.

Since the Chi square statistical technique was not applicable for this compilation, no Chi square value was determined. Practically speaking, however, the comparitive percentages do not support the null hypotheses for item 7. The findings show that there was a difference between the reports of the two groups relative to the number of teachers each considered outstanding. The positive difference was on the side of the Outstanding Principal's Group.

The findings suggest that the Outstanding Principal's Group perceive more of their teachers as outstanding, because this group involves teachers more actively in the evaluation process than do the Other Principals Group.

Question 8

What do you do to encourage teachers?

Presentation of Data

Of the 23 members of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 17 reported that they praised and/or rewarded teachers who had performed outstandingly. The methods by which they praised and rewarded varied greatly. Of the 17 principals just mentioned, 6 reported sending personal letters of appreciation and commendation; 5 reported honoring teachers for special achievements

at public programs and by personal letters; 1 said that he gave summer school assignments to outstanding teachers, and 5 reported they held the outstanding teachers up as models--especially for new teachers coming into the system.

The remaining 6 of the Outstanding Principal's Group said that they gave superior ratings to the teachers who had distinguished themselves during the term.

Of the 23 members of the Other Principal's Group, 4 did not respond to the question of how they encouraged teachers. The remaining 19 responded as follows: 9 of the group said that they praised and rewarded outstanding teachers either by public recognition, personal letter, or recommendation to serve on district and city-wide committees; 1 used a combination of public praise and recognition and superior ratings; 2 gave support to outstanding teachers who had launched innovative programs; 5 gave superior ratings exclusively, and 2 gave special assignments and responsibilities to outstanding teachers to underscore their value to the school.

Analysis of Data

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 17 reported that they praised and/or rewarded teachers who had performed outstandingly; whereas only 9 of the others said that they praised and rewarded teachers publicly and privately. The null hypothesis for item 8 was not supported. The large number of Outstanding Principals who rewarded and praised outstanding teachers was in marked contrast to the way members of the Others Principal's Group recognized their outstanding teachers.

Question 9

What percent of the teachers in your school are unsatisfactory?

Presentation of Data

The 23 members of the Outstanding Principal's Group responded to the question of what percent of the teachers in their schools were unsatisfactory as follows: 13 or 56.5 percent reported that no teacher was unsatisfactory; 1 or 4.3 percent said that 1.0 percent of the teachers was unsatisfactory; 3 or 13.0 percent said that 2.0 percent of their teachers were unsatisfactory; 1 or 4.3 percent said that 6.0 percent were unsatisfactory; 1 or 4.3 said that 10.0 percent were unsatisfactory; 1 or 4.3 said that 20.0 percent were unsatisfactory, and 1 or 4.3 percent said that 30.0 percent were unsatisfactory.

The 23 members of the Other Principal's Group responded as follows: 8 or 34.8 percent said that no teacher was unsatisfactory; 1 or 4.3 percent said that 1.0 percent was unsatisfactory; 2 or 8.7 percent said that 2.0 percent were unsatisfactory; 2 or 8.7 percent said that 3 percent were unsatisfactory; 1 or 4.3 percent said that 4.0 percent were unsatisfactory, 4 or 17.4 percent said that 5.0 percent were unsatisfactory, and 5 or 21.7 percent said that 10 percent were unsatisfactory.

For the Outstanding Principal's Group, the percentage range for the majority of unsatisfactory teachers was from 0 to 2.0 percent.

For the Other Principal's Group, the percentage range for the majority of unsatisfactory teachers was from 0 to 10 percent.

A compilation of responses to Question 9 is presented in Table 13.

TABLE 13

PERCENT OF TEACHERS PERCEIVED TO BE UNSATISFACTORY WITH THE FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES

Condensed Version of Interview	Outstanding Principals	Percent	Other Principals	Percent
9. Percent of Teachers Unsatisfactory				
0	13	56.5	8	34.8
1	1	4.3	1	4.3
2	3	13.0	2	8.7
3	1	4.3	2	8.7
4	0	0	1	4.3
5	1	4.3	4	17.4
6	1	4.3	0	0
10	1	4.3	5	21.7
20	1	4.3	0	0
30	1	4.3	0	0
Total	23		23	

Analysis of Data

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 56.5 percent reported that no teacher was unsatisfactory; whereas 34.8 percent of the Other Principal's Group said that no teacher was unsatisfactory. Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, no more than 4.3 percent found 10.0 percent unsatisfactory, while 21.7 percent of the Other Principal's Group found 10.0 percent unsatisfactory. The

preponderance of members in the Outstanding Principal's Group who found no unsatisfactory teachers does not support the null hypothesis for item 9. There was an impressive difference between the two groups in their evaluation of unsatisfactory teachers. This conclusion is abetted by the fact that a large number of the Outstanding Principal's Group considered more of their teachers outstanding as reported in their responses to Question 7.

The findings suggest that when teachers are involved in the evaluation process, they correct their shortcomings and do not perform in an unsatisfactory way. The findings also suggest that because members of the Other Principal's Group do not involve teachers in their evaluation this has resulted in their teachers performing less satisfactorily.

Question 10

What do you do about the unsatisfactory teacher?

Presentation of Data

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 13 reported no unsatisfactory teachers. The remaining 10 responded to the question as to what they did about the unsatisfactory teacher as follows: 5 said that they held conferences with the teachers and offered suggestions and guidance; 3 said that they offered suggestions and gave unsatisfactory ratings; 1 said that he observed the unsatisfactory teacher more frequently than he observed the others.

Of the Other Principal's Group, 8 reported no unsatisfactory teachers. The remaining 15 responded to the question as to what

they did about the unsatisfactory teacher as follows: 3 said that they held private conferences with the teacher and offered help and guidance; 3 said that they used a combination of strategies--private conferences, frequent observations, unsatisfactory ratings, and personal letters; 3 said that they used unsatisfactory ratings exclusively; 4 said that they visited and observed the teacher often; 1 said that he asked for the resignation of unsatisfactory teachers who do not improve, and 1 said that he encouraged unsatisfactory teachers to seek employment elsewhere.

As no measurable entities were involved in these responses, no attempt was made to tabulate the findings and to determine a Chi square value for Question 10.

Analysis of Data

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 5 said that they had conferences with unsatisfactory teachers; whereas 3 of the members of the Other Principal's Group reported having conferences. None of the Outstanding principals reported that they asked for resignations and/or encouraged unsatisfactory teachers to seek employment elsewhere; whereas two of the Other principals said that they used those means to deal with unsatisfactory teachers. The wide divergence in modes of treatment does not support the null hypothesis for item 10. There was a large difference between the two groups in regard to their manner of dealing with unsatisfactory teachers.

Question 11

What three of the following criteria do you consider of primary importance in evaluating your teachers? List them in order of priority.

A. Tends to be self-motivating

B. Indicates desire to improve

C. Is able to accept advice, criticism, and help from others

D. Attains high level of achievement from students

E. Manages classroom effectively

F. Follows a definite study plan for each student

G. Disciplines students without degrading them

H. Maintains accurate and current records

I. Files regular reports with principal's office

J. Creatively presents his subject and related materials

K. Endeavors to communicate regularly with the principal

L. Endeavors to communicate regularly and well with other teachers

M. Encourages high social standards, such as sportsmanship, friendship, fairness, politeness

N. Encourages high personal standards, such as neatness, honesty, cheerfulness, courage, humility, fortitude, and creativity

Priority 1

Of the 23 members of the Outstanding Principal's Group for the Number 1 Priority, the responses were as follows: 0 percent chose A; 9 or 39.1 percent chose D; 2 or 8.7 percent those E; 4 or 17.4 percent chose F; 0 percent chose G; 0 percent chose I; 8 or 34.8 percent, chose J, and 0 percent chose L.

Of the 23 members of the Other Principal's Group for the Number 1 Priority, the responses were as follows: 3 or 13.0 percent chose A; 4 or 17.4 percent chose D; 5 or 21.7 percent chose E; 4 or 17.4 percent chose F; 3 or 13.0 percent chose G; 1 or 4.3 percent chose I; 2 or 8.7 percent chose J, and 1 or 4.3 percent chose L.

Priority 2

Of the 23 members of the Outstanding Principal's Group for the Number 2 Priority, the responses were as follows: 3 or 13.0 percent chose A; 0 percent chose B; 0 percent chose C; 2 or 8.7 percent chose D; 7 or 30.4 percent chose E; 2 or 8.7 percent chose J; 0 percent chose K; 2 or 8.7 percent chose L; 1 or 4.3 percent chose N.

Of the 23 members of the Other Principal's Group for the Number 2 Priority, the responses were as follows: 4 or 17.4 percent chose A; 2 or 8.7 percent chose B; 1 or 4.3 percent chose C; 1 or 4.3 percent chose D; 3 or 13.0 percent chose E; 3 or 13.0 percent chose F; 2 or 8.7 percent chose G; 1 or 4.3 percent chose H; 1 or 4.3 percent chose J; 1 or 4.3 percent chose K; 0 percent chose L; 1 or 4.3 percent chose M, and 3 or 13.0 percent chose N.

Priority 3

Of the 23 members of the Outstanding Principal's Group for the Number 3 Priority, the responses were as follows: 3 or 13.0 percent those A; 0 percent chose B and C; 2 or 8.7 percent chose D; 7 or 30.4 percent chose E; 2 or 8.7 percent chose F; 0 percent chose G and H; 4 or 17.4 percent chose J; 0 percent chose K; 2 or 8.7 percent chose L; 1 or 4.3 percent chose M, and 2 or 8.7 percent chose N.

The Number 3 Priority responses selected by the Other Principal's Group were as follows: 4 or 17.4 percent chose A; 2 or 8.7 percent chose B; 1 or 4.3 percent chose C; 1 or 4.3 percent chose D; 3 or 13.0 percent chose E; 3 or 13.0 percent chose F; 2 or 8.7 percent chose G; 1 or 4.3 percent chose H; 1 or 4.3 percent

chose J; 1 or 4.3 percent chose K; 0 percent chose L; 1 or 4.3 percent chose M, and 3 or 13.0 percent chose N.

A summary of the responses to Question 11 and the Chi square analyses is presented in Table 14.

TABLE 14

FREQUENCIES, PERCENTAGES, AND CHI SQUARE ANALYSES OF PRINCIPALS THAT LISTED THREE CRITERIA IN ORDER OF PREFERENCE

Condensed Version of Interview	Outstanding Principals	Percent	Other Principals	Percent
11. Criteria Number 1 Priority				
A. Has self-motivation....	0	0.0	3	13.0
B. Desires to Improve.....	0	0.0	0	0.0
C. Accepts help..	0	0.0	0	0.0
D. Attains high pupil achievement.....	9	39.1	4	17.4
E. Manages classroom.....	2	8.7	5	21.7
F. Follows study plan.....	4	17.4	4	17.4
G. Disciplines students.....	0	0.0	3	13.0
H. Maintains records.....	0	0.0	0	0.0
I. Reports regularly.....	0	0.0	1	4.3
J. Teaches Creatively....	8	34.8	2	8.7
K. Communicates with principal	0	0.0	0	0.0
L. Communicates with teachers.	0	0.0	1	4.3
M. Encourages high social standards.....	0	0.0	0	0.0
N. Encourages high personal standards.....	0	0.0	0	0.0

Chi Square = 14.809 Significance = .039 - Significant

TABLE 14 - Continued

Condensed Version of Interview	Outstanding Principals	Percent	Other Principals	Percent
11. Criteria				
Number 2 Priority				
A. Has self-motivation....	3	13.0	4	17.4
B. Desires to Improve.....	0	0.0	2	8.7
C. Accepts help..	0	0.0	1	4.3
D. Attains high pupil achievement.....	2	8.7	1	4.3
E. Manages classroom.....	7	30.4	3	13.0
F. Follows study plan.....	2	8.7	3	13.0
G. Disciplines students.....	0	0.0	2	8.7
H. Maintains records.....	0	0.0	1	4.3
I. Reports regularly.....	0	0.0	0	0.0
J. Teaches Creatively....	4	17.4	1	4.3
K. Communicates with principal	0	0.0	1	4.3
L. Communicates with teachers	2	8.7	0	0.0
M. Encourages high social standards	1	4.3	1	4.3
N. Encourages high personal standards	2	8.7	3	13.0

Chi Square = 13.277 Significance = .349 - Not Significant

TABLE 14 - Continued

Condensed Version of Interview	Outstanding Principals	Percent	Other Principals	Percent
11. Criteria				
Number 3 Priority				
A. Has self-motivation....	2	8.7	1	4.3
B. Desires to Improve.....	0	0.0	1	4.3
C. Accepts help..	0	0.0	1	4.3
D. Attains high pupil achievement.....	2	8.7	5	21.7
E. Manages classroom.....	7	30.4	6	26.1
F. Follows study plan.....	3	13.0	3	13.0
G. Disciplines students.....	1	4.3	0	0.0
H. Maintains records.....	2	8.7	1	4.3
I. Reports regularly.....	0	0.0	0	0.0
J. Teaches Creatively....	3	13.0	2	8.7
K. Communicates with principal	0	0.0	0	0.0
L. Communicates with teachers	1	4.3	0	0.0
M. Encourages high social standards	0	0.0	1	4.3
N. Encourages high personal standards	2	8.7	2	8.7

Chi Square = 7.229 Significance = .780 - Not Significant

Analysis of Data

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 39.1 percent reported high pupil achievement as the number one priority item they considered when evaluating teachers. Among the Other Principal's Group, high pupil achievement was the number one priority item for 17.4 percent of the principals. While the Outstanding Principal's Group chose high pupil achievement as an item of first importance, the Other Principal's Group indicated their first priority was effective classroom management.

The Chi square value of 14.8 for the first priority was significant at the .039 level of confidence--a value of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not supported for Item 11: Priority 1. There was a noticeable difference between the two groups in their choice of the category given top priority in the evaluation of teachers.

The Outstanding Principal's Group selected high pupil achievement as their first priority. This finding indicates that Outstanding principals are concerned with instruction as it relates to student achievement. The findings relative to the Other Principal's Group indicate they are more interested in teacher characteristics rather than the area of teacher competence.

Principals in the Outstanding Principal's Group selected effective classroom management as their second priority item; of this group, 7 or 30.4 percent stated this preference. The Other Principal's Group chose self-motivation as their

second priority item with 4 or 17.4 percent of the group making this selection.

The Chi square value of 13.2 at the .349 level of confidence is a level of no significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis with regard to Item 11: Priority 2 was supported.

By coincidence, effective classroom management was also selected by 7 or 30.4 percent of the Outstanding Principal's Group as their third priority item when evaluating teacher performance. The Other Principal's Group also selected effective classroom management as their third priority item with 6 or 26.1 percent of the group selecting this category.

The Chi square value of 7.2 at the .780 level of confidence is a value of no significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis with regard to Item 11: Priority 3 was also supported.

When teacher performance is evaluated, the Outstanding Principal's Group relegated importance to the following categories: 1st priority: Attains high level of achievement from students; 2nd priority: Manages classroom effectively, and 3rd priority: Manages classroom effectively.

The Other Principal's Group, when evaluating teacher performance, relegated importance to the following categories: 1st priority: Manages classroom effectively; 2nd priority: Tends to be self-motivating, and 3rd priority: Manages classroom effectively.

A summary of Questions 1-11, comprising the Interview Guide, is shown in Table 15.

TABLE 15

SUMMARY OF CHI SQUARE VALUE OF RESPONSES TO EACH OF THE STATEMENTS ON THE INTERVIEW GUIDE - PART A

Condensed Version of Each Statement	X^2 Value	Level of Significance	Outstanding & Others Hypothesis 1
1. What Criteria....	N.C.*	N.C.	Supported
2A. Evaluation-Communicates with Teachers.....	1.58	.208	Supported
2B. Evaluation-Aware of Problems.....	3.86	.049	Not Supported
2C. Evaluation-Judging Performance.....	3.86	.049	Not Supported
3. How Often Evaluation.....	N.C.	N.C.	Supported
4. Discuss Criteria	2.69	.101	Supported
5. Under what Circumstances....	4.74	.094	Supported
6A. Respond to Discussions.....	8.76	.003	Not Supported
6B. Suggests Improvements.....	10.54	.001	Not Supported
6C. Offer Solutions.....	9.33	.002	Not Supported
6D. Work to Improve Handicap.....	10.54	.001	Not Supported
6E. Contribute to Discussion.....	9.33	.002	Not Supported
6F. Teachers Take Criticism.....	.27	.601	Supported
7. Percent Teachers Outstanding.....	N.C.	N.C.	Not Supported
8. Teachers Encouraged.....	N.C.	N.C.	Not Supported
9. Percent Teachers Unsatisfactory...	N.C.	N.C.	Not Supported
10. What is Done.....	N.C.	N.C.	Not Supported
11. Criteria most Important.....			
Priority 1.....	14.81	.039	Not Supported
Priority 2.....	13.27	.349	Supported
Priority 3.....	7.23	.780	Supported

*N.C. (Not Computed) See the Analysis of Data section for an explanation of the findings.

Part B

Description and Analysis of Data from Section II of the CTEM

Section II of the CTEM was comprised of twelve questions to which each member of the Outstanding Principal's Group and the Other Principal's Group responded.

The questions and a summary of the responses from each group are given. The responses from the Outstanding Principal's Group are given first, followed by the responses from the Other Principal's Group.

Question 1

What are the things you look for when you evaluate a teacher?

Presentation of Data

Due to the fact that there was no check-list of quality or practice categories, which would have determined and limited the number of responses, the sum total of categories for both the Outstanding Principal's Group and the Other Principal's Group was 69.

The following is an inclusive listing for both groups of respondents, reported in the wording of the groups: (1) Creativity and Initiative, (2) Cooperation, (3) Knowledge of Subject, (4) Concern for Children, (5) Community Relations, (6) Parent-teacher Relations, (7) Adaptable to Changes, (8) Preparation, (9) Discipline and Class, (10) Follows School Policy, (11) Interest in Child's Progress, (12) Attendance, (13) Reports and Records, (14) Extra Activities, (15) Instruction Techniques, (16) Organization, (17) Empathy with Children, (18) Knowledge of Teaching, (19) Compassion, (20) Enthusiasm,

(21) Gets Along with Staff, (22) Integrity, (23) Professionalism, (24) Punctualness, (25) Knowledge of Community, (26) Student Learning, (27) Class Management, (28) Bulletin Boards, (29) Rapport with Students, (30) Teacher's Appearance, (31) Classroom Work, (32) Diction, (33) Fairness, (34) Appearance of Classroom, (35) Environment of Class, (36) Student Participation, (37) Teaching Aids, (38) Student Motivation, (39) Sees Students as Individuals, (40) Goal Oriented, (41) Experience, (42) Relationship with Principal, (43) Evaluates Pupil Growth, (44) Stimulates Students, (45) Guidance, (46) Intelligence, (47) Sense of Humor, (48) O.K. To Take Supervision, (49) Displays, (50) Judgment, (51) Handling of Routines, (52) Positive Attitudes, (53) Planning, (54) Accepts Criticism, (55) Lesson Plan, (56) Concern for Student, (57) Respect for Students, (58) Reading Program, (59) Student Achievement, (60) Safety, (61) Likes Self, (62) High Expectations, (63) Field Trips, (64) Relevant Assignments, (65) Students' Work Habits, (66) Questions Asked by Teacher, (67) Nothing, (68) Handwriting on Board, (69) Continuity of Lesson.

The range of numbers representing responses to any one category for <u>both</u> groups was from 1-15. The breakdown with regard to the range of numbers of responses to any one category for <u>each</u> group is as follows:

For the <u>Outstanding Principal's Group</u>, the range was from 1-15. For the <u>Other Principal's Group</u>, the range was 1-15.

The category receiving the highest count was not the same for both groups. For the <u>Outstanding Principal's Group</u>, the category receiving the highest count was <u>Lesson Plan</u>. For the

Other Principal's Group, the category named most often was Nothing Specific.

Since a count of 2 for any one category would indicate some degree of consensus in the group, those categories named from 2-15 by both groups are listed.

The number of times the category appeared beginning with 2, and the identification of the categories, are as follows:

Number of Times Category Appeared	Name of Category
2	Community Relations, Preparation, Extra Activities, Organization, Experience, Handling of Routines, Student Learning. Compassion, Environment of Class, Student participation, High Expectation, Questions Asked by Teacher, Nothing Specific - Total: 13
3	Cooperation, Adaptable to Change, Preparation, Professionalism, Teaching Aids, Enthusiasm, Diction, Sense of Humor, Positive Attitude, Student Achievement - Total: 10
4	Parent-Teacher Relations, Empathy with Children, Creativity and Initiative, Enthusiasm, Integrity, Professionalism, Punctuality, Evaluates Pupil Growth Total: 8
5	Organization, Diction, Appearance of Classroom, Environment of Class, Treated Students as Individuals - Total: 5

Number of Times Category Appeared	Name of Category
6	Adaptable to Change, Gets Along with Staff, Punctuality, Stimulates Students - Total: 4
7	Reports and Records, Parent-Teacher Relations - Total: 2
8	Attendance, Knowledge of Subject, Reports and Records, Instruction Techniques, Gets Along with Staff Total: 5
9	Knowledge of Subject, Extra Activities Total: 2
10	Rapport with Students, Appearance of Classroom - Total: 2
11	Discipline and Class Attendance, Attendance - Total: 2
12	Rapport with Students - Total: 1
13	Instruction Techniques, Classroom Management, Lesson Plans - Total: 3
14	Lesson Plans, Nothing Specific - Total: 2

Of the categories named by both the Outstanding Principal's Group and the Other Principal's Group, 13 appeared 2 times; 10 appeared 3 times; 8 appeared 4 times; 5 appeared 5 times; 4 appeared 6 times; 7 appeared 2 times; 5 appeared 8 times; 2 appeared 9 times; 2 appeared 10 times; 2 appeared 11 times; 1 appeared 12 times; 3 appeared 14 times, and 2 appeared 15 times.

The categories receiving the highest number of counts (from 10 to 15) for both groups are as follows: Rapport with Students, Appearance of Classroom, Discipline and Class Attendance, Attendance, Instruction Techniques, Classroom Management, Lesson Plans, and Nothing Specific.

The count and percent of responses and percent of cases determined for the categories most often named for the Outstanding Principal's Group are as follows:

Of the 23 members of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 10 or 45.5 percent listed Rapport with Students as one of the things they would look for in evaluating teachers; 5 or 22.7 percent listed Appearance of Classroom; 11 or 50.0 percent listed Discipline and Class Attendance; 8 or 36.4 percent listed Attendance; 14 or 63.6 percent listed Instruction Techniques; 14 or 63.6 percent listed Classroom Management; 15 or 68.2 percent listed Lesson Plans, and 2 or 9.1 percent said that they looked for Nothing Specific.

Of the 23 members of the Other Principal's Group, 12 or 54.5 percent listed Rapport with Students as one of the things they would look for in evaluating teachers; 10 or 45.5 percent listed Appearance of Classroom; 13 or 69.1 percent listed Discipline and Class Attendance; 11 or 50.0 percent listed Attendance; 8 or 36.4 percent listed Instructional Techniques; 8 or 36.4 percent listed Classroom Management and 15 or 68.2 percent said that they looked for Nothing Specific.

The criteria listed by 50.0 percent or more of the Outstanding Principal's Group were Discipline mentioned by 50.0 percent; Instructional Techniques mentioned by 63.3 percent;

Classroom Management mentioned by 63.6 percent and Lesson Plans mentioned by 68.2 percent.

The criteria listed by 50.0 percent or more of the Other Principal's Group were: Nothing Specific, 68.2 percent; Lesson Plans, 63.6 percent; Discipline 59.1 percent; Rapport with Students, 54.5 percent, and Attendance, 54.5 percent.

The categories included in the criteria listed by 50.0 percent of the Outstanding Principal's Group and not included in the 50 percent or more range of the Other Principal's Group are: Instructional Techniques and Classroom Management.

The categories included in the criteria listed by 50.0 percent of the Other Principal's Group and not included in the 50.0 percent or more range of the Outstanding Principal's Group are: Rapport with Students and Attendance.

There were categories listed that had only one count. These are included in the complete tabulation of the responses to Question 1 represented by Table 16.

Analysis of Data

There was a high degree of divergence in the criteria selected by both groups. Eight items appeared on the lists of both groups; however, the difference in responses to six of the eight showed significant difference. The two items with positive response in favor of the Outstanding Principal's Group were: Instruction Techniques, 63.6 percent for Outstanding and 36.4 percent for Others. Of the Other Principal's Group, 69.1 percent named Discipline as an important criterion; whereas only 50.0 percent of Outstanding principals named it. 45.5 percent of Others named Appearance of Classroom; whereas only 22.7 percent

TABLE 16

FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES OF TEACHER EVALUATION CRITERIA USED BY PRINCIPALS IN THE CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Category	Outstanding			Other		
	Count	Percent of Responses	Percent of Cases	Count	Percent of Responses	Percent of Cases
1. Creativity and Initiative.....	6	2.8	27.3	4	1.8	18.2
2. Cooperation.....	3	1.4	13.6	1	.5	4.5
3. Knowledge of Subject.....	9	4.1	40.9	8	3.7	36.4
4. Concern for Children...	1	.5	4.5	1	.5	4.5
5. Community Relations.....	2	.9	9.1	1	.5	4.5
6. Parent-Teacher Relations.....	4	1.8	18.2	7	3.2	31.8
7. Adaptable to Change.....	3	1.4	13.6	6	2.7	27.3
8. Preparation.....	2	.9	9.1	3	1.4	13.6
9. Discipline.....	11	5.0	50.0	13	6.0	69.1
10. Follows School Policy.....	1	.5	4.5	1	.5	4.5
11. Interest in Child's Children.....	...	...	...	1	.5	4.5

TABLE 16 - Continued

Category	Outstanding			Other		
	Count	Percent of Responses	Percent of Cases	Count	Percent of Responses	Percent of Cases
12. Attendance.....	8	3.7	36.4	11	5.1	50.0
13. Reports & Records.....	7	3.2	31.8	8	3.7	36.4
14. Extra Activities.....	2	.9	9.1	9	4.1	40.9
15. Instruction Techniques.....	14	6.4	63.6	8	3.7	36.4
16. Organization.....	5	2.3	22.7	2	.9	9.1
17. Empathy with Children.....	4	1.8	18.2	6	2.8	27.3
18. Knowledge of Teaching.....	1	.5	4.5	1	.5	4.5
19. Compassion.....	1	.5	4.5	2	.9	9.1
20. Enthusiasm.....	4	1.8	18.2	3	1.4	13.6
21. Gets Along With Staff.....	6	2.8	27.3	8	3.7	36.4
22. Integrity.....	4	1.8	18.2	1	.5	4.5
23. Professionalism.....	3	1.4	13.6	4	1.8	18.2
24. Punctualness.....	6	2.8	27.3	4	1.8	18.2

TABLE 16 - Continued

Category	Outstanding			Other		
	Count	Percent of Responses	Percent of Cases	Count	Percent of Responses	Percent of Cases
25. Knowledge of Community.....	...	...	...	1	.5	4.5
26. Student Learning.....	2	.9	9.1	1	.5	4.5
27. Class Management.....	14	6.4	63.6	8	3.7	36.4
28. Bulletin Boards.....	1	.5	4.5	...	...	...
29. Rapport with Students.....	10	4.6	45.5	12	5.5	54.5
30. Teacher's Appearance.....	7	3.2	31.8	1	.5	4.5
31. Classroom Work.....	1	.5	4.5	...	...	...
32. Diction.....	5	2.3	22.7	3	1.4	13.6
33. Fairness.....	1	.5	4.5	...	...	...
34. Appearance of Classroom.....	5	2.3	22.7	10	4.6	45.5
35. Environment of Class..	5	2.3	22.7	2	.9	9.1
36. Student Participation.	1	.5	4.5	2	.9	9.1
37. Teaching Aids.....	3	1.4	13.6	1	.5	4.5

TABLE 16 - Continued

Category	Outstanding			Others		
	Count	Percent of Responses	Percent of Cases	Count	Percent of Responses	Percent of Cases
38. Student Motivation...	1	.5	4.5	1	.5	4.5
39. Treats Students As Individuals.....	5	2.3	22.7	5	2.3	22.7
40. Goal Oriented.....	1	.5	4.5	...	...	...
41. Experience.....	...	...	...	2	.9	9.1
42. Relationship With Principal.....	...	...	...	1	.5	4.5
43. Evaluated Pupil Growth.....	1	.5	4.5	4	1.8	18.2
44. Stimulates Students...	6	2.8	27.3	1	.5	4.5
45. Guidance.....	...	...	...	1	.5	4.5
46. Intelligence.....	1	.5	4.5	...	...	...
47. Sense of Humor.....	3	1.4	13.6	1	.5	4.5
48. O.K. to Take Supervision.....	...	...	...	1	.5	4.5
49. Displays.....	1	.5	4.5	...	...	...

TABLE 16 - Continued

Category	Outstanding			Others		
	Count	Percent of Responses	Percent of Cases	Count	Percent of Responses	Percent of Cases
50. Judgment.....	1	.5	4.5	...	...	...
51. Handling of Routines..	...	...	...	2	.9	9.1
52. Positive Attitude.....	1	.5	4.5	3	1.4	13.6
53. Planning.....	...	...	...	1	.5	4.5
54. Accepts Criticism.....	1	.5	4.5	1	.5	4.5
55. Lesson Plans.....	15	6.9	68.2	14	6.5	63.6
56. Concern for Students..	...	...	...	1	.5	4.5
57. Respect for Student.....	4	1.8	18.2	1	.5	4.5
58. Reading Program.....	1	.5	4.5	1	.5	4.5
59. Student Achievement.....	3	1.4	13.6	2	.9	9.1
60. Safety.....	...	...	...	1	.5	4.5
61. Likes Self.....	...	...	...	1	.5	4.5
62. High Expectations.....	2	.9	9.1	2	.9	9.1

TABLE 16 - Continued

Category	Outstanding			Other		
	Count	Percent of Responses	Percent of Cases	Count	Percent of Responses	Percent of Cases
63. Field Trips.....	...	...	...	1	.5	4.5
64. Relevant Assignments.....	1	.5	4.5	...	...	...
65. Student's Work Habits.....	1	.5	4.5	...	...	...
66. Questions Asked By Teacher.....	2	.9	9.1	...	...	...
67. None.....	2	.9	9.1	15	6.9	68.2
68. Handwriting on Board.....	1	.5	4.5	...	...	...
69. Continuity of Lesson.....	1	.5	4.5	...	...	...
TOTAL RESPONSES	218			217		

Missing Cases: Outstanding Principal's Group--1; Other Principal's Group--0.

of Outstanding named it. 50.0 percent of the Others named Attendance; whereas only 36.4 percent of the Outstanding principals named it. Because of the percentage difference between the two groups, the null hypothesis with regard to Item 1 was not supported.

The findings suggest that instructional techniques and classroom management should be the purposes of teacher evaluation. The findings also suggest that the Other Principal's Group do not consider the improvement of instruction as the purpose for evaluating teachers.

Question 2A

> Of the criteria which you named, which one is the most important in evaluating teachers' performances: A. During the first year of teaching.

Presentation of Data

Of the members of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 2 or 9.1 percent thought that Creativity and Initiative was the most important criterion in evaluating teacher's performance during the first year of teaching; 2 or 9.1 percent named Discipline; 2 or 9.1 percent named Instructional Techniques; 1 or 4.5 percent named Organization; 1 or 4.5 percent named Empathy with Children; 8 or 36.4 percent named Classroom Management; 2 or 9.1 percent named Rapport with Students; 1 or 4.5 percent named Lesson Plans, 1 or 4.5 percent named Student Work Habits and 2 or 9.1 percent named Nothing Specific.

Of the members of the Other Principal's Group, 5 or 25.0 percent named Discipline; 2 or 10.0 percent named Knowledge of Subject; 1 or 5.0 percent named Instruction Techniques; 1 or 5.0 percent named Classroom Management; 1 or 5.0 percent named

Appearance of Classroom; 1 or 5,0 percent named Student Motivation; 1 or 5.0 percent named Pupil's Growth; 1 or 5.0 percent named Handling of Routines; 2 or 10.0 percent named Lesson Plans; 1 or 5.0 percent named Willingness to Take Supervision, and 3 or 15.0 percent named Nothing Specific.

Analysis of Data

There was divergence in the list of each group. Practically the same criteria appeared on both lists; however, no more than five of either group agreed on any one criterion. Because of the differences in responses, the null hypothesis for Item 2A was not supported. There was found to be differences in the responses of each group as to the choice of criteria which each deemed important during the first year of teaching.

The same conclusion can be drawn from the responses to the questions that were drawn for Question One. Outstanding principals selected criteria more often that dealt with instructional techniques. The findings tend to suggest that criteria should be based on instructional techniques. The findings also suggest that Other principals are more concerned with non-instructional areas.

Question 2B

> Which criterion do you consider the most important in evaluating a teacher's performance during the second to fourth year of teaching?

Presentation of Data

Of the members of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 1 or 4.5 percent named Creativity and Initiative as the most important in evaluating teachers' performance during the 2nd-4th year of teaching; 1 or 4.5 percent named Cooperation; 3 or 13.6 percent named Instructional Techniques; 1 or 4.5 percent named

Empathy with Children; 1 or 4.5 percent named Punctuality; 3 or 13.6 percent named Rapport with Students; 3 or 16.6 percent named Lesson Plans; 1 or 4.5 percent named the Quality of the Reading Program; 2 or 9.1 percent named Student Achievement; 1 or 4.5 percent named High Expectations, and 5 or 22.7 percent named Nothing Specific.

Of the members of the Other Principal's Group, 3 or 15.0 percent named Discipline; 2 or 10.0 percent named Knowledge of Subject; 1 or 5.0 percent named Organization; 1 or 5.0 percent named Classroom Management; 1 or 5.0 percent named Rapport with Students; 1 or 5.0 percent named Appearance of Classroom; 1 or 5.0 percent named Evaluates Pupil Growth; 2 or 10.0 percent named Lesson Plans; 1 or 5.0 percent named Reading Program; 1 or 5.0 percent named Student Achievement; 5 or 25.0 percent names Nothing Specific.

Analysis of Data

Although the two groups named a variety of criteria, five of each group listed Nothing Specific in the answer to Question 2B. The same criteria appeared on both lists with similar frequency. Therefore, the null hypothesis with regard to Item 2B was supported. There were no differences between the two groups regarding their choice of criterion deemed most important in evaluating teachers during the second to fourth year of teaching. After a teacher has taught for a year, the findings tend to suggest that principals are concerned with non-instructional techniques when they evaluate teachers.

Question 2C

> Which criterion do you consider the most important in evaluating a teacher's performance during the fifth to seventh year?

Of the members of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 1 or 4.5 percent named Creativity and Initiative as the most important criterion by which to judge a teacher during the 5th-7th year of teaching; 1 or 4.5 percent named Knowledge of Subject; 1 or 4.5 percent named Extra Activities; 3 or 13.6 percent named Instruction Techniques; 1 or 4.5 percent named Student Learning; 3 or 13.6 percent named Rapport with Students; 1 or 4.5 percent named Environment of Classroom; 2 or 9.1 percent named Student Achievement; 1 or 4.5 percent named High Expectations; 1 or 4.5 percent named Student Work Habits, and 7 or 31.8 percent named Nothing Specific.

Of the members of the Other Principal's Group, 1 or 5.0 percent named Creativity and Initiative; 1 or 5.0 percent named Discipline; 2 or 10.0 percent named Knowledge of Subject; 2 or 10.0 percent named Instructional Techniques; 1 or 5.0 percent named Organization; 1 or 5.0 percent named Empathy with Children; 1 or 5.0 percent named Student Learning; 1 or 5.0 percent named Rapport with Students; 1 or 5.0 percent named Appearance of Classroom; 1 or 5.0 percent named Students as Individuals; 1 or 5.0 percent named Evaluates Pupil Growth; 1 or 5.0 percent named Lesson Plans; 1 or 5.0 percent named Student Achievement, and 7 or 35.0 percent named Nothing Specific.

Analysis of Data

The highest number of principals of both groups agreeing on one criterion was 7 or 31.8 percent, and the category they agreed on was Nothing Specific. 3 or 13.6 percent of the Outstanding principals named Instruction Techniques as compared with 2 or 10.1 percent of the Other Principals Group. For all the criteria named, the difference in frequency between the two

groups was not large. Therefore, the null hypothesis with regard to Item 2C was supported. There were no differences between the two groups regarding their choice of criterion deemed most important in evaluating teachers during the fifth to seventh year of teaching.

Question 2D

Which criterion do you consider the most important in evaluating a teacher's performance during the eighth to tenth year?

Presentation of Data

Of the members of the Outstanding group, 3 or 13.6 percent named Creativity and Initiative as the most important criterion by which to judge a teacher during the eighth to tenth year teaching span. 1 or 4.5 percent named Community Relations; 1 or 4.5 percent named Enthusiasm; 2 or 9.1 percent named Rapport with Students; 1 or 4.5 percent named Evaluates Pupil Growth; 2 or 9.1 percent named Student Achievement; 1 or 4.5 percent named High Expectations; 1 or 4.5 percent named Relevant Assignments and 8 or 36.4 percent named Nothing Specific.

Of the members of the Other Principal's Group, 1 or 5.0 percent named Discipline, 1 or 5.0 percent named Ability to Change; 1 or 5.0 percent named Extra Activities; 1 or 5.0 percent named Organization; 1 or 5.0 percent named Student Learning; 1 or 5.0 percent named Appearance of Classroom; 1 or 5.0 percent named Students as Individuals; 2 or 10.0 percent named Evaluates Pupil Growth; 1 or 5.0 percent named Planning; 1 or 5.0 percent named Concern for Students; 1 or 5.0 percent named Lesson Plans; 1 or 5.0 percent named Student Achievement, and 5 or 30.0 percent named Nothing Specific.

Analysis of Data

Analysis of the data for Item 2D indicates that 36.4 percent of the Outstanding Principal's Group and 30.0 percent of the Other Principal's Group selected the Nothing Specific category as their response to this question. The difference between the two groups was not great.

The other criteria named were varied and they were selected with relatively the same frequencies by members of both groups. Therefore, the null hypothesis with regard to Item 2D was supported. There were no differences between the two groups regarding their choice of criteria deemed most important in evaluating teachers during the eighth to tenth year of teaching.

A summary of frequencies and percentages of criteria used by principals to evaluate teachers during the first year of teaching, second to fourth year of teaching, fifth to seventh year of teaching, and eighth to tenth year of teaching is presented in Table 17.

Question 3A

How many times each year do you observe each teacher during the first year of teaching?

Presentation of Data

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 2 or 8.7 percent observed teachers during the first year a total of 4 times. 2 or 8.7 percent observed 8 times; 4 or 17.4 percent observed 10 times; 2 or 8.7 percent observed 12 times; 1 or 4.3 percent observed 15 times; 3 or 13.0 percent observed 20 times; 2 or 8.7 percent observed 35 times; 1 or 4.3 percent observed 40 times; 2 or 8.7 percent observed 98 times and 4 or 17.4 percent observed 99 times.

TABLE 17

FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES OF CRITERIA USED BY PRINCIPALS TO EVALUATE TEACHERS DURING 1ST YEAR OF TEACHING, 2ND TO 4TH YEAR OF TEACHING, 5TH TO 7TH YEAR OF TEACHING, AND 8TH TO 10TH YEAR OF TEACHING

Category	1st Year Teaching				2nd-4th Year Teaching				5th-7th Year Teaching				8th-10th Year Teaching			
	Out-standing		Other		Out-standing		Other		Out-standing		Other		Out-standing		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Creativity & Initiative	2	9.1	...	.....	1	4.5	...	....	1	4.5	1	5.0	3	13.6	...	.....
2. Cooperation	...	.....	...	.....	1	4.5	...	....	...	.....	...	.....	...	.....	...	.....
3. Discipline	2	9.1	5	25.0	...	.....	3	15.0	...	.....	1	5.0	...	.....	1	5.0
4. Knowledge of Subject	...	.....	2	10.0	...	.....	2	10.0	1	4.5	2	10.0	...	.....	...	.....
5. Concern for Children	...	.....	...	....	...	.....	...	....	...	.....	...	.....	...	.....	...	.....
6. Community Relations	...	.....	...	....	...	.....	...	....	...	.....	...	.....	1	4.5	...	.....
7. Adaptable to Change	...	.....	...	.....	...	.....	...	....	...	.....	...	.....	...	.....	1	5.0
8. Extra Activities	...	.....	...	.....	...	.....	...	....	1	4.5	...	.....	...	.....	...	.....
9. Instruction Technique	2	9.1	1	5.0	3	13.6	...	....	3	13.6	2	9.1	...	.....	...	.....
10. Organization	1	4.5	1	5.0	...	.....	1	5.0	...	.....	1	5.0	...	.....	1	5.0

TABLE 17 - Continued

Category	1st Year Teaching				2nd-4th Year Teaching				5th-7th Year Teaching				8th-10th Year Teaching			
	Out-standing		Other		Out-standing		Other		Out-standing		Other		Out-standing		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
11. Empathy with children	1	4.5	...	.....	1	4.5	...	.....	.....	.....	1	5.0	.....	.....	.....	.....
12. Enthusiasm	.....	.....	...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	4.5	...	.....
13. Professionalism	.....	.....	...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
14. Punctualness	.....	.....	...	.....	1	4.5	...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
15. Student Learning	.....	.....	...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	4.5	1	5.0	.....	.....	1	5.0
16. Classroom Management	8	36.4	1	5.0	.....	.....	1	5.0	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
17. Rapport with Students	2	9.1	...	.....	3	13.6	1	5.0	3	13.6	1	5.0	2	9.1	...	.....
18. Appearance of Classroom	.....	.....	1	5.0	.....	.....	1	5.0	.....	.....	1	5.0	.....	.....	1	5.0
19. Environment of Classroom	.....	.....	...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	4.5	...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
20. Student Participation	.....	.....	...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

TABLE 17 - Continued

Category	1st Year Teaching				2nd-4th Year Teaching				5th-7th Year Teaching				8th-10th Year Teaching			
	Out-standing		Other		Out-standing		Other		Out-standing		Other		Out-standing		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
21. Student Motivation	.....	.....	1	5.0	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
22. Students as Individuals	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	5.0	.....	.....	1	5.0
23. Evaluates Pupil Growth	.....	.....	1	5.0	.....	.....	1	5.0	.....	.....	1	5.0	1	4.5	2	10.0
24. Stimulates Pupil Growth	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
25. Handling of Routines	.....	.....	1	5.0	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
26. Planning	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	5.0
27. Concern for Students	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	5.0
28. Lesson Plans	1	4.5	2	10.0	3	13.6	2	10.0	.....	.....	1	5.0	.....	.....	1	5.0

TABLE 17 - Continued

Category	1st Year Teaching				2nd-4th Year Teaching				5th-7th Year Teaching				8th-10th Year Teaching			
	Out-standing		Other		Out-standing		Other		Out-standing		Other		Out-standing		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
29. Respect for Students	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
30. Reading Program	...	...	...	...	1	4.5	1	5.0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
31. Student Achievement	...	...	...	...	2	9.1	1	5.0	2	9.1	1	5.0	2	9.1	1	5.0
32. High Expectations	...	...	...	...	1	4.5	...	...	1	4.5	...	...	1	4.5	...	...
33. Relevant Assignments	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	4.5	...	...
34. Willingness to take Supervision	...	...	1	5.0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
35. Student Work Habits	1	4.5	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	4.5	...	...	...	...	...	...
36. None	2	9.1	3	15.0	5	22.7	5	25.0	7	31.8	7	35.0	8	36.4	6	30.0

Of the Other Principal's Group, 2 or 9.1 percent observed 5 times; 2 or 9.1 percent observed 6 times; 2 or 9.1 percent observed 7 times; 1 or 4.5 percent observed 8 times; 1 or 4.5 percent observed 9 times; 5 or 22.7 percent observed 10 times; 2 or 9.1 percent observed 20 times; 1 or 4.5 percent observed 25 times; 1 or 4.5 percent observed 26 times; 1 or 4.5 percent observed 30 times, and 4 or 18.2 percent observed 99 times.

The highest number of observations for the 1st year reported was 99 and this number was reported by members of both groups. The lowest number of observations was 4, which was reported by the Outstanding Principal's Group.

The responses of the Outstanding Principal's Group indicated that during the first year, 60.8 percent observed teachers from 4 to 20 times.

The responses of the Other Principal's Group indicated that during the first year, 60.8 percent observed teachers from 4 to 20 times.

The responses of the Other Principals indicated that 59.0 percent observed teachers 5 to 10 times.

A summary of the frequency of observations made of teachers by both groups during the first year is presented in Table 18.

Analysis of Data

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 60.8 percent observed teachers from 4 to 20 times and 69.0 percent of the Others observed teachers from 5 to 10 times. The difference between the two groups was not outstanding. Therefore, the null hypothesis with regard to Item 3A was supported. There was no difference

between the two groups regarding the number of times they observed each teacher during the first year. The findings tend to suggest that all principals visit first year teachers frequently.

TABLE 18

SUMMARY OF THE FREQUENCY OF OBSERVATIONS MADE OF TEACHERS DURING THE FIRST YEAR OF TEACHING

OUTSTANDING			OTHER		
Number of Observations	Number of Principals	Percent	Number of Observations	Number of Principals	Percent
4	2	8.7	5	2	9.1
8	2	8.7	6	2	9.1
10	4	17.4	7	2	9.1
12	2	8.7	8	1	4.5
15	1	4.3	9	1	4.5
20	3	13.0	10	5	22.7
35	2	8.7	20	2	9.1
40	1	4.3	25	1	4.5
98	2	8.7	26	1	4.5
99	4	17.4	30	1	4.5
			99	4	18.2

NOTE: M = 14.8 for the Outstanding Principal's Group and M = 11.1 for the Other Principal's Group.

Question 3B

How many times do you observe each teacher during the second to fourth year span?

Presentation of Data

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 1 or 4.3 percent observed 2 times; 1 or 4.3 percent observed 4 times; 3 or 13.0

percent observed 5 times; 2 or 8.7 percent observed 8 times; 5 or 21.7 percent observed 10 times; 2 or 8.7 percent observed 12 times; 1 or 4.3 percent observed 15 times; 1 or 4.3 percent observed 35 times; 1 or 4.3 percent observed 70 times; 2 or 8.7 percent observed 98 times, and 4 or 17.4 percent observed 99 times.

Of the Other Principal's Group, 3 or 13.6 percent observed 3 times; 1 or 4.5 percent observed 4 times; 4 or 18.2 percent observed 5 times; 1 or 4.5 percent observed 6 times; 2 or 9.1 percent observed 8 times; 3 or 13.6 percent observed 9 times; 1 or 4.5 percent observed 10 times; 1 or 4.5 percent observed 15 times; 1 or 4.5 percent observed 25 times; 1 or 4.5 percent observed 50 times, and 4 or 18.2 percent observed 99 times.

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 60.7 percent reported that they observed each teacher from 2 to 12 times during the two-four year span.

Of the Other Principal's Group, 63.5 stated that they observed teachers from 3 to 9 times during the two to four year span.

The lowest number of observations reported was 2 and this was indicated by a member of the Outstanding Principal's Group.

A summary of the frequency of observations made of teachers by both groups during the second to fourth year span is presented in Table 19.

Analysis of Data

The number of observations reported by both groups was from 2 to 99. Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 17.4 per-

cent observed 99 times; whereas 18.2 percent of the Others observed 99 times. The difference was certainly not great. Therefore, the null hypothesis with regard to item 3B was supported. There was no measurable difference between the two groups regarding the number of times they observed each teacher during the second to fourth year teaching span.

The findings tend to support the conclusion that all principals observe second to fourth year teachers with relative frequency. The findings also suggest that because teachers are tenured in the Chicago Schools after three years, the tendency to evaluate increases during this period.

TABLE 19

SUMMARY OF THE FREQUENCY OF OBSERVATIONS MADE OF TEACHERS DURING THE SECOND TO FOURTH YEAR

OUTSTANDING			OTHER		
Number of Observations	Number of Principals	Percent	Number of Observations	Number of Principals	Percent
2	1	4.3	3	3	13.6
4	1	4.3	4	1	4.5
5	3	13.0	5	4	18.2
8	2	8.7	6	1	4.5
10	5	21.7	8	2	9.1
12	2	8.7	9	3	13.6
15	1	4.3	10	1	4.5
35	1	4.3	15	1	4.5
70	1	4.3	25	1	4.5
98	2	8.7	50	1	4.5
99	4	17.4	99	1	18.2

NOTE: M = 15.8 for the Outstanding Principal's Group and M = 10.6 for the Other Principal's Group.

Question 3C

How many times do you observe each teacher during the fifth to seventh year span?

Presentation of Data

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 1 or 4.3 percent observed each teacher 2 times; 1 or 4.3 percent observed 3 times; 1 or 4.3 percent observed 4 times; 2 or 8.7 percent observed 5 times; 1 or 4.3 percent observed 6 times; 1 or 4.3 percent observed 8 times; 1 or 4.3 percent observed 9 times; 6 or 26.1 percent observed 10 times; 2 or 8.7 percent observed 12 times; 1 or 4.3 percent observed 35 times; 1 or 4.3 percent observed 80 times; 1 or 4.3 percent observed 98 times, and 4 or 17.4 percent observed 99 times.

Of the Other Principal's Group, 2 or 9.1 percent observed 2 times; 1 or 4.5 percent observed 3 times; 5 or 22.7 percent observed 4 times; 1 or 4.5 percent observed 5 times; 1 or 4.5 percent observed 6 times; 1 or 4.5 percent observed 8 times; 2 or 9.1 percent observed 9 times; 1 or 4.5 percent observed 10 times; 1 or 4.5 percent observed 20 times; 1 or 4.5 percent observed 50 times, and 5 or 22.7 percent observed 99 times.

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 60.6 percent reported that they observed each teacher from 2 to 10 times during the five to seven year span.

Of the Other Principal's Group, 58.9 percent reported that they observed each teacher from 2 to 8 times during the five to seven year span.

A summary of the frequency of observations made of teachers by both groups during the five to seven year teaching span is presented in Table 20.

TABLE 20

SUMMARY OF THE FREQUENCY OF OBSERVATIONS MADE OF TEACHERS DURING THE FIFTH TO SEVENTH YEAR

OUTSTANDING			OTHER		
Number of Observations	Number of Principals	Percent	Number of Observations	Number of Principals	Percent
2	1	4.3	2	2	9.1
3	1	4.3	3	1	4.5
4	1	4.3	4	5	22.7
5	2	8.7	5	1	4.5
6	1	4.3	6	1	4.5
8	1	4.3	8	1	4.5
9	1	4.3	9	2	9.1
10	6	26.1	10	1	4.5
12	2	8.7	20	1	4.5
35	1	4.3	50	1	4.5
80	1	4.3	99	5	22.7
98	1	4.3			
99	4	17.4			

NOTE: M = 16.1 for the Outstanding Principal's Group and M = 9.8 for the Other Principal's Group.

Analysis of Data

The number of observations reported by both groups ranged from 2 to 99. Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 17.4 percent observed 99 times; whereas 22.7 percent of the Other principals observed 99 times. 4.3 percent of the Outstanding principals observed 2 times; whereas 9.1 percent of the Other principals observed 2 times. The differences between the two groups of principals

were negligible. Therefore, the null hypothesis, with regard to Item 3C was supported. There was no difference between the two groups regarding the number of times they observed each teacher during the fifth to seventh year.

Although there was little difference between the responses of the two groups, it should be noted that the Outstanding Principals Group observed teachers more often than did members of the Other Principal's Group. The findings tend to suggest that after the first year of teaching, the Outstanding principals continue to observe teachers frequently.

Question 3D

How many times do you observe each teacher during the eight to ten year span?

Presentation of Data

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 1 or 4.3 percent observed 3 times; 1 or 4.3 percent observed 4 times; 2 or 8.7 percent observed 5 times; 1 or 4.3 percent observed 6 times; 1 or 4.3 percent observed 8 times; 1 or 4.3 percent observed 9 times; 5 or 21.7 percent observed 10 times; 2 or 8.7 percent observed 12 times; 1 or 4.3 percent observed 35 times; 1 or 4.3 percent observed 80 times; 1 or 4.3 percent observed 98 times, and 4 or 17.4 percent observed 99 times.

Of the Other Principal's Group, 2 or 9.1 percent observed each teacher 2 times during the eight to ten year span; 2 or 9.1 percent observed 3 times; 2 or 9.1 percent observed 4 times; 4 or 18.2 percent observed 5 times; 1 or 4.5 percent observed 6 times, 1 or 4.5 percent observed 8 times; 2 or 9.1 percent observed 9 times; 1 or 4.5 percent observed 10 times; 1 or 4.5 percent observed 20 times; 1 or 4.5 percent observed 50 times, and 5 or 22.7 percent observed 99 times.

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 60.5 percent reported that they observed each teacher from 2 to 10 times during the 8-10 year span.

Of the Other Principal's Group, 63.6 percent reported that they observed each teacher from 2 to 8 times during the 8-10 year span.

A summary of the frequency of observations made of teachers for both groups for the 8-10 year span is presented in Table 21.

TABLE 21

SUMMARY OF THE FREQUENCY OF OBSERVATIONS MADE OF TEACHERS DURING THE EIGHTH TO TENTH YEAR

OUTSTANDING			OTHER		
Number of Observations	Number of Principals	Percent	Number of Observations	Number of Principals	Percent
2	1	4.3	2	2	9.1
3	1	4.3	3	2	9.1
4	1	4.3	4	2	9.1
5	2	8.7	5	4	18.2
6	1	4.3	6	1	4.5
8	1	4.3	8	1	4.5
9	1	4.3	9	2	9.1
10	5	21.7	10	1	4.5
12	2	8.7	20	1	4.5
35	1	4.3	50	1	4.5
80	1	4.3	99	5	22.7
98	1	4.3			
99	4	17.4			

NOTE: M = 16.1 for the Outstanding Principal's Group and M = 9.8 for the Other Principal's Group.

Analysis of Data

The number of observations reported by both groups ranged from 2 to 99. Of the Outstanding principals, 4.3 percent observed 3 times; whereas 9.1 percent observed each teacher 2 times. Of the Outstanding principals, 17.4 percent observed 99 times; whereas 22.7 percent of the Others observed 99 times. The differences were not great between the two groups. Therefore, the null hypothesis for Item 3D was supported. There was no difference between the two groups regarding the number of times they observed each teacher during the eight to ten year span.

Question 3E

How many times each year do you observe each teacher beyond the tenth year?

Presentation of Data

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 1 or 4.3 percent observed each teacher beyond the tenth year 2 times; 1 or 4.3 percent observed 3 times; 2 or 8.7 percent observed 4 times; 2 or 8.7 percent observed 5 times; 2 or 8.7 percent observed 8 times; 1 or 4.3 percent observed 9 times; 5 or 21.7 percent observed 10 times; 2 or 8.7 percent observed 12 times; 1 or 4.3 percent observed 98 times, and 4 or 17.4 percent observed 99 times.

Of the Other Principal's Group, 1 or 4.5 percent observed 1 time; 1 or 4.5 percent observed 2 times; 2 or 9.1 percent observed 3 times; 2 or 9.1 percent observed 4 times; 5 or 22.7 percent observed 5 times; 1 or 4.5 percent observed 8 times; 2 or 9.1 percent observed 9 times; 1 or 4.5 percent observed 50 times, and 5 or 22.7 percent observed 99 times.

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 65.0 percent

reported that they observed each teacher from 2 to 10 times beyond the tenth year.

A summary of the frequency of observations made of teachers for both groups is presented in Table 22.

TABLE 22

SUMMARY OF THE FREQUENCY OF OBSERVATIONS MADE OF TEACHERS BEYOND THE TENTH YEAR

OUTSTANDING			OTHER		
Number of Observations	Number of Principal	Percent	Number of Observations	Number of Principals	Percent
2	1	4.3	1	1	4.5
3	1	4.3	2	1	4.5
4	2	8.7	3	2	9.1
5	2	8.7	4	2	9.1
6	2	8.7	5	5	22.7
8	1	4.3	8	1	4.5
9	1	4.3	9	2	9.1
10	5	21.7	10	1	4.5
12	2	8.7	20	1	4.5
35	1	4.3	50	1	4.5
80	1	4.3	99	5	22.7
98	1	4.3			
99	4	17.4			

NOTE: M = 16.1 for the Outstanding Principal's Group and M = 10.5 for the Other Principal's Group.

Of the Outstanding principals, 65.0 percent observed 2 to 10 times; 63.6 percent of the Other principals observed from 1 to 9 times. The differences were negligible. Therefore, the null hypothesis for Item 3E was supported. There was no noticeable difference between the two groups regarding the number of times they observed each teacher beyond the tenth year.

The findings for this question, though not statistically significant, do suggest a consistency in the type of observations made by the Outstanding Principal's Group. This is true whether the teacher being observed has less than one year or more than 10 years of teaching experience.

The mean percent of observations of the Outstanding Principal's Group for the first year was 14.8. For the second to fourth year it was 15.5, and from the fifth year and beyond to the tenth year it was 16.1.

The mean percent of the observations for the Other Principal's Group was: first year of teaching: 11.1; second to forth year of teaching: 10.6; fifth to tenth year of teaching: 9.8, and beyond the tenth year it was 10.5

The findings would tend to support the conclusion that successful principals observe all teachers on a regular basis--irrespective of the teachers' years of experience. The findings also suggest that less successful principals observe less often as the teachers' years of experience increases.

A summary of the mean percentages and percent of differences for the first year to beyond the tenth year is presented in Table 23.

TABLE 23

MEAN PERCENTAGES AND PERCENT OF DIFFERENCES IN HOW OFTEN TEACHERS ARE OBSERVED

Years as a Teacher	Mean Percent OUTSTANDING	Mean Percent OTHER	Percent of Difference
1 Year	14.8	11.1	3.7
2nd to 4th Year	15.5	10.6	4.9
5th to 7th Year	16.1	9.8	6.3
8th to 10th Year	16.1	9.8	5.6
Beyond 10th Year	16.1	10.5	5.6

NOTE: M = 15.7 for the Outstanding Principal's Group and M = 10.4 for the Other Principal's Group.

The Outstanding principals consistently observed more frequently than did the Other principals.

Question 4.

How long do you observe each teacher's class? Do you observe 45 minutes to 1 hour? More than 1 hour? More than 2 hours?

Presentation of Data

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 19 or 82.6 percent said that they observed for 45 minutes to one hour; 3 or 13.0 percent said that they observed more than one hour; 1 or 4.3 percent said that they observed more than two hours.

Of the Other Principal's Group,20 or 90.9 percent said that they observed a teacher 45 minutes to one hour; 1 or 4.5 percent said that they observed more than one hour, and 1 or 4.5 percent observed more than two hours.

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 82.6 percent observed a teacher's class between 45 minutes and one hour. Of the Other Principal's Group, 90.9 percent observed a teacher's class between 45 minutes and an hour.

A summary of the responses to Question 4 are presented in Table 24.

TABLE 24

FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES OF TIME THAT TEACHERS ARE OBSERVED BY PRINCIPALS

Observation Time	Outstanding Principals		Other Principals	
	N	%	N	%
45 Minutes to One Hour.....	19	82.5	20	91.0
More than One Hour.....	3	13.0	1	4.5
More than Two Hours.....	1	4.5	...	...
Missing Information....	...	...	1	4.5

Analysis of Data

The time span reported most frequently by both groups was 45 minutes to 1 hour. Of the Outstanding principals, 82.5 percent observed between 45 minutes and 1 hour. Of the Other principals, 91.0 percent observed teachers 45 minutes to 1 hour. There was no real difference between the two groups on this question. Therefore, the null hypothesis for Item 4 was supported. There was no difference between the two groups as to the length of time they observed each teacher.

Question 5

(a) Is each observation prearranged?
(b) If yes, how many were prearranged?
(c) How many are not prearranged?

Presentation of Data

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 1 or 4.3 percent

said that observations were prearranged; 22 or 95.7 said that they were not. Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 3 or 13.6 percent responded to the question asking how many observations were prearranged. Their responses varied and are recorded as they were written: "A few by agreement."; "Sometimes I ask to see certain things."; "One, at least, out of the year." Members of this group reported the following number of observations were not prearranged: 1 principal reported that at least 1 observation each year was not prearranged; 2 reported that 2-4 were not; 3 reported that 5-10 were not, and 4 reported that more than 10 observations a year were not prearranged.

In answer to the question (a) "Is each observation prearranged?", 2 or 9.1 percent of the Other Principal's Group said that they were; 21 or 90.0 percent said that they were not. In answer to the question (b) "How many were prearranged?", 1 or 4.5 percent of the Other Principal's Group reported that most were prearranged; 1 or 4.5 percent said that about 20.0 percent were prearranged. In answer to the question: "How many are not prearranged?", 21 or 90.9 percent of this group reported that more than 10 observations a year were not prearranged.

Because of the variety and sketchiness of the responses, the summary of only the frequencies and percentages of both groups who arrange or do not arrange observations of teachers is presented in Table 25.

Analysis of Data

The members of both groups reported a decisive preference for observations that were not prearranged. 95.7

percent of Outstanding principals did not arrange observations, and 90.9 percent of the Other principals did not either. There was no great difference between the two groups in their responses to this question. Therefore, the null hypothesis for Item 5 was supported.

TABLE 25

PERCENTAGE OF PRINCIPALS WHO ARRANGE OR DO NOT ARRANGE FOR TEACHER OBSERVATIONS

Type of Observation	Outstanding Principals		Other Principals	
	N	%	N	%
Prearranged.....	1	4.3	2	9.1
Not Prearranged....	22	95.7	21	90.9
Total.....	23		23	

Question 6

Do you keep a log in each teacher's file about each visit?

Presentation of Data

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 13 or 56.5 percent said that they did keep a log in each teacher's file about each visit; 9 or 39.1 percent said that they did not.

Of the Other Principal's Group, 11 or 47.8 percent said that they did keep a log in each teacher's file for each visit; 11 or 47.8 percent said that they did not; 1 or 4.5 percent did not respond.

The summary of the frequencies and percentages of both groups who keep or do not keep logs is presented in Table 26

TABLE 26

PERCENTAGE OF PRINCIPALS WHO MAINTAIN LOGS PRETAINING TO TEACHER OBSERVATIONS

Logs kept by principals	Outstanding Principals		Other Principals	
	N	%	N	%
6. Do you keep a log in each teacher's file about each visit?				
Yes.....	13	56.5	11	47.8
No.....	9	39.1	11	47.8
No Response.....	1	4.5	1	4.5
Total.....	23		23	

Analysis of Data

Although a higher percentage of Outstanding principals reported keeping a log, the difference between 56.5 percent for this group and 47.8 for the Other principals is very small. Because of this small difference, the null hypothesis for Item 6 was supported. These two groups indicated similar practices in regard to the keeping of logs relative to teacher observations

Question 7

Are evaluations discussed regularly?

Presentation of Data

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 13 ot 56.5 percent said that evaluations were discussed regularly; 9 or 39.1 percent said that they were not.

Of the Other Principal's Group, 11 or 47.8 percent said

that the evaluations were discussed regularly; 11 or 47.8 percent said they were not. One of the Other Principal's Group did not respond.

A summary of the frequencies and percentages of both groups who discuss or do not discuss evaluations is presented in Table 27.

TABLE 27

FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES OF PRINCIPALS WHO DISCUSS OR DO NOT DISCUSS EVALUATIONS

Category	Outstanding Principals		Other Principals	
	N	%	N	%
7. Are evaluations discussed regularly?				
Yes.....	13	56.5	11	47.8
No.....	9	39.1	11	47.8
No Response....	1	4.4	1	4.4
Total.....	23		23	

Analysis of Data

The difference between 59.1 percent of the Outstanding Principal's Group who discussed evaluations regularly and 50.0 percent of the Other Principal's Group who discussed evaluations was negligible. Therefore, the null hypothesis for Item 7 was supported. There was no great difference between the two groups as to the regularity with which evaluations were discussed.

Question 8

Are the problems, shortcoming, etc., discussed?

Presentation of Data

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 23 or 100 percent said that they did discuss problems and shortcomings with the teachers.

Of the Other Principal's Group, 23 or 100 percent said that they did discuss problems and shortcomings with the teachers.

Analysis of Data

All members of both groups answered in the affirmative to this question. Therefore, the null hypothesis for Item 12 was supported. There was no difference between the two groups on the question of whether or not problems and shortcomings were discussed at conferences.

Question six of the Interview Guide, Part A, asked: "Do teachers respond to discussions of teacher evaluations by offering criticism of the criteria?" Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 87.0 percent reported that teachers offered solutions to their problems, while only 39.0 percent of the Other Principal's Group reported that teachers suggested solutions to problems.

The findings to Question eight of the CTEM imply no difference between Outstanding principals and Other principals when asked the question: "Are the problems, shortcomings, etc., discussed?"

The findings suggest that Outstanding principals encourage teachers to discover solutions to their problems. The findings also suggest that Other principals discuss shortcomings, but do not involve teachers in solving their own problems.

Question 9

Are suggestions made? Are plans for improved methods discussed and decided upon?

Presentation of Data

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, and the Other Principal's Group, 23 or 100 percent said that suggestions were made and plans for improvement were decided upon.

Analysis of Data

All members of both groups answered in the affirmative on Question 9. Therefore, the null hypothesis for Item 9 was supported. There was no difference between the two groups on the question of whether suggestions were made and plans for improved methods were discussed and decided upon during conference with teachers.

Question 10

Do you, or you and the teacher, or others, design, define, and determine criteria and methods you use for teacher evaluation?

Presentation of Data

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 12 or 52.2 percent said that they designed, defined, and determined criteria and methods for teacher evaluation. Of this group, 8 or 34.8 percent said that they and the teacher designed, defined, and determined teacher evaluation criteria. Also, 3 or 13.0 percent said that others designed and determined criteria for teacher evaluation.

Of the Other Principal's Group, 12 or 52.2 percent said that they designed, defined, and determined criteria for teacher evaluation. This group reported that 10 or 43.3 percent utilized

principal and teacher designed, defined, and determined criteria. Also, 1 or 4.5 percent of the Other Principal's Group said that persons other than the teacher and principal designed, defined, and determined criteria.

A summary of the frequencies and percentages of the responses of both groups to the question as to who designs, defines, and determines criteria and methods used in evaluations is presented in Table 28.

TABLE 28

FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES OF THE PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION WHO DESIGNS, DEFINES, AND DETERMINES CRITERIA AND METHODS USED IN EVALUATION

Category	Outstanding Principals		Other Principals	
	N	%	N	%
10. Who designs, defines, and determines criteria and methods used in evaluation?				
Principal.....	12	52.2	12	52.2
Teacher and Principal...	8	34.8	10	43.3
Others.....	3	13.0	1	4.5
Total.....	23		23	

Analysis of Data

The responses of both groups were noticeably similar on all three parts of this question. 52.2 percent of the Outstanding principals and the Other principals said that they defined and determined criteria and methods of teacher evaluation.

There was very little difference between the percentages of Outstanding principals and Other principals who reported that teachers assisted in the defining and designing of criteria. In view of the small differences that exist, the null hypothesis for Item 10 was supported. There was no real difference between the two groups on the question of who designed, defined, and determined criteria and methods used in teacher evaluation.

Question 11

Do you, you and the teacher, or others do actual evaluation?

Presentation of Data

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 18 or 78.3 percent said that they did actual evaluation; 4 or 17.2 percent said that they and the teacher did actual evaluation, and 1 or 4.5 percent said that others did the evaluation.

Of the Other Principal's Group, 17 or 73.8 percent said that they actually did the evaluation; 5 or 21.7 percent said that they and the teacher did the evaluation, and 1 or 4.5 percent said that others did the evaluation.

A summary of the frequencies and percentages of the responses of both groups to the question of who does the evaluation is presented in Table 29.

Analysis of Data

The responses of both groups were similar enough on all aspects of Question 11 to warrant its acceptance. For both groups, the principal alone most often did the evaluation. The percentages were 78.3 for the Outstanding principals and 73.8

percent for the Other principals. For both groups the co-operation of principal and teachers in evaluations was quite similar with 17.2 percent reporting this among the Outstanding principals and 21.7 among the Other principals. In view of these results, the null hypothesis for Item 11 was supported. There was no difference between the two groups as to who carried out the actual evaluations.

TABLE 29

FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES SHOWING WHO DOES TEACHER EVALUATIONS

Category	Outstanding Principals		Other Principals	
	N	%	N	%
11. Do you, the teacher and you, or do others do the actual evaluation?				
Principal.....	18	78.3	17	73.8
Teacher and Principal...	4	17.2	5	21.7
Other.....	1	4.5	1	4.5
Total.....	23		23	

Question 12

Do you, you and the teacher, or others interpret findings of evaluation?

Presentation of Data

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 11 or 47.8 percent said that they interpreted findings; 11 or 47.8 percent said that they and the teacher interpreted findings, and 1 or 4.4

percent said that others interpreted the findings.

Of the Other Principal's Group, 6 or 30.0 percent said that they interpreted the findings; 13 or 65.0 percent said that they and the teacher interpreted the findings; 1 or 5.0 percent said that others interpreted the findings, and 2 did not respond.

A summary of the frequencies and percentages of the responses of both groups to the question of who interprets the findings of the evaluations is presented in Table 30.

TABLE 30

FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES SHOWING WHO INTERPRETS EVALUATION FINDINGS

Category	Outstanding Principals		Other Principals	
	N	%	N	%
12. Do you, you and the teacher, or others interpret evaluation findings?				
Principal.....	11	47.8	6	30.0
Teacher and Principal....	11	47.8	13	65.0
Others.....	1	4.4	1	5.0
No Response....	.....	.....	(2)*	.....
Total....	23		20	

* The No Response figures were not included in the total number of Other Principal respondents.

Analysis of Data

47.8 percent of the Outstanding principals reported that they alone interpreted evaluations as compared with only 30.0 percent of the Other principals who reported acting alone.

Two of the Others, however, did not respond. The two groups were closer together on the percentage of those who had teacher assistance. The percentages were 47.8 for Outstanding and 65.0 for Others. The differences were not basic. Therefore, the null hypothesis for Item 12 was supported. There was no difference between the two groups as to who interpreted the evaluations. There was no difference between the two groups as to who interpreted the evaluations.

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Section II

Hypothesis II

The second hypothesis under investigation was that there is no significant difference in the purposes of teacher evaluation (i.e., to improve instruction or to fulfill an administrative requirement) as determined by Outstanding principals and Other principals in the Chicago Public Schools.

The questions used for testing Hypothesis II are Questions 1-3 of Section III of the CTEM.

The questions and a listing of the responses from the Outstanding Principal's Group are given first, followed by a listing of the responses from the Other Principal's Group. A summary by tabulations is given where the nature of the responses permitted. A Chi square value was determined where applicable.

Question 1A

> What is the purpose for which teacher evaluation is conducted in your school? Respond by indicating one of the following: To Improve Instruction or Because it is an Administrative Requirement.

Presentation of Data

Of the 23 members of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 23 or 100 percent reported that the purpose of teacher evaluation in their schools was to improve instruction.

Of the Other Principal's Group, 20 or 86.4 percent said that teacher evaluations were conducted in their schools to improve instruction; 3 or 13.6 percent said that they were conducted as an administrative requirement.

A summary of the frequencies and percentages of the responses of the two groups to Question IA is presented in Table 31.

TABLE 31

PURPOSE OF TEACHER EVALUATION

Category	Outstanding Principals		Other Principals	
	N	%	N	%
1A. Purpose of Teacher Evaluation				
To Improve Instruction	23	100.0	20	86.4
Administrative Requirement			3	13.6
Total....	23		23	

NOTE: Chi square = 298; Significance = .581; Not significant.

Analysis of Data

100 percent of the members of the Outstanding Principal's Group reported that the purpose of teacher evaluation was to improve instruction. 86.4 percent of the Others said that evaluations were conducted in order to improve instruction. The Chi

square value of .298 for the responses was significant at the .585 level, a value of no statistical significance. There was no real difference between the responses of the two groups with regard to the purposes of teacher evaluation. Therefore, the null hypothesis pretaining to Item 1A was supported.

Question 1B

Are these purposes stated in administrative directives?

Presentation of Data

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 19 or 76.0 percent said that the purposes were stated in administrative directives; 4 or 24.0 percent said that they were not.

Of the Other Principal's Group, 15 or 65.2 percent said that they were; 7 or 34.8 percent said that they were not; 1 did not respond.

A summary of the responses of both groups to Question 1B is presented in Table 32.

TABLE 32

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE DIRECTIVES AS PURPOSE FOR EVALUATION

Category	Outstanding Principals		Other Principals	
	N	%	N	%
1B. Are purposes stated in administrative directives?				
Yes.....	19	76.0	15	65.2
No.....	4	24.0	7	34.8
Total....	23		22	

NOTE: 1 member of Other Principal's Group did not respond.
Chi square = 253; Significance = 615; Not significant.

Analysis of Data

76.0 percent of the Outstanding principals reported that the purposes were stated in administrative directives, and 65.5 percent of the Other principals said that they were. The Chi square value of .253 is statistically significant at the .615 level of confidence, a value of no statistical significance. There was no noticeable difference between the responses of the two groups. Therefore, the null hypothesis for Item 1B was supported.

Question 2A

Do you have written criteria (such as appearance, knowledge of subject matter, etc.) upon which teachers are evaluated in your school?

Presentation of Data

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 87.0 percent reported that they had written criteria for evaluating teachers; whereas 77.0 percent of the Other Principal's Group said that they used written criteria.

A summary of the responses made by both groups is given in Table 33.

TABLE 33

FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES OF PRINCIPALS USING WRITTEN CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION

Category	Outstanding Principals		Other Principals	
	N	%	N	%
2A. Do you have written criteria upon which teachers are evaluated?				
Yes.....	20	87.0	17	77.3
No.....	3	13.0	5	22.7
Total.....	23		22	

Analysis of Data

The percentages of affirmative responses for the two groups were 87.0 percent for the Outstanding principals and 77.0 percent for the Other principals. There was a very small difference between the responses for the two groups. Therefore, the null hypothesis for Item 2A was supported.

Question 2B

Are the teachers informed in advance of the criteria upon which they are to be evaluated?

Presentation of Data

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 19 or 82.6 percent said that the teachers are informed in advance and 4 or 17.4 percent said that they are not informed prior to evaluation.

Of the Other Principal's Group, 20 or 90.0 percent said that the teachers are informed in advance of the criteria; 2 or 9.1 percent said that they are not.

A summary of the responses made by both groups is given in Table 34.

TABLE 34

FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES OF PRINCIPALS WHO INFORM TEACHERS IN ADVANCE OF EVALUATION CRITERIA

Category	Outstanding Principals		Other Principals	
2B. Are teachers informed in advance of criteria for evaluation?	N	%	N	%
Yes.....	19	82.6	20	90.9
No.....	4	17.4	2	9.1
Total:....	23		22	

NOTE: 1 member of the Other Principal's Group did not respond to Question 2B.

Analysis of Data

The percentages of affirmative responses of the two groups were 82.6 for the Outstanding principals and 90.9 for the Other principals. There was very little difference in responses for the two groups. Therefore, the null hypothesis for Item 2B was supported.

Question 2C

Are the teachers informed in writing?

Presentation of Data

The members of both groups reported unanimously that their teachers were informed in writing of the criteria they would be evaluated on.

Analysis of Data

Due to the fact that there was no divergence in responses, the null hypothesis for Item 2C was supported. The findings suggest that this was not a valid question.

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Section III

Hypothesis III

The third hypothesis under investigation was that there is no significant difference in the approaches to evaluation of principals with schools that have fewer than twenty teachers and principals that have more than forty teachers in both the Outstanding and Other principal groups.

The question used for testing Hypothesis III was Question 4 of the CTEM.

The question and a listing of the responses from the

Outstanding Principal's Group are presented first, followed by responses from the Other Principal's Group and from the group designated "All the Others."

Question 4A

> What approach do you use in teacher evaluation? Check the answers which are appropriate from the following: on the basis of teacher characteristics (Presage); on the basis of measurement of pupil gain (Product); and on the basis of observation of teaching activities; assessment of teacher competence (Process).

Presentation of Data

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 12 had schools with between 30 and 40 teachers; 11 were in schools with over 40 teachers.

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group in the schools with over 40 teachers, 6 or 55.0 percent used the presage approach; 4 or 36.0 percent did not use the presage approach, and 1 or 9.0 percent did not respond. 6 or 55.0 percent of the Outstanding principals said they used the product approach; 6 or 55.0 percent did not use the product approach; 1 or 9.0 percent did not respond; the process approach was used by 10 or 91.0 percent, and 1 or 9.0 percent did not respond.

Of the Other Principal's Group, only 22 responded to Question 4A. Of these, 7 had schools with between 20 and 40 teachers; 2 were in schools with less than 20 teachers and 13 were in schools with over 40 teachers.

Of the Outstanding principals who had fewer than 20 teachers, 1 or 6.6 percent said that they used the presage approach; 1 or 6.6 percent said they did not; 2 or 13.2 percent used the product approach; 2 or 13.2 percent used the

process approach.

Of the Other principals who had more than 40 teachers, 6 or 40.0 percent used the presage approach; 7 or 47.0 percent did not; 9 or 60.0 percent used the product approach; 4 or 27.0 percent did not; 13 or 87.0 percent used the process approach.

Of the 172 principals not listed as Outstanding or Other, but designated as All the Others, 80 were principals of schools with between 20 and 40 teachers, 44 were in schools with less than 20 teachers, 48 were in schools with over 40 teachers on the staff, and 2 did not respond.

Of All the Others who were in schools of fewer than 20 teachers, 25 or 27.0 percent used the presage approach; 19 or 21.0 percent did not; 20 or 22.0 percent used the product approach; 24 or 26.0 percent did not, and 44 or 48.0 percent used the process approach.

Of All the Others who were in schools with over 40 teachers, 25 or 27.0 percent used the presage approach; 23 or 25.0 percent did not; 26 or 28.0 percent used the product approach; 24.0 percent did not; 46 or 50.0 percent used the process approach, and 2 or 2.0 percent did not.

Analysis of Data

Principals of both groups in schools with fewer than 20 teachers named both process and product approaches with practically equal frequency. In schools with over 40 teachers, the process approach was the one indicated as most often used. Ten of the eleven Outstanding principals in schools with over

40 teachers said that they used the process approach. All 13 of the Others who responded indicated they used the process approach. 6 of the 11 Outstanding principals used the product approach; 9 of the 13 Other principals used the product approach. 6 out of 11 Outstanding principals used the presage approach; all 13 of the Others named the presage approach.

There were no basic difference among the responses of the two groups. Therefore, the null hypothesis for Item 4A was supported. There was no basic difference in the approaches used by principals with schools that have fewer than 20 teachers, and principals that have more than 40 teachers in both the Outstanding and Other principals' groups.

Question 4B

> Which one of the three approaches listed do you use to the greatest extent? Check one of the following: On the basis of teacher characteristics (Presage); on the basis of measurement of pupil gain (Product); on the basis of observations of teaching activities; assessment of teacher competence (Process).

Presentation of Data

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 12 had schools with between 20 and 40 teachers; 11 were in schools with over 40 teachers.

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group in schools with over 40 teachers, 2 or 18.0 percent named the product approach as the one most used; 8 or 73.0 percent named the process approach.

Of the Other Principal's Group, only 22 responded to Question 4B. Of the remainder, 7 had schools that had between 20 and 40 teachers.

Of the Other Principal's Group with fewer than 20 teachers, 2 or 13.0 percent said they used the process approach most often.

Of the Other Principal's Group with more than 40 teachers, 12 or 86.0 percent named the process approach as the most used.

Of All the Others who were in schools of fewer than 20 teachers, 4 or 4.0 percent named the product approach as the most used; 40 or 43.0 percent named the process approach.

Of All the Others who were in schools with more than 40 teachers, 3 or 3.0 percent named the product approach as the most often used; 43 or 47.0 percent named the process approach.

A summary of the frequencies and percentages of responses given by the Outstanding Principal's Group as to the approaches used in teacher evaluation and the one most used is presented in Table 35.

A summary of the frequencies and percentages of responses given by the Other Principal's Group and the most used approach is presented in Table 36.

A summary of the frequencies and percentages of responses given by All the Others and the most used approach is presented in Table 37.

A summary of percentages for all groups appears in Table 38. Outstanding and Other principals are compared first, and secondly, Outstanding and All the Others are compared. A percent of difference is computed for both groups. A positive value is given to the Outstanding principals and a negative value is given to Others and All the Others.

TABLE 35

FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES OF APPROACHES USED BY OUTSTANDING PRINCIPALS

Approaches Used	Responses	Less Than 20 Teachers		Over 40 Teachers		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Presage	Using Teacher Characteristics						
	Yes	.....	.....	6	55.0	6	55.0
	No	.....	.....	4	36.0	4	36.0
	No Response	1	9.0	....	.....	1	9.0
	Total	1	9.0	10	91.0	11	100.0
Product	Pupil Gain						
	Yes	.....	.....	6	55.0	6	55.0
	No	.....	.....	4	36.0	4	36.0
	No Response	1	9.0	....	.....	1	9.0
	Total	1	9.0	10	91.0	11	100.0
Process	Teacher Competence						
	Yes	.....	.....	10	91.0	10	91.0
	No	.....	.....	....	.....	....	.....
	No Response	1	9.0	....	.....	1	9.0
	Total	1	9.0	10	91.0	11	100.0
Most Used Approach							
Product	Pupil Gain	.....	.....	2	18.0	2	18.0
Process	Teacher Activities	.....	.....	8	73.0	8	73.0
	No Response	1	9.0	....	.....	1	9.0
	Total	1	9.0	10	91.0	11	100.00

NOTE: Twelve principals had schools with between twenty and forty teachers.

TABLE 36

FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES OF APPROACHES USED BY OTHER PRINCIPALS

Approaches Used	Responses	Less Than 20 Teachers		Over 40 Teachers		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Presage	Using Teacher Characteristics						
	Yes	1	6.5	6	40.0	7	47.0
	No	1	6.5	7	47.0	8	53.0
	Total	2	13.0	13	87.0	15	100.0
Product	Pupil Gain						
	Yes	2	13.0	9	60.0	11	73.0
	No	.....	.....	4	27.0	4	27.0
	Total	2	13.0	13	87.0	15	100.0
Process	Teacher Competence						
	Yes	2	13.0	13	87.0	15	100.0
	No	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Total	2	13.0	13	87.0	15	100.0
Most Used Approach							
Process	Teacher Competence	2	13.0	12	81.0	14	93.0
	No Response	.....	.....	1	6.0	1	6.0
	Total	2	13.0	13	87.0	15	100.0

NOTE: Seven principals had schools with between twenty and forty teachers.

TABLE 37

FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES OF APPROACHES USED BY ALL OTHER PRINCIPALS

Approaches Used	Responses	Less Than 20 Teachers		Over 40 Teachers		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
	Using Teacher Characteristics						
Presage	Yes	25	27.0	25	27.0	50	54.0
	No	19	21.0	23	25.0	42	46.0
	Total	44	48.0	48	52.0	92	100.0
	Pupil Gain						
Product	Yes	20	22.0	26	28.0	46	50.0
	No	24	26.0	22	24.0	46	50.0
	Total	44	48.0	48	52.0	92	100.0
	Teacher Competence						
	Yes	44	48.0	46	50.0	90	98.0
Process	No	....	.....	2	2.0	2	2.0
	Total	44	48.0	48	52.0	92	100.0
Most Used Approach							
Presage	Teacher Characteristics	....	.....	2	2.0	2	2.0
Product	Pupil Gain	4	4.0	3	3.0	7	7.0
Process	Teacher Activities	40	44.0	43	47.0	83	91.0
	Total	44	48.0	48	52.0	92	100.0

NOTE: Eighty principals had schools with between twenty and forty principals.

TABLE 38

SUMMARY OF PERCENTAGES OF APPROACHES USED
BY ALL PRINCIPALS

Approaches	Outstanding	Others	All the Others	Percent of Difference Outstanding vs. Others	Percent of Difference Outstanding vs. All the Others
Presage	54.5	47.0	54.5	7.5	0.0
Product	54.5	73.0	50.0	- 18.5	4.5
Process	91.0	100.0	99.0	- 9.0	- 1.0
Most Used Approach					
Presage	.....	.....	2.0	.....	2.0
Product	18.0	.....	7.0	.....	11.0
Process	73.0	93.0	90.0	- 20.0	- 17.0

Analysis of Data

Of the Outstanding principals in schools with more than 40 teachers, 73.0 percent named the process approach as the one used to the greatest extent. Of the Other Principal's Group, 86.0 percent named the process approach as the one most used. There were no real differences among the responses of the two groups. Therefore, the null hypothesis for Item 4B was supported. There was no difference in the choice of approach most often used by the two groups.

The findings suggest that the selection of the process approach by the Outstanding principals is consistent with the findings of Hypothesis I, Question 1: What are the things you look for when you evaluate a teacher? Outstanding principals emphasize instructional techniques in evaluation practices and approaches. The findings also suggest an inconsistency with Other principals on criteria and approaches. Other principals selected presage criteria more often than did Outstanding principals. Other principals listed the criteria, and did not select from a group of responses . The findings on criteria indicate that there is a significant difference in approaches to teacher evaluation. More research is needed on criteria and approaches.

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Section III

Hypothesis IV

The fourth hypothesis under investigation was that there is no significant difference in the methods and procedures used in evaluation by Outstanding principals and Other

principals with less than six years as a principal and those with more than six years as principal.

The question used for testing Hypothesis IV was Question 5A on the CTEM.

The question is stated first. The responses from the Outstanding Principal's Group, the Other Principal's Group and the group designated as "All the Others" will follow.

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, 8 or 35.0 percent had less than 6 years of experience as as principals; 15 or 65.0 percent had more than 6 years. Of the Other Principal's Group, 11 or 45.9 percent had less than 6 years of experience; 12 or 54.1 percent had more than 6 years. of All the Others,29 or 16.8 had experience of less than 6 years; 143 or 83.2 percent had experience of more than 6 years.

A summary of the frequencies and percentages of length of experience for all groups is presented in Table 39.

TABLE 39

NUMBER OF PRINCIPALS WITH LESS OR MORE THAN SIX YEARS EXPERIENCE

Years as a Principal	Outstanding Principals		Other Principals		All the Other Principals	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Less than 6 years....	8	35.0	11	45.9	29	16.8
More than 6 years....	15	65.0	12	54.1	143	83.2
Total.....	23		23		172	

Question 5A

How many of the following methods and procedures do you use for teacher evaluation in your school? Check the ones that apply: formal classroom observation, with a predetermined instrument; informal classroom observation, without an instrument; rating scales; self-evaluation form(s); conference/interview; observation outside of classroom; records/reports; informal feedback from students and/or teachers; other(s) please specify.

Presentation of Data

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group, with 6 years experience, 8 or 34.8 percent checked Formal Classroom Observation; 8 or 34.8 percent checked Informal Classroom Observation; 3 or 13 percent checked Rating Scales; 1 or 4.3 percent checked Self-Evaluation Forms; 6 or 26.0 percent checked Observation Outside Classroom; 8 or 34.8 percent checked Records and Reports; 5 or 21.7 percent checked Informal Feedback from Students; 2 or 8.7 percent checked (Others) namely, Group Morale and Pupil Confidence, Plan Books of New Teachers or Weekly Plan Books or Long-term Plans on a 10 Week Basis, Bulletin Boards and Assembly Programs.

Of the Outstanding Principal's Group with +6 years of experience, 10 or 43.4 named Formal Classroom Observation; 14 or 60.9 percent named Informal Classroom Observation; 3 or 13.0 percent named Rating Scales; 4 or 7.4 percent named Self-Evaluation Forms; 13 or 56.5 percent named Conference/Interviews; 5 or 21.7 percent named Observation Outside Classroom; 14 or 60.9 percent named Records and Reports; 4 or 17.4 percent named Informal Feedback from Students; 1 or 4.3 percent named Others, namely Student Rating Scale and Attendance/Tardiness Record.

Of the group designated as "All the Others," with -6 years of experience, 18 or 93.0 percent named Formal Classroom Observation; 16 or 27.4 percent named Informal Classroom Observation; 3 or 1.7 percent named Rating Scales; 9 or 5.2 percent named Self Evaluation Forms; 16 or 27.4 named Conference/Interview; 16 or 93.0 percent named Observation Outside Classroom; 19 or 11.0 percent named Records and Reports; 12 or 7.0 percent named Informal Feedback from Students, and 4 or 2.3 percent named Others, but did not specify.

Of the group designated as All the Others, with +6 years of experience, 130 or 76.7 percent checked Formal Classroom Observation; 132 or 58.6 percent named Informal Classroom Observation; 26 or 15.2 percent named Rating Scales; 24 or 13.9 percent named Self-Evaluation Forms; 125 or 54.6 percent named Conference/Interview; 82 or 47.7 percent named Observation Outside Classroom; 84 or 48.8 percent named Records and Reports, 66 or 38.3 percent named Informal Feedback from Students, and 9 or 5.3 percent named Others, but did not specify.

A summary of the frequencies and percentages of the reponses on the question of methods and procedures used by principals of all three groups with less than 6 years experience and those with more than 6 years experience is shown in Table 40.

The total percentages and percent of differences in methods and procedures of evaluation is shown in Table 41.

A summary of frequencies and percentages of methods and procedures used by principals in teacher evaluation is shown in Table 42.

TABLE 40

FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES OF METHODS AND PROCEDURES USED BY PRINCIPALS IN TEACHER EVALUATIONS WITH LESS THAN SIX YEARS EXPERIENCE AND THOSE WITH MORE THAN SIX YEARS EXPERIENCE

	OUTSTANDING						OTHERS						ALL THE OTHERS					
	-6 Yrs. Exper.		+6 Yrs Exper.		Totals		-6 Yrs. Exper.		+ 6 Yrs. Exper.		Total Exper.		-6 Yrs. Exper.		+6 Yrs. Exper.		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Formal Classroom Observation	8	34.8	10	43.4	18	78.3	6	27.3	11	50.0	17	77.3	18	93.0	130	76.6	148	86.0
2. Informal Classroom Observation	8	34.8	14	60	22	95.7	9	40.8	12	54.4	21	95.2	16	27.4	132	58.6	148	86.0
3. Rating Scales	3	13.0	3	13.0	6	22.0	3	13.6	2	9.1	5	22.7	3	1.7	26	15.2	29	16.9
4. Self Evaluation Forms	1	4.3	4	7.4	5	21.7	2	9.1	4	18.2	6	27.3	9	5.2	24	13.9	33	19.1
5. Conference/ Interviews	8	34.8	13	56.5	21	91.3	7	31.8	11	50.0	18	81.8	16	27.4	125	54.6	141	82.0
6. Observation Outside Classroom	6	26.1	5	21.7	11	47.8	3	13.6	6	27.3	9	40.9	16	93.0	82	47.7	98	57.0
7. Records and Reports	8	34.8	14	60.9	22	95.7	6	27.2	9	40 9	15	68.1	19	11.0	84	48.8	103	59.8
8. Informal Feedback from Students	5	21.7	4	17.4	9	39.1	3	13.6	4	18.2	7	31.8	12	7.0	66	38.3	78	45.3
9. Others	2	8.7	1	4.3	3	13.0	1	4.5			1	4.5	4	2.3	9	5.3	13	7.6

TABLE 41

TOTAL PERCENTAGES AND PERCENT OF DIFFERENCE IN METHODS AND PROCEDURES OF EVALUATION

Item	Outstanding	Other	Percent of Difference
	%	%	%
1. Formal Classroom Observation.....	*78.3	*77.3	1.0
2. Informal Classroom Observation.....	*95.7	*95.2	.5
3. Rating Scale.....	22.0	22.7	- .7
4. Self Evaluation Forms.....	21.7	27.3	- 5.6
5. Conference/ Interviews.....	*91.3	*81.8	9.5
6. Observation Outside Classroom.....	47.8	40.9	6.9
7. Records and Reports.....	*95.7	*68.1	27.6
8. Informal Feedback From Students.....	39.1	31.8	7.3
9. Others.....	13.0	4.5	8.5

NOTE: Most used methods and procedures of Outstanding Principals and Other Principals is indicated by *.

TABLE 42

SUMMARY OF FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES OF METHODS AND PROCEDURES USED BY PRINCIPALS IN TEACHER EVALUATION

Item	Outstanding	All the Others	Percent of Difference
	%	%	%
1. Formal Classroom Observation.....	*78.3	*86.0	7.7
2. Informal Classroom Observation.....	*95.7	*86.0	9.7
3. Rating Scales.....	22.0	16.9	5.1
4. Self Evaluation Forms..	21.7	19.1	2.6
5. Conference/ Interviews..	*91.3	*82.0	9.3
6. Observation Outside Classroom...	47.8	57.0	9.2
7. Records and Reports.....	*95.7	*59.8	35.9
8. Informal Feedback from Students	39.1	45.3	6.2
9. Other	13.0	7.6	5.4

NOTE: Most used methods and procedures of Outstanding Principals and All the Other are indicated by *

Analysis of Data

The methods named most often by Outstanding principals regardless of years of experience were: Informal Classroom Observation, 95.7 percent; Records and Reports, 95.7 percent; Conference and Interviews, 91.3 percent and Formal

Classroom Observation, 78.3 percent.

The method and procedure named most often by Other principals were: Informal Classroom Observation, 95.2 percent; Conference and Interviews, 81.8 percent; Formal Classroom Observation, 77.3 percent, and Records and Reports, 68.1 percent. There was no difference in the methods and procedures used in evaluation by Outstanding principals and Other principals with less than six years as a principal and those with more than six years as a principal. Hypothesis IV, therefore, was supported.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, IMPLICATIONS, SUMMARY, AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Hypothesis I

The first hypothesis under investigation was that there is no significant difference in teacher evaluation practices as employed by elementary school principals designated as Outstanding by their superiors and Other elementary school principals in the Chicago Public Schools.

Based on the findings of the study, Hypothesis I was not supported.

Interview Guide - Part A

2B. Conclusion: Outstanding principals find that teacher evaluation aids them in understanding the teacher's problems. Other principals do not find teacher evaluation helpful in understanding the teachers' problems.

Recommendation: The principal and the teacher should agree upon the criteria for teacher evaluation. The purpose, improvement of instruction, should govern the development of this criteria.

2C. Conclusion: Outstanding principals indicate that teacher evaluation is a valuable tool for assessing teacher competence. Other principals do not believe that teacher evaluation is of value in assessing teacher competence.

Recommendations: All schools should conduct formal teacher evaluations. A model for teacher evaluation should be developed by the school system.

4. Conclusions; Outstanding principals include teachers in the formulation of evaluation criteria. Other principals develop teacher evaluation criteria alone.

Recommendations: The principal and the teacher should formulate evaluation criteria. When school systems develop the criteria, representatives from the principals' groups and the teachers' groups should be involved in formulating the criteria.

6A. Conclusions: Outstanding principals involve teachers in the selection of the methods to be used in teacher evaluation. Other principals develop the methods alone.

Recommendations: Teachers and principals should decide on the methods to be employed in the evaluation of teachers.

6C. Conclusions: The findings suggest that when teachers are involved in the discussion of the problems an evaluation has revealed, the teacher will offer solutions to their own problems. The findings also suggest that Other principals will suggest a solution for the teacher.

Recommendations: Teachers should be encouraged to offer solutions to revealed problems. Teachers are in the best position to assess needs and to determine how effective the teacher is.

6E. Conclusions: The findings indicate that Outstanding principals involve teachers in the discussion of shortcomings, and that Other principals do not involve teachers in such discussions.

Recommendations: Principals and teachers should participate in the discussion of the teacher's shortcomings.

6F. Conclusions: The findings suggest that teachers of both the Outstanding and the Other principal groups accept criticism but not defensively. The findings for Question 6E indicated that 60.0 percent of the Other principals did not involve teachers in any discussion of evaluation practices. The high percentage of Other principals who indicated that teachers take criticism, but not defensively, must be questioned, since discussion is not permitted by this group.

Recommendations: A performance appraisal plan should be developed. Teachers, with the principal, would determine objectives. During the assessment periods, teacher and principal can then discuss how well objectives are being met. Communication between principal and teacher would be facilitated.

7. Conclusions: Outstanding principals perceive more teachers as outstanding and fewer teachers as unsatisfactory than do the Other principals.

Recommendations: It is recommended that the evaluation practices of Outstanding principals be studied for the purpose of identifying more definitively their evaluation practices. These practices would serve as a springboard for an evaluation model.

11. Conclusions: Outstanding principals rank high student achievement as the number one priority. The Other principals disagreed, and they selected classroom management as their number one priority.

Recommendation: Future research should study student achievement in schools that have principals who are rated outstanding, with the view that effective evaluation techniques improve teacher competence and teacher competence improves student achievement.

CTEM - Part B

1. Conclusions: Outstanding principals agree that instructional techniques and creative teachers are the most important criteria for teacher evaluation. Other principals list discipline and appearance of classroom as the important criteria for evaluation.

Recommendations: Criteria should be related to teacher competence. Research supports this premise. Criteria should be developed for the school system, and should be stated in written school policy.

3E. Conclusions: The findings indicate that successful principals observe teachers on a regular basis, irrespective of the teachers' years of experience.

Recommendations: All teachers should be observed on a scheduled, regular basis.

8. Conclusions: The findings to Question 8 of the CTEM indicate no difference between the responses of Outstanding principals and Other principals when they were asked when problems and shortcomings were discussed. In the interview,

principals were asked how teachers responded to the discussion of evaluation. Of the Outstanding principals, 87.0 percent reported that teachers offered solutions to problems, while only 39.0 percent of the Other principals suggested that teachers offered solutions to problems. The findings to Question 8 indicate no difference between the two groups. This discrepancy indicates that Outstanding principals encourage teachers to find solutions to problems, but Other principals do not.

Recommendations: In view of the discrepancies, research is needed to determine whether Outstanding principals and Other principals differ in the extent of their involvement of teachers in the evaluation process.

Implications

The findings of this study imply that the effectiveness of principals designated as Outstanding is related to their teacher evaluation practices. The Outstanding principals tended to encourage a higher degree of teacher involvement in evaluation than did the Other principals. This is supported by the responses of the Outstanding principals to Questions 6A-E of the Interview Guide.

The responses of the majority of Outstanding principals indicated that they had an effective and productive relationship with their teachers. 78.0 percent of the Outstanding principals said that teachers offered solutions to problems revealed in the evaluation; 78.0 percent said that teachers worked with them to improve a situation or overcome a handicap, and 87.0 percent said that teachers contributed to the

discussion when their shortcomings were discussed.

The productive aspect of these evaluation practices was reflected in the responses of Outstanding principals to Questions 7 and 9 of the Interview Guide: What percent of the teachers in your school do you consider outstanding? What percent of the teachers in your school are unsatisfactory? In contrast to the Other Principal's Group, the Outstanding principals found more of their teachers outstanding and they found fewer of their teachers unsatisfactory.

Summary of Hypothesis I

The literature on the subject reveals that there is a decided lack of agreement among administrator/evaluators as to what teacher characteristics should be measured and what measurement instruments should be used. The fact that a group of highly qualified principals in one school system agreed on crucial aspects of teacher evaluation practices has strong implications for future research. It is, therefore, recommended that the practices of Outstanding principals be studied for the purpose of using their choice of criteria as the basis for eventually arriving at an instrument for teacher evaluation that will be objective and viable. There was little difference in the responses of the two groups on the mechanical aspects of evaluation, which included methods, modes, and frequency of communicating findings. The differences were in the choice of criteria which the two used as the basis for observations. There was, however, a high percentage of agreement among Outstanding principals on the choice of teacher creativity and teaching techniques as competencies which they found desirable. It is recommended

that the effectiveness of creative teaching techniques, identified by Outstanding principals, be actually tested with regard to pupil gains and the empirical data used in the formulation of a valid and reliable instrument for teacher evaluation. Such an instrument could conceivably incorporate tested pre-established criteria that are simple, objective, and flexible enough to accommodate a variety of individual teaching styles.

Hypothesis II

The second hypothesis under investigation was that there is no significant difference in the purposes of teacher evaluation (i.e., to improve instruction or to fulfill an administrative requirement) as determined by Outstanding principals and Other principals in the Chicago Public Schools.

Based on the findings, Hypothesis II was supported.

Conclusions: Outstanding and Other principals agree that that the purpose of teacher evaluation was to improve instruction.

Recommendations: The purpose of teacher evaluation should be stated specifically in written school policy and made available to all principals.

Implications

The findings of this study with regard to Hypothesis II reveal that there is general agreement among principals that teacher evaluations are designed to improve teacher performance. It must be noted, however, that the respondents had to choose between only two questions, the wording of which made the choice of the first almost inevitable. It seems to be generally conceded at the administrative level of education that the purpose of evaluation is to improve the performance of the teacher. That this is true makes it even more significant

that there is not equal consensus as to what actually constitutes effective teaching. It is, therefore, implied from the findings that merely going through the process without a clear definition of goals is not productive of the highest results.

Summary of Hypothesis II

It is recommended that attempts be made to standardize teacher evaluation practices and to make the results easy to measure. The chances are good that if principals could see the direct relations between evaluations, teacher performance, and pupil gain, the ranks of the uncommitted would be lessened.

Hypothesis III

The third hypothesis under investigation was that there is no significant difference in the approaches to evaluation of principals with schools that have fewer than twenty teachers and principals that have more than forty teachers in both the Outstanding and the Other principals' groups.

Based on the findings, Hypothesis III was supported.

Conclusions: Size as a variable did not seem to affect the choice of teacher evaluation approaches by either the Outstanding group or the Other group. Both Process and Product were named with equal frequency by both groups with fewer than twenty teachers. Both groups in schools with more than forty teachers reported that they use the Process approach most often.

Recommendations: Further research is recommended because there is a discrepancy in the criteria selected by Other principals, Hypothesis I, and the conclusions drawn in Hypothesis III. Other principals selected discipline, classroom management, and classroom appearance as the most important

criteria for teacher evaluation. These criteria are neither product nor process criteria, but are classified as presage criteria.

Implications

The findings show that there was general agreement among all the principals questioned as to their assessment of the relative merits of the three approaches to teacher evaluation. The responses made by the special group, designated as All the Others, agreed in general with those of the two main research groups. The result implies that the principals themselves posit a cause and effect relationship between the Process and Product approaches.

Summary of Hypothesis III

There is a consensus among Outstanding principals that a relationship exists between the Product and Process approach. This consensus of opinion among principals with regard to the merits of the Process and Product approach should become the springboard for research that would first identify the teacher competencies that are likely to be effective in achieving the desired goal of significant pupil gain. A validation of the effectiveness of each competency could be obtained in correlational studies by choosing a specific competency and observing the teacher as he/she engaged in an activity to which the specific competency was relevant. Resultant student achievement for the particular activity might be measured to ascertain whether or not each competency was indeed related to student gain.

Hypothesis IV

The fourth hypothesis under investigation was that there is no significant difference in the methods and procedures used in evaluation by Outstanding principals and Other principals with less than six years as a principal and those with more than six years as a principal.

Based on the findings, Hypothesis IV was supported.

Conclusions: All principals, regardless of years of experience, agree that the following methods and procedures are used in teacher evaluation: informal classroom observation; records and reports; conference and interviews; and formal classroom observation.

Recommendations: Methods and procedures in teacher evaluation should be mutually agreed upon by principal and teacher. These methods and procedures should be related to the criteria and the purposes for teacher evaluation.

Summary of Hypothesis IV

There is a minimal lack of agreement with regard to mechanics of and approaches to teacher evaluation and a maximal lack of agreement with regard to criteria for evaluation. Future research should concentrate on identifying effective teacher competencies. When the competencies have been identified, the development of an objective instrument could then be undertaken. The fact that the majority of principals favored informal observations suggests that the instrument should be objective but not highly sophisticated, and that the instrument provide the means by which a reasonably accurate score on each of the entire set of competencies could be attained in a relatively short

period of observations. The methods and procedures for use of the new instrument could be practically built into the instrument itself and would attempt to implement assumptions and correct omissions. A very necessary feature would be a procedure for pre-testing and post-testing to determine the efficacy of a specific competency.

The evidence provided by this study and by the review of the literature points to the need for pre-established criteria incorporated into a reliable instrument. It is further recommended that the criteria for teacher evaluation identified by Outstanding principals in this study provide the basis for further testing and validation.

Interpretive Analysis of the Study

The conclusions drawn from this study indicate a high degree of consistency among Outstanding principals in the following significant aspects of teacher evaluation: perception of the aims of evaluation; choice of criteria for evaluation; perception of the need for direct administrative involvement with the teacher; and perception of the need for evaluation on a continuous and regular basis throughout the duration of the teacher's employment.

What is implied in the consistency of the perception and practices of the Outstanding principals in the area of teacher evaluation is a consistency in the definition and perception of their roles as principals. The results of this study imply that the Outstanding principals do not define their roles in a restricted or narrow sense. On the contrary,

they seem to view their positions in the school system as more or less centrifugal, with influence extending in more than one direction, and encompassing many dimensions. There is conclusive evidence from this study that Outstanding principals regard it as their responsibility to establish and maintain an effective production line in a dynamic educational scheme which includes their superiors, their teachers, and their students, as well as material with which to work.

It is consistent with this evaluation of their roles that the Outstanding principals labeled more of their teachers as "outstanding" than Other principals. There can be little doubt that pride in accomplishment serves as motivation for both principal and teacher. The principal who can report that he/she has outstanding teachers can justifiably take credit for himself. The closer the professional relationship between principal and teacher, the greater the degree of reciprocity. Because the Outstanding principals reported a high degree of administrative involvement with their teachers, it is conceivable that they perceived of their roles as partially that of creating outstanding teachers who would in turn create outstanding students as a result of which they, themselves, would be labeled outstanding by their superiors.

More conclusive than the above that the consistency demonstrated by the Outstanding principals with regard to teacher evaluation stemmed from a consistency in role definition is the fact that they did not regard teacher evaluation merely as a directive handed down by the superintendent to be carried

out methodically and perfunctorily. The data revealed that they regarded evaluations rather as a means for establishing a common ground of understanding between principal and teacher.

This point of view is also reflected in the fact that the Outstanding principals tended to perceive the teacher as the catalyst whose potential could not be realized unless the proper ingredients were brought together. These ingredients included sympathetic support and respect for the teacher. The Outstanding principals provided this support by constant and regular visitations and by showing a willingness to include the teachers in the discussions of revealed shortcomings and methods of improvement.

That they were supportive of the teachers also implied that the Outstanding principals had a clear idea of the specific competencies needed to achieve specific results. That they tended to be more supportive of teachers than the Other principals could quite conceivably be linked to their consistency in the choice of criteria for teacher evaluation. A principal who knows what he is looking for in the performance of a teacher and who conveys his expectations to the teacher accomplishes a two-fold purpose. He re-affirms his own validity as an "authority" figure and, at the same time, reassures the teacher that he has his/her interest at heart.

With the Outstanding principals, the support did not end as the teacher gained experience. The research data reveal that there were just as many informal visitations and direct

administrative involvements between the more experienced teachers and the principals as between the less experienced teachers and the principals. This practice, furthermore, is consistent with the process and product orientation to teacher evaluation for which the Outstanding principals indicated a preference. The principal who is committed to the ideal of high pupil achievement cannot, with impunity, be insensitive to economic and social changes which are bound to be reflected in the backgrounds, attitudes, and capabilities of the students. The teacher remains the same, but the students change and the teacher must be creative enough to adapt to the changes.

The recognition of creativity by the Outstanding principals as a desirable trait in the teacher is further evidence that they conceive of the administrative process as a dynamic continuum which has to assimilate the variables which time is sure to present. The teacher who becomes "set" in her ways of teaching will not be flexible enough to adjust his/her methods and approaches to the needs and demands of an increasingly diversified school population. It is, however, most often true that a principal in a changing situation has the advantage of the teacher in that his/her view of the situation can be more objective than that of the teacher. The day-to-day contact which the teacher has with the student may tend to make him/her less sensitive to subtle changes than the visiting principal would be. The Outstanding principals indicated that they visited the classrooms and talked directly with all teachers as often as the need warranted. The principal

who would simply assume that because a teacher is "experienced," he/she can handle any situation is not being fair to the teacher. When a new situation arises, the teacher needs the perspective and the authoritative support of the competent principal more than under usual circumstances. It could easily become a source of frustration to an experienced teacher to suddenly discover that a procedure that had worked for him/her for years is suddenly not working anymore. She simply may not be aware of the fact that some assumptions on which the old procedures were based can simply not be assumed any longer. It is, therefore, only by frequent and regular visits through the years, followed by discussions, during which a frank interchange between the principal and teacher can take place that the creative teacher can continue to live up to his/her full potential. The research data support the conclusion that the Outstanding principals possessed this awareness.

Also consistent with the product orientation of the Outstanding principals is the high priority which they placed on instructional techniques as criteria for evaluation. In the interview sessions with Outstanding principals, the question of instructional techniques often arose. The Outstanding principals tended to couple instructional techniques with creativity as twin desirable competencies. The implications here are that they conceived of teaching techniques as more or less "organic" in nature--that is, arising out of the demands of a situation and not as a priori fixed patterns to be

super-imposed on any situation regardless of its nature. This point of view does not, however, preclude the recognition of tested educational principles which should serve as a basis for all instructional techniques. More importantly still, this point of view does not obviate the necessity for having some standardized measuring instrument for evaluating teacher performance. The results of this study strongly indicate that the practice of teacher evaluation is "uneven" to say the least. It can be assumed from the data that the most effective evaluations are carried out by Outstanding principals. It would simply be within the tradition of progressive evaluation to "harness" the expertise of the competent and make it available to the less competent. It is hoped that this study will help in some small measure toward the realization of this goal.

Suggestions for Further Research

Based on the results and implications derived from the present investigation, the following suggestions for further research are made:

1. That the present study be replicated for the purpose of either verifying or refuting the results.

2. That future research be conducted in the same general subject area but that it be of greater breadth and scope. A larger sample population than is included in this study could be chosen. Secondary schools, or schools from other state systems could be included for comparison.

3. That the listing of process and product criteria

identified by a varied group of Outstanding principals be refined and incorporated into a data gathering instrument which could be validated and could then provide objective measures of teacher effectiveness.

4. That school systems in other states make similar attempts to identify areas of agreement among outstanding principals and the results correlated for publication and distribution as well as for further research.

5. That longitudinal models for teacher evaluation be devised and implemented. Such implementation could provide an accumulation of information about the practices and procedures that are being used in many public school systems. In turn, feedback information could be given to individual principals with the possible result that the overall teaching evaluation process throughout the country might be substantially and continually improved.

APPENDIX A

LETTERS TO PRINCIPALS

1450 East 55th Place
Chicago, Illinois 60657
April 6, 1977

Dear Principal,

At a time when there are increasing pressures for accountability, there is an accompanying demand for teacher evaluation. It is the purpose of this study to analyze teacher evaluation practices in the Chicago Public Schools at the present time so that practicing administrators may have the information at their disposal. I am requesting principals of the Chicago Public Schools to assist me in determining the present status of teacher evaluation practices by responding to the brief questionnaire enclosed.

This study will provide all of those responsible for teacher evaluation with information about current teacher evaluation practices in Chicago.

I know how busy you are and have therefore attempted to design this questionnaire so that it can be completed in a few minutes with a minimum of effort. I assure you that all information you give will remain strictly confidential; names of schools and administrators are not used in the study.

If you would like a copy of the results of this study, please so indicate at the bottom of the questionnaire.

I would greatly appreciate your cooperation in returning the questionnaire by April 15. I am enclosing a stamped, self-addressed envelope for your convenience.

Sincerely,

/s/ Alice C. Blair

Alice C. Blair
Ed. D. Candidate
Loyola University
Superintendent, District 13

Encls. (2)
Questionnaire
Envelope

4934 South Wabash Ave.
Chicago, Illinois 60615
April 21, 1977

Dear Principal,

At a time when there are increasing pressures for accountability, there is an accompanying demand for teacher evaluation. On April 6, a questionnaire was sent to all principals in the Chicago Public Schools.

This letter is a reminder that your questionnaire has not been received. I am forwarding a duplicate questionnaire in case the first one was misplaced. All information you give is confidential. You are not required to answer any questions you do not wish to answer.

I would greatly appreciate receiving the questionnaire before May 1. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

/s/ Alice C. Blair

Alice C. Blair
Ed. D. Candidate
Loyola University
Superintendent, District 13

Encls. (2)
Questionnaire
Envelope

APPENDIX B

COPY OF INTERVIEW GUIDE - PART I

AND

COPY OF CTEM - PART II

CERTIFIED TEACHER EVALUATION METHODS IN THE CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Part I

Question 1. What criteria do you use personally in evaluating a teacher?

Question 2. As an evaluator/administrator do teacher evaluations

A. Enable you to communicate more honestly with your teachers? Yes____ No_____

B. Enable you to be more aware of your teachers' problems? Yes____ No____

C. Provide you with a means of readily judging a teacher's performance? Yes___ No___

Question 3. How often are the assigned teachers evaluated in your school?

Question 4. Do you discuss with your teacher the criteria for evaluation?

Yes____ No____

Question 5. If you do discuss the criteria for evaluation, under what circumstances are they discussed?

A. at staff meetings

B. private conferences

C. other (specify):_____

Question 6. Do teachers respond to discussions of teacher evaluations by

A. offering criticism of the criteria? Yes___ No___

B. by suggesting ways for improving the methods of teacher evaluation?

Yes_____ No_____

C. offering solutions to problems that they have that their evaluations have revealed or emphasized?

Yes_____ No_____

D. working with you to improve a situation or to overcome a handicap?

Yes____ No____

E. by contributing to the discussion when their shortcomings are discussed?

Yes____ No____

F. taking criticisms, advice, or suggestions seriously but not defensively?

Yes____ No____

Question 7. What percent of the teachers in your school do you consider outstanding?

_____

Question 8. What do you do to encourage teachers?

_____

_____

Question 9. What percent of the teachers in your school are unsatisfactory?

_____

Question 10. What do you do about the unsatisfactory teacher?

_____

_____

Question 11. What three of the following criteria do you consider of primary importance in evaluating your teachers? List them in order of priority:

A. Tends to be self-motivating

B. Indicates desire to improve

C. Is able to accept advice, criticism, and help from others

D. Attains high level of achievement from students

E. Manages classroom effectively

F. Follows a definite study plan for each student

G. Disciplines students without degrading them

H. Maintains accurate and current records

I. Files regular reports with principal's office

J. Creatively presents his subject and related material

K. Endeavors to communicate regularly with the principal

L. Endeavors to communicate regularly and well with other teachers

M. Encourages high social standards, such as sportsmanship, friendship, fairness, politeness

N. Encourages high personal standards, such as neatness, honesty, cheerfulness, courage, humility, fortitude, and creativity

Part II

Section I - Background Information

Directions: Please circle the number which represents your answer

1. Are you: Male 1 Female 2

2. Are you: Black 1 White 2

3. Into which of the following does your age fall?

   Under 30 (1) 30-34 (2) 35-44 (3) 45-54 (4)

   55 or older (5)

4. How many years have you been a principal?

   Less than 1 year (1) 1-4 years (2) 5-9 years (3)

   10-19 years (4) 20 or more years (5)

5. What type of school are you in?

   Elementary..... 01 EVGC.....03

   Upper Grade Center... 02 Middle School....04

   Other (Specify)_____....05

6. Size of School:

Under 500.....(1) 500-999.....(2) 1000-above.....(03)

7. How many teachers on your teaching staff?

_____

Section II - Evaluation Criteria Used/Evaluation Methods

1. What are the things you look for when you evaluate a teacher? (Be specific--Name at least ten).

1._____ 2._____ 3._____

4._____ 5._____ 6._____

7._____ 8._____ 9._____

10._____ 11._____ 12._____

2. Of the criteria which you named, which one is the most important in evaluating a teacher's performance? (List numbers after letter questions)

A. During first year of teaching_____?

B. During second to fourth year of teaching_____?

C. During Fifth to seventh year of teaching_____?

D. During eighth to tenth year of teaching_____?

3. How many times each year do you observe each teacher?

A. During first year of teaching_____.

B. During second to fourth year_____.

C. During fifth to seventh year_____.

D. During eighth to tenth year_____.

E. Beyond the tenth year_____.

4. How long do you observe each teacher's class?

45 minutes to 1 hour (1) More than 1 hour (2)

More than 2 hours (3)

5. Is each observation prearranged? Yes_____ No_____

   If yes, how many are prearranged?_____

   How many are not prearranged?

   0-1 (1) 2-4 (2) 5-10 (3) More than 10 (4)

6. Do you keep a log in each teacher's file about each visit?

   Yes_____ No_____

7. Are evaluations discussed regularly? Yes_____ No_____

8. Are problems, shortcomings, etc. discussed? Yes____ No_____

9. Are suggestions made? Are plans for improved methods discussed and decided upon?

   Yes_____ No_____

10. Do you, or you and the teacher, or others, design, define and determine criteria and methods you use for teacher evaluation?

    You (1) You and teacher (2) Others (3)

11. Do you, you and the teacher, or others, do actual evaluation?

    You alone (1) You and teacher (2) Others (3)

12. Who interprets findings of evaluation?

    You (1) You and teacher (2) Others (3)

Section III - Analysis of Evaluation Practices by Principal

1. Purposes of Teacher Evaluations:

   A. Please state the purpose(s) for which teacher evaluation is conducted in your school: (Check answer)

      Inprove Instruction _____

      Administrative Requirement_____

   B. Are these purposes stated in administrative directives?

      Yes_____ No_____

2. Criteria for Teacher Evaluation:

A. Do you have written criteria (such as appearance, knowledge of subject matter, etc.) upon which teachers are evaluated in your school?

Yes_____ No_____

B. Are teachers informed in advance of the criteria upon which they are to be evaluated?

Yes_____ No_____

C. Are the teachers informed in writing?

Yes_____ No_____

3. Frequency of Evaluation:

A. How often are the assigned teachers evaluated in your school?

_____

4. Approaches to Teacher Evaluation:

A. Please check any of the following approaches to teacher evaluation used in your school:

(1) _____on the basis of teacher characteristics

(2) _____on the basis of measurement of pupil gain

(3) _____on the basis of observation of teaching activities; assessment of teacher competence

B. Of the three approaches listed above, check the one used to the greatest extent in your school:

(1) _____on the basis of teacher characteristics

(2) _____on the basis of measurement of pupil gain

(3) _____on the basis of observation of teaching activities; assessment of teacher competence

5. Methods and Procedures of Teacher Evaluation:

A. Please check any of the following methods and procedures used for teacher evaluation in your school:

(1) _____formal classroom observation, with a predetermined instrument

(2)_____informal classroom observation, without an instrument

(3) _____rating scales

(4) _____self-evaluation form(s)

(5) _____conference/interview

(6) _____observation outside of classroom

(7) _____records/reports

(8) _____informal feedback from students and/or teachers

(9) _____other(s) (please specify)_____

B. Are teachers in your school usually informed of the results after an evaluation has been conducted?

Yes_____ No_____

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

REFERENCES CITED

Adams, W. C. T. "Superintendents' Rating of Teachers," Journal of Education 90 (1919): 288-298.

Amidon, Edmund J. and Flanders, Ned A. The Role of the Teacher in the Classroom. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Paul S. Amidon & Associates, Inc. 1963.

Amidon, Edmund and Giammateo, Michael. "The Verbal Behavior of Superior Teachers." The Elementary School Journal (February 1965): 283-285.

Anderson, H. H., Brewer, J. E., and Reed, M. F. "Studies of Teachers' Classroom Personalities." Applied Psychology Monograph III 11 (1946): 18.

Chicago Board of Education. Directory of the Chicago Public Schools. Chicago, Illinois, 1976.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Better Than Rating: New Approaches to Appraisal of Teaching Services. Washington, D.C.: National Education. 1950

Babel, John, Jr. "Teacher Appraisal: How to Make it More Meaningful." Paper presented at AASA Annual Convention (104th, Atlantic City, New Jersey, April 12-16, 1972).

Barr, A. S. Characteristic Differences in the Teaching Performance of Good and Poor Teachers of the Social Studies. Bloomington, Illinois: Public Schools Publishing House, 1929.

_____. "Summary and Comments," Journal of Experimental Education XV 1 (1946): 99-100.

_____. "The Measuremental and Prediction of Teaching Efficiency: A Summary of Investigation," Journal of Experimental Education XVI 4 (1952): 203-283.

_____. "Report of the Committee on the Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness," Review of Educational Research XXII 3 (1952): 238-263.

_____. "Second Report of the Committee on Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness," Journal of Educational Research XLVI 9 (1953): 641-658.

Beller, E. Kuno. "Teacher Evaluation: Why, What, and How!" Peabody Journal of Education (January 1971): 125-139.

Biddle, Bruce J. and Elleva, William J. Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

Bloom, Benjamin S. (Ed.) Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals. Handbook I: Cognitive Domain New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1956.

Brain, George. "Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness," NEA Journal 2 (1965): 35-36.

Burron, A. "The Relationship of Selected Pre-Service Biographical Factors and Administrator-Evaluated Competence or Incompetence in Teaching." Ph.D. dissertation, Ballstate University, 1969.

Cook, Martha A. and Richards, Herbert C. "Dimensions of Principal and Supervisor Ratings of Teacher Behavior," Journal of Experimental Education XLI 2 (1972): 111-114.

Dandes, Herbert M. "Psychological Health and Teaching Effectiveness," The Journal of Teacher Education XVII 3 (1966): 301-306.

Deneen, James R. The Selection and Evaluation of Teachers. Presentation to the AASPA, October 19, 1971, New Orleans, Louisians. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service. 1972.

Ellinger, W. B. "A Study of the Procedures Used to Evaluate Professional School Perconnel in the Public Schools of the State of Maryland." Ph.D. dissertation, George Washington University, 1968.

Flanders, Ned A. and Simon, Anita. "Teacher Effectiveness," Encyclopedia of Educational Research (1969) 1423-1437.

Getzels, Jacob W., Lipman, James M., and Campbell, Ronald F. Educational Administration as a Social Process. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Grasha, Anthony F. Evaluating Teaching: Some Problems. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 071 582, 1972.

Greene, Jae E. School Personnel Administration. Philadelphia: Chilton Book Company, 1971.

Hall, J. "Selected Aspects of Teacher Evaluation in the Public School Systems in the State of Montana as Compared with Public School Systems from Throughout the United States." Ph.D dissertation, University of Montana, 1967.

Heil, Bruce A., Adams, Carl G., and Cohn, Ben. "A Study of Teacher/Pupil Behavior," The Journal of Teacher Education 1 (1971): 72.

Howsan, Robert B. "Current Issues In Evaluation." National Elementary Principal (October 1973): 12.

Jones, Anthony S. "A Realistic Approach to Teacher Evaluation," The Clearing House (April 1972): 474-481.

Justiz, Thomas B. "A Reliable Measure of Teacher Effectiveness," Educational Leadership (October 1969): 49-55.

King, Leroy A. "The Present Status of Teacher Ratings," American School Board Journal 70 (1925): 44-46.

Klonecky, H. M. "The Relationships of Teacher and Administrator Views of the Component Parts of Teacher Evaluation." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1972.

Koskennieme, Jay, Brent, Arthur, and Murray, Phillip. "Factors in Teaching Competence," Educational Leadership (1973): 46.

Krathwohl, David R., Bloom, Benjamin S., and Mosia, Bertram B. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals: Handbook II: Affective Domain. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1964.

Lawrence, Gordon. "Delineating and Measuring Professional Competencies," Educational Leadership (January 1974): 298-302.

LeFevre, Carol. "Teacher Characteristics and Careers," Review of Educational Research, 4 (1967): 433-447.

Lill, G. "A Study of Non-Tenure Elementary School Teacher Evaluation Programs in Selected New Jersey School Districts." Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 1970.

Lins, Leo Joseph. "The Prediction of Teaching Efficiency," The Journal of Experimental Education XV 1 (1946): 2-60.

Litherland, B. H. "An Analysis of Programs for Evaluating Teachers for Tenure in Selected Michigan Public School Districts." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1968.

Lucio, William H. "Pupil Achievement as an Index of Teacher Performance," Educational Leadership XXXI 1 (1973): 71-77.

McNeil, John D. "Antidote to a School Scandal," Educational Forum, 1 (1966): 69-77.

_____. "Concomitants of Using Behavioral Objectives in the Assessment of Teacher Effectiveness," The Journal of Experimental Education 1 (1967): 69-74.

_____. Toward More Accountable Teachers: Their Appraisal and Improvement. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1971.

Medley, Donald M. "Closing the Gap Between Research in Teacher Effectiveness and the Teacher Education Curriculum," Journal of Research and Development in Education 2 (1973): 39-46.

Miller, Susan K. "The Teacher's View of S.P.I. & O.," Phi Delta Kappen 2 (1972): 104.

Mitzel, Harold E. "Teacher Effectiveness," Encyclopedia of Educational Research (1960): 1481-1485.

Monroe, W. S. and Clark, J. A. "Measuring Teacher Efficiency," University of Illinois Bulletin: Educational Research Circular No. 25. Urbana, Illinois.: University of Illinois Press, 1924.

Moskowitz, Gertrude and Hayman, John L. "Interaction Patterns of First Year, Typical, and 'Best' Teachers in Inner-City Schools," The Journal of Educational Research LXVII 5 (1974): 224-230.

Musella, Donald. "Open-Closed-Mindedness as Related to the Rating of Teachers by Elementary School Principals," The Journal of Experimental Education, XXXV 3 (1964): 75-59.

National Education Association. "Programs for Evaluating Classroom Teachers," NEA Research Bulletin XLII 3 (1964): 83-88.

_____. "What Teachers and Administrators Thing About Evaluation," NEA Research Bulletin XLII 4 (1964): 108-111.

_____. NEA Research Bulletin (October 1969): 67-75.

_____. Evaluation Systems for Descriptive Abstracts. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 079 282, 1973.

National Elementary Principal (October 1973): 1.

National IOTA Council. The Role of the Teacher in Society: Six Areas of Teacher Competence. San Jose, California: National IOTA Council, 1970.

Nelson, Kenneth G., Bicknell, John E., and Hedlund, Paul A. Development and Refinement of Measures of Teaching Effectiveness. Albany: The Univeristy of the State of New York and the State Education Department, 1956.

Niedermeyer, Fred and Klein, Stephen. "An Empirical Evaluation of a District Teachers' Accountability Program," Phi Kelta Kappen LIV 2 (1972): 100-103.

Patton, Walter J and Desena, Leon. "Measures of Teacher Effectiveness," Journal of Teacher Education 3 (1968): 275.

Peck, Robert F. and Feldman, Donald J. Personal Characteristics Associated with Effective Teaching. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 078 028, 1973.

Pharies, William. "Evaluation of School Principals," National Elementary Principal (October 1973): 36-37.

Poliakoff, Lorraine L. Evaluating School Personnel Today. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 073 045, 1973.

Popham, James W. "The Performance Test: A New Approach to the Assessment of Teaching Proficiency," The Journal of Teacher Education XIV 2 (1968): 216-222.

_____. Designing Teacher Evaluating Systems. A Series of Suggestions for Establishing Teacher Assessment Procedures as Required by the Stull Bill (AB 293), 1971 California Legislature. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 070 716, 1971.

Reavis, William C. and Cooper Dan H. "Evaluation of Teacher Merit in City School Systems," Education Monograph No. 59. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1945.

Redfern, George. Quoted in the 1973 AASA Convention Reporter, National School Public Relations Association, 1973.

Roche, John. "Evaluating School Personnel," National Elementary Principals (October 1973): 43.

Rosenshine, Barak. "To explain: A Review of Research," Educational Leadership II 3 (1968): 303-309.

Ryans, David G. "Prediction of Teacher Effectiveness," Encyclopedia of Educational Research (1957): 1486-1491.

_____. Characteristics of Teachers: Their Description, Comparison, and Appraisal. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960.

_____. Teacher Evaluation Research, Part I: Consideration of Critical Issues, Feasibility of Collaborative Research, and Overall Design, Final Report. Bethesda, Md." ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 055 991, 1971.

Schramm, Wilbur. Measuring Educational Development Through Classroom Interaction. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 067 892, 1969.

Scott, Jerome P. "Evaluating Teacher Performance," Journal of Educational Psychology 54 (1963): 289.

Soar, Robert S. "Accountability: Assessment Problems and Possibilities," Journal of Teacher Education XXIV 3 (1973): 205-212.

Sprinthall, Normal A., Whitely, John M., and Mosher, Ralph L. "A Study of Teacher Effectiveness," The Journal of Teacher Education, XVII 1 (1966): 92-106.

Stemmock, Suzanne K. Evaluating Teacher Performance. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 033 448, 1966.

Tolor, Alexander. "Evaluation of Perceived Teacher Effectiveness," Journal of Educational Psychology LXIV 1 (1973): 98-104.

Torreson, D. "A Comparative Study of Evaluation Procedures for Non-Tenure Teachers in Selected Urban School Systems." Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1967.

United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education. Nongraded Primaries in Action (A Guide for Observing Classroom and Classroom Teaching in Nongraded Schools). Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 073 127, 1973.

Voege, R. "A Study of the Procedures for Evaluating Classroom Teachers in Certain School Districts in the State of Washington." Ph.D. dissertation, Washington State University, 1970.

Von Haden, Herbert I. "An Evaluation of Certain Types of Personal Data Employed in the Prediction of Teaching Efficiency," The Journal of Experimental Education, XV 1 (1946): 61-84.

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Alice C. Blair has been read and approved by members of the Department of Education.

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

April 24, 1978
Date

Philip M. Carlin
Signature of Advisor