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Introduction

A Nation at Risk¹, First Lessons², The Holmes Report³, and many other reports examining the lack of success in America's schools stimulated action on the part of state legislatures throughout the country. Legislators, local citizens and school boards cited teacher performance as a key ingredient in school success and thus sought ways to evaluate teacher performance. Those with this perspective believed that better teacher evaluation would promote accountability and improve instruction.

McLaughlin and Pfeifer propose that "teacher evaluation, in short, is pursued as a potent strategy for enhancing both quality and control of American public education." ⁴

In Selection and Evaluation of Teachers⁵, Dale

---


Bolton defines teacher evaluation as a process by which an evaluator attempts to either diagnose or categorize. The diagnostic purpose is seen as improving instruction while the categorizing system ranks teachers or places them in classifications.

While there may be examples of evaluation systems from the late 1800's, much of the emphasis of our present mode of evaluation came from the Scientific Movement in education which was influenced by the work of Frederick Winslow Taylor\(^6\). As was characteristic of this movement, evaluation of teachers followed an approach which emphasized standardization, systematization, and stimulation. Evaluation schemes of this nature would cause one to question the true nature of an evaluation system. The contemporary notion of formative evaluation does not seem to be a priority of those who adhere to the Scientific Management approach.

More recent systems of teacher evaluation focus on the professional nature of the supervision process. The "improvement of instruction" component of teacher evaluation systems is seen as the major purpose of models such as:

Performance Based Teacher Evaluation, Goal Setting, Professional Judgement, Clinical Supervision, Duty Based and others.

While these models acknowledge the importance of summative evaluation, they concentrate their efforts on formative activities.

Problem

As a reaction to poor student performance by Illinois students and to the recent research on teacher evaluation, legislators in the state of Illinois passed Senate Bill 730 resulting in Public Act 84-126 (1984). A


major component of this legislation involved teacher evaluation. It cited as its purpose the desire to "improve educational services in the elementary and secondary public schools in Illinois by requiring that all certified school district employees be evaluated on a periodic basis and that the evaluations result in remediation action being taken when deemed necessary."13

Specifically, the Act called for the Illinois State Board of Education to require local educational agencies to develop and submit a teacher evaluation plan that would incorporate the following components:

(a) personal observation of the teacher in the classroom by a district administrator, qualified under Section 24A-3, unless the teacher has no classroom duties.

(b) consideration of the teacher’s attendance, planning, and instructional methods, classroom management, where relevant, and competency in the subject matter taught, where relevant.

(c) rating of the teacher’s performance as "superior," "excellent," "satisfactory," or "unsatisfactory."

(d) specification as to the teacher’s strengths and weaknesses, with supporting reasons for the comments made.

(e) inclusion of a copy of the evaluation in the teacher's personal file and provision of a copy to the teacher.

(f) within thirty days after the completion of an evaluation rating a teacher rated as "unsatisfactory," development and commencement by the district of a remediation plan designed to correct deficiencies, provided the deficiencies are deemed remediable.

(g) participation in the remediation plan by the teacher rated "unsatisfactory," a district administrator..., and a consulting teacher..."

(h) quarterly evaluation and ratings for one year immediately following receipt of an "unsatisfactory" rating of a teacher for whom a remediation plan has been developed.

(i) reinstatement of biennial evaluation for any teacher who completes the one year remediation plan with a "satisfactory" or better rating, unless the district's plan regularly requires more frequent evaluations.

(j) dismissal in accordance with section 2412 or 34-85 of the School Code of any teacher who fails to complete the one-year remediation plan with a "satisfactory" or better rating.14

14 Ibid, 1402-1403.
In compliance with the law, the Illinois State Board of Education issued to local school districts an outline modeling the components which should be included in the teacher evaluation plans. They are:

1) statement of teacher involvement;
2) identification of evaluators;
3) job description;
4) standards;
5) evaluation process; schedule of evaluation;
6) rating scale;
7) evaluation instrument;
8) filing of evaluation; and
9) remediation activities.\(^{15}\)

In response to this state mandate, the Chicago Board of Education designed, submitted, and implemented a teacher evaluation plan which adheres to the guidelines required by law.

The Chicago Teacher Evaluation Plan (1986) spells out the educational roles of all involved, defines teachers' long range goals, provides a job description for classroom and non-classroom teachers, identifies the evaluation process, establishes criteria for ratings, outlines the procedures to be used during the remediation process, and set forth guidelines for the implementation of the

evaluation procedures.\textsuperscript{16}

Three years have passed since the teacher evaluation plan of the Chicago Board of Education has been designed and initiated. No data, however, have been generated to determine how the state mandated plan, as implemented by the Chicago Board of Education, is being fulfilled by principals in the Chicago Public School System. Without this information, it is unlikely that the success of the teacher evaluation plan can be determined and that adequate steps can be taken to address any problems that may arise in relationship to the successful improvement of educational services in Chicago Public Schools.

\textbf{Purpose of the Study}

The purpose of this study was to examine the state of teacher evaluation in selected Chicago Public Elementary Schools. The Chicago Board of Education has implemented a teacher evaluation plan designed to improve instruction and hold teachers accountable. It is clear that the plan is in place. Research needs to be conducted to ascertain what principals are doing with the plan and what they are doing with suggestions from the literature on teacher evaluation.

In broad terms, the study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What are Chicago Public School principals doing in terms of the implementation of the Chicago Board of Education’s teacher evaluation plan?
2. How do identified practices for evaluation adhere to methods suggested in the literature as effective?

**Procedures**

The sample consisted of Chicago Elementary School principals assigned to one of Chicago’s subdistricts. Since the Teacher Evaluation Plan had been in effect for only two years, only those principals with three or more years of experience were used for the study - this selection allowed subjects to bring to the study the perspective of a previous evaluation plan. Using this criterion, the size of the sample was nineteen. The collection of data was facilitated by interviews with seventeen of these elementary school principals.\(^\text{17}\) This subdistrict was selected because it reflects the overall principal population in terms of size of schools, experience of principals, and principals’ exposure to the Board of Education’s teacher evaluation plan.

The interview responses were analyzed in order to

\(^{17}\) One of the principals had retired by the time the investigation began. A second principal proved to be unavailable on numerous occasions.
identify patterns, problems, strengths and weaknesses, and similarities and differences in patterns. Guideline questions focused on:

1. What patterns are apparent in terms of methodologies and standards for evaluation district-wide?
2. What techniques identified in the Chicago Board of Education's Teacher Evaluation Plan are being implemented by principals?
3. How are identified practices related to practices identified in the literature.

In addition to the principal interviews, the Chicago Board of Education's Teacher Evaluation Plan was described and analyzed. The evaluation plan was analyzed in light of practices suggested in the literature as well as in terms of the problems and strengths/weaknesses identified in the principal interviews. Where weaknesses or problems were identified, recommendations were made to improve the execution of the evaluation system.

Definition of Terms

The following terms were used in this study:

Teacher Evaluation. Teacher evaluation, in this study, is linked to personnel evaluation and as such can be considered "as the systematic assessment of a person's performance and/or qualifications in relation to a professional role
and some specified and defensible institutional purpose."  

**Formative Evaluation.** Formative evaluation refers to appraisals of quality focused on instructional programs that are still capable of being modified."  

**Summative Evaluation.** Summative evaluation refers to appraisals of quality focused on completed instructional programs."  

**Supervision.** "Supervision is a process inclusive of, but broader than, evaluation. In its generic sense, supervision refers to the set of responsibilities and activities designed to promote instructional improvement in schools."  

**Clinical Supervision.** A supervisory process that involves a systematic study and analysis of the

---


20 Ibid.

actual teaching-learning situation and that utilizes a planned process that is adapted to the needs of those involved and which has been cooperatively developed by both the teacher and supervisor\textsuperscript{22}.

**Organization of the Study**

This study is divided into four chapters, as described below:

Chapter I contains the introduction, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, procedures, definition of terms and organization of the study.

Chapter II contains a review of the literature as it relates to teacher evaluation.

Chapter III contains the presentation and analysis of the data.

Chapter IV contains a summary, conclusions, recommendations, and suggestions for further study based on the research conducted.

CHAPTER II

The purpose of this chapter is to review the literature related to teacher evaluation. In order to complete this task, numerous books, periodicals, dissertations, theories, and research journals were examined. Related studies were reviewed by the investigator to examine teacher evaluation systems explored in other studies. This chapter is organized to include the purpose of teacher evaluation, teacher evaluation studies, a review of teacher evaluation models, and other related literature.

As seen by the National Society for the Study of Education, teacher evaluation had three basic purposes. While quite dated, these practices are still in vogue today and used by advocates of summative and/or formative evaluation. The basic purposes were:

1. Vocational Guidance for Teachers
   a. for an analysis of qualities of students entering the field.
   b. to determine proper placement of teachers.

2. The Improvement of Teacher in Service
   a. basis for self-criticism and self-improvement based on specific standards.
   b. specific standards facilitate useful criticism
by supervisors.

c. supervisors concentrate on areas of need.

d. standards of efficiency would itself be a spur
by laying emphasis on certain points.

3. For the Determination of Promotion and Dismissal

a. placement on salary schedule.

b. intelligent promotion decisions.

c. dismissal - impersonal and based on proven
inefficiency.¹

In their book, *Teacher Evaluation: A Study of Effective Practices*, Wise et al. identified four basic
purposes of teacher evaluation: individual staff
development, school improvement, individual personnel
decisions, and school status decisions.² The first two
purposes are directed towards improvement and the latter two
are aimed at accountability.

Arthur Costa and his associates agree with the
purposes described above and emphasize the importance of
describing the role of the instructional improvement in


Three reasons for evaluation are identified by Sergiovanni. They are:

A. Quality control. In this area, the principal is responsible for monitoring teaching and learning in his/her school and accomplishes this by visiting classrooms, touring the building, talking with people, and visiting with students. B. Professional development. The responsibility of the principal in this arena is to help teachers to grow and develop in their understanding of teaching and classroom life, in improving basic teaching skills, and expanding their knowledge of teaching repertories. C. Teacher motivation. The major responsibility here is building and nurturing motivation and commitment to teaching, to the school's overall purposes and to the school's educational platform.

The purposes of evaluation are reduced even further by DeRoche who says,

It seems apparent that there are two purposes of evaluating teachers: the first is to improve the teacher's performance, the second to provide a measure of accountability. That's it.

---


Everything else is a variation on that theme.

The first purpose, improvement, usually means that evaluation methods (formative) are employed to help teachers diagnose and improve their teaching skills.

The second purpose, accountability, usually means that evaluation methods (summative) are employed by administrators to determine retention and tenure, hiring and firing, promotion and reassignment.

In the simplest terms of all, Bolton suggests that the purpose of teacher evaluation is "to safeguard and improve the quality of instruction received by students." He elaborates on this brief statement by presenting a set of functions through which the evaluation functions are fulfilled. They are:

1. To improve teaching through the identification of ways to change the teaching system, teaching environments, or teaching behaviors.

2. To supply information that will lead to the modification of assignments, such as placements in other positions, promotions, and terminations.

3. To protect students from incompetence, and teachers from unprofessional administrators.

4. To reward superior performance.

5. To validate the school system's teacher

---


selection process.

6. To provide a basis for teachers' career planning and professional development.⁷

While agreeing with the stated purposes of teacher evaluation, Popham⁸ suggests that a great deal of confusion on the concept of teacher evaluation has been generated by administrators who merge the two basic functions of evaluation - summative and formative. The distinct nature of these ideas was advanced by Michael Scriven.⁹

According to Stiggins and Duke,

Local teacher evaluation systems are designed to serve two purposes. The first is a summative evaluation purpose, in which evaluation provides information for use in making personnel management decisions, such as dismissal, promotion and salary increase. In this sense, evaluations provide accountability.

The second purpose is to promote the professional development of teachers. In this case, evaluations provide information on teacher strengths and weaknesses, so appropriate training can be planned. Both purposes are important and can contribute to school improvement: but they are fundamentally different.¹⁰

---

⁹ Michael Scriven, Educational Thesaurus, 1981.
A Review of Related Empirical Studies of Teacher Evaluation

Several studies were found to be of particular interest to the present investigation because of their examination of teacher evaluation systems found in a variety of school districts throughout the country.

One such study was sponsored by the RAND Corporation and conducted by Wise et. al. The major purpose of this study was to assess teacher evaluation practices with a view to analyzing how teacher evaluation can be used to facilitate personnel decisions and staff development. The study began with an examination of thirty-two school districts said to have highly developed teacher evaluation systems. The researchers found that while the evaluation systems appeared to be similar at the district level, variations at the local level were divergent. These differences caused the researchers to suggest that teacher evaluation is presently underconceptualized and underdeveloped.

The examination of the various teacher evaluation systems did, however, identify some common problems with evaluation practices in the thirty-two school districts. These difficulties were identified as: 1. Lack of resolve and competency on the part of the principal to evaluate

---

properly; 2. Teacher resistance or apathy; 3. Lack of uniformity or consistency of evaluation within a school system; 4. Inadequate training for evaluators; and 5. Shortcomings in the evaluation of secondary school staff and specialists.¹²

After establishing baseline information, Wise and his associates selected four diverse teacher evaluation processes from four different regents of the country. The case studies of these four systems revealed differences and commonalities among them. The differences noted were in approaches to evaluation; the major purposes of evaluation; the instruments; the process by which major judgments were made; and the linkage between teacher evaluation and other school district activities.

Wise and associates submit that the commonalities found in the evaluation systems of these districts make these districts successful. The districts give attention to organizational commitment to the evaluation process, they make sure that their evaluators are competent, they establish a process which facilitates collaboration between teacher and administrator, and they use systems which are compatible with the overall goal of the district.

In their examination of the evaluation systems, Wise and his associates evaluated the evaluation systems on their reliability (consistency of measurement across

¹² Ibid, p. vi.
evaluators and observations) and validity (accuracy and comprehensiveness in assessing teaching quality as defined by agreed upon criteria.

Several conclusions are advanced by Wise et. al. They are:

To succeed, a teacher evaluation system must suit the educational goals, management style, conception of teaching, and community values of the school system.

Top level commitment to and resources for evaluation outweigh checklists and procedures.

The school district must decide the main purpose of its teacher evaluation system and then match the process to the purpose.

To sustain resource commitment and political support, teacher evaluation must be seen to have utility. Utility depends on the efficient use of resources to achieve reliability, validity, and cost effectiveness.\(^{13}\)

In addition to commitment from the top, the use of defensible criteria, evaluator competence, and sufficient resources alluded to above, Bridges\(^{14}\) also suggests the inclusion of personal assistance, principal accountability, faculty staffing plans, and the use of tenure committees.

---

\(^{13}\) Ibid, p. 66-73.

McLaughlin and Pfeifer\textsuperscript{15} (1988) conducted a study during which they used the same case study procedure used in the Wise et. al. study. Their examination of four school districts in various locations in the United States led them to conclude that joint training of evaluators and teachers in the evaluation process, a system of checks and balances, an accountability structure for the structure of the evaluation system, effective feedback procedure, flexible instrumentation and integration of evaluation and development resources are essential to a successful evaluation system.

In a 1973 study of Illinois secondary school principals, George Thomas Freese\textsuperscript{16} solicited information concerning various teacher evaluation procedures and instruments used in Illinois secondary schools. This information was obtained from principals from all public secondary schools, with the exception of Chicago, as well as from a random sample of teachers. The investigator coupled this information with opinions and satisfactions of principals and teachers regarding the various evaluation techniques.

Freese's findings indicate that there were a

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
variety of evaluation systems being used in Illinois secondary schools and that these procedures had been in practice for as many as 15 years and for a few as 4 years. His findings also indicate that 51% of the principals and 34% of the teachers expressed limited confidence in the evaluation procedures used then while 56% of the principals and 56% of the teachers could not express limited satisfaction with the evaluation system. Although Freese's study was completed in 1973, a variety of practices is evident in Chicago Public Schools despite the uniform evaluation outline established by the Illinois General Assembly.

Unlike Freese's study, the present study is limited to public elementary school principals in Chicago. It solicited information by way of interviews with principals. Analysis was based on the system-wide teacher evaluation plan.

Russell G. Ramsay17 conducted a study in 1980 designed to ascertain teachers' perceptions of the design and implementation of teacher evaluation systems in Tennessee Public Schools. Ramsay developed a survey instrument which he administered to a sample of 380 participants from Tennessee's 147 school districts.

Ramsay's findings indicate that teachers' perceptions of school systems' most important purposes of teacher evaluation were 1) to meet state department requirements; 2) to approve of tenure; 3) to account to authorities. Teachers' personal opinion of the purpose of teacher evaluation were 1) improvements of instruction; 2) increased job performance; 3) provide feedback to teachers. The distinction between Ramsay's study and this study lies in the purpose and the in the sample. While Ramsay sought to identify teachers' perception of the design and implementation of teacher evaluation systems, this study attempted to find out what Chicago Public School principals were doing in teacher evaluation and consequently used principals as the source of data.

Saleh Hamad Al-Tuwaijri completed a doctoral dissertation in 1985 designed to investigate the strengths and weaknesses, as perceived by educational supervisors, in both the Saudi Arabian Public School system and in the instructional supervision process. The researcher wanted to find out the degree of compatibility between supervisors' perceptions of the ideal and actual supervisor practice in Saudi Arabian schools.

Al-Tuwaijri administered a three-part questionnaire to 175 randomly selected supervisors. His

---

findings indicate that a majority of the participants were generally satisfied that both the education system and the supervisory process are serving the needs of Saudi Arabia. In addition, however, respondents believed that both should be revised or reformed to increase efficiency.

Supervisors, in general, agreed that their colleagues were conscientious and that they are helping teachers. It appears from the data that supervisors find their colleagues qualified and professional, and that the inefficiency in instructional supervision is beyond their control.\textsuperscript{19}

Al-Tuwaijri's study has as its focus the school's chief supervisor and the supervisory process. In a like fashion, the present study attempted to analyze data derived from the chief school supervisor (the principal) and the supervisory process (the Chicago Board of Education's teacher evaluation system). Rather than looking at the perceptions, the present study sought to examine the practices of principals as they evaluate faculty members. While the Al-Tuwaijri study was nation-wide, this investigation examined the practices of principals in one subdistrict.

The next study presented here involves the work of David Thomas Conley\textsuperscript{20} who attempted to identify the state

\textsuperscript{19} Ibid, p. 165.

of evaluation practice in Colorado at the time of implementation of the Certified Personnel Performance Act in June of 1986.

Through the use of data gathered by a survey of administrators responsible for the implementation of the evaluation plan and by an analysis of district evaluation systems, Conley found that significant changes had occurred in district evaluation practices and procedures. He noted that the perceptions of the implementation process were generally positive. His results also show that there is a great diversity in the evaluation systems employed. Teacher evaluation criteria however, appear stable over time. "Teacher criteria showed overall consistency when compared to criteria utilized in Colorado districts in 1983." 21

The current study, in a similar fashion, used principals and the district evaluation plan as the source of data. Unlike Conley's research, the present study concentrated on a single school system and used the interview process to ascertain how principals evaluate teachers.

Emily Brizendine 22, in a 1987 study, proposed 1) to examine the extent the Stull Act process (state mandated

Univ. of Colorado, 1986).

21 Ibid, p. 195.

teacher evaluation process) was being implemented according to its legislative intent; 2) to examine selected conditions in organizational and school environments as possible factors associated with the district's level of implementation; 3) to expose the factors that might affect districts' implementation of legislated educational reform measures.

Brizendine found that the school districts varied greatly in their level of implementation of the Stull Act. The continuum of implementation ran from non-implementation through symbolic implementation to substantial implementation. The final component of Brizendine's study revealed that local conditions, the collective bargaining process, and perceived inadequacies of the Stull Act process were significant factors in their non-implementation of the Stull process.

The researcher used survey and questionnaire techniques to gather data for analysis. In contrast to the Brizendine study, the investigation presented in this volume sought to examine how principals within a local school district implemented the district's teacher evaluation system.

Teacher Evaluation Models

Over the past two decades, a host of teacher
evaluation models have been introduced. Each model has as its major purpose the improvement of instruction.

CLINICAL SUPERVISION

One of the first models of clinical supervision was introduced by Morris Cogan, Robert Goldhammer, and others at the Harvard School of Education in the 1960's. Goldhammer has suggested several key steps in the clinical supervision process. They are: pre-observation conference, observation of teaching, analysis and strategy, post observation conference, and post observation analysis.

The pre-observation conference allows the teacher and supervisor to establish/reestablish communication and to develop a relaxing state in which to communicate; to articulate goals of teacher and observer; to permit the teacher to practice the lesson; to permit revisions; and to establish a common ground for the observation. The purpose of the observation is to permit the supervisor to observe what is actually happening in order to share observations with the teacher. During the analysis and strategy stage, the supervisor analyzes the data and develops a strategy for sharing the data with the teacher.

Stage four - the post observation conference - is "intended to give the teacher the opportunity to deal

---

aggressively with the supervisor's analysis of his teaching and to initiate his own problems of analysis."

The post observation analysis - or postmortem - permits the supervisor to examine his style and behavior as well as that of the teacher. It also permits him to plan approaches he will use in future supervisory activity.

In contrast to Goldhammer, Acheson and Gall identify only three phases of clinical supervision: the planning conference, classroom observation, and feedback. They maintain the basic rationale as identified in the companion steps of the Goldhammer model.

In his description of clinical supervision, Acheson says that "clinical" is meant to suggest a face-to-face interaction between the teacher and supervisor and a focus on the teacher's actual classroom behavior. He continues by suggesting that the pathological connotation of "clinical" is not acceptable when speaking of teacher supervision.

Richard Weller identifies clinical supervision as "supervision focused upon the improvement of instruction by means of systematic cycles of planning, observation, and intensive intellectual analysis of actual teaching.

---

24 Ibid, p.69.

While she agrees with the basic concepts and assumptions of clinical supervision, Madeline Hunter has, as of late, suggested the elimination of the pre-observation conference\textsuperscript{27}. She bases her position on the following assumptions:

1. Teachers should know at the beginning of the year that the purpose of the observation is to promote constantly escalating instructional effectiveness.

2. Trust and support result from what happens in the post observation conference.

3. An observation requires interpretation of each part of a lesson in relation to preceding and subsequent parts, each behavior in terms of prior and subsequent behaviors.

4. The preobservation conference builds bias in both teacher and observer.

5. The time required for the pre-observation conference reduces by one-third the time available for observation and conferences\textsuperscript{28}.

Clinical supervision, for Hunter, is primarily one-dimensional in nature - the improvement of instruction


\textsuperscript{28} Ibid, p.69-70.
MEASUREMENT-BASED EVALUATION

In response to what they would consider the poor track record of other teacher evaluation systems, Donald M. Medley, Homer Coker, and Robert S. Soar have identified what they call measurement-based evaluation of teacher performance.29

The performance-based component presented by Medley and his associates is primarily concerned with the evaluation of teacher performance on the job. The evaluation process suggested by them has four major areas:

1) setting, defining, or agreeing upon the task to be performed;

2) making a documentary, quantifiable record of the behavior of the candidate while the task is being performed;

3) quantifying the record, that is, deriving a score or set of scores from it; and

4) comparing the score with the predetermined standard.30

In order to facilitate the implementation of the performance-based evaluation plan, non-professional observers are trained to observe teachers in the teaching


situation. Special attention is given to the reliability and validity of the observations made. A plethora of forms and indices are provided by the authors to help execute this segment of their evaluation program.

While the authors admit that their measurement-based evaluation plan is difficult and complex, they believe that the strengths of the plan outweigh the complexity of the plan. The wealth of useful information provided and the capacity for self-correction facilitated by the plan make the time and effort put into the plan worthwhile, according to Medley and his colleagues.

JUDGEMENT-BASED TEACHER EVALUATION (J-BTE)

W. James Popham\textsuperscript{31} believes that it is possible for competent professionals to consider various data sources and the soundness of those sources and emerge with an appraisal of a teacher’s competence in the context of the teacher’s specific instructional setting. His program relies on the pooled professional judgment of educators who have been trained and certificated to make defensible judgments regarding teachers’ instructional competence. It also requires that multiple sources of evidence be considered in the context of a teacher’s instructional program.

In his description of the pooled resource component of this summative evaluation plan, Popham states that there is a need to have at least three evaluators because one should not rely on the summative appraisal of one judge. Training and certification of judges is said to reduce the disparities of judgments offered by the evaluators and is thus an essential element in the Judgement-Based Teacher Evaluation program.

In terms of multiple evidence sources, Popham brings to notice the weakness of any single source of evidence regarding a teacher's instructional competence. Five data sources were identified by the author: observations of classroom performance, administrative ratings of the teachers' instructional skills, student evaluations of teacher's instructional skills, review of teacher prepared materials, and evidence of student growth.32

After examining the various sources, the evaluators synthesize the data in order to identify a pattern. The examination of the patterns identified by the three evaluators provides the direction needed to determine whether the teacher needs remediation, reevaluation, or needs to be terminated from employment.

Six key steps are identified for the implementation of the Judgment-Based Teacher Evaluation

32 Ibid, p. 70.
Step 1: Determine particulars of J-BTE.
Step 2: Train and certify J-BTE evaluators.
Step 3: Gather designated evidence.
Step 4: Assign weight to evidence.
Step 5: Review all evidence.
Step 6: Reached pooled judgment.\textsuperscript{33}

\textbf{OTHER RELATED LITERATURE - MOTIVATION}

According to Hoy and Miskel,

\begin{quote}
The ultimate function of theory is to provide general explanation for phenomena...Theory also provides an integrating, common framework for the development of further knowledge...Finally, theory guides actions, for it should provide the basis for making decisions about practical everyday questions.\textsuperscript{34}
\end{quote}

Various theories can provide the conceptual framework from which to view teacher evaluation. Motivation theory was selected by the investigator because motivation theory is closely linked to the research question under study. Three motivation theories are presented here. These theories assisted the researcher in developing a practical framework from which to view teacher evaluation.

\textsuperscript{33} Ibid, p. 73.

Motivation on the part of the teacher evaluator and the teacher plays a major role in the success of the evaluation process. Several theories which have an impact on this process have been advanced in the literature. 

One such theory is Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory. According to Herzberg, the presence or absence of certain factors impact on an individual's job satisfaction. The elements he identifies as motivators increase job satisfaction beyond the natural point. When the factors he calls hygienes are not met, dissatisfaction occurs.

The following factors were identified as motivators: achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, and advancement. The hygienes or dissatisfiers are interpersonal relations with subordinates, the interpersonal relations with superordinates, interpersonal relations with peers, technical supervision, policy and administration, working conditions, and personal life.

Recognition of these factors by the individual engaged in teacher evaluation and by the teacher should discount certain pitfalls which might otherwise cause


37 Ibid, 113
difficulty. The implications for improving the interpersonal relations between the supervisor and teacher are far reaching.

In his book, Motivation and Personality, Abraham Maslow provides the field with additional information on motivation theory. His theory identifies several needs which are said to motivate human beings to particular actions and, consequently, have implications for teacher evaluation and teacher supervision.

These needs as identified by Maslow are: physiological needs, safety needs, belongingness and love needs, esteem needs, and self-actualization needs. "These basic human needs are organized into a hierarchy of relative prepotency." That is to say, once the physiological needs are met, the safety needs become the focus. After the safety needs have been satisfied, the belongingness/love needs become activated, and so on. Maslow cautions the reader not to think that the movement is always in a positive direction. If lower needs become crucial, they may become the focal point again.

While additional research and studies tend to demonstrate the need for supervisors to apply Maslow's theory to the work place, James E. Gardner in Choosing Effective Development Programs: An Appraisal Guide for Human

---

Resources and Training Managers tends to disagree with the assertion. Although he accepts the notion of self-actualization for individuals, he can not see the attachment of such a perspective to the place of employment. "Those," he says, "who understand self-actualization in its broad sense and expect it to be realized through the individual's job will inevitably be frustrated. A larger environmental setting would seem to be required." 39

Those who follow Maslow and his colleagues in the human-relations model of human development would most likely take exception to the position espoused by James Gardner. The teacher supervisor will, no doubt, have to take the stand which would allow for more collegiality.

Administrator Training

THE ILLINOIS ADMINISTRATORS' ACADEMY

In 1981 Harvard University initiated its principals' center. The purpose of this center was to provide principals and other administrators with the opportunity to improve their skills as leaders of educational institutions. The principals' center is said to operate under several assumptions. They are:

- The principal or headmaster is a central variable in determining the quality of a school.

- It is possible for most school heads to be effective educational leaders as well as building managers.

- The role of the principal, the nature of the job, and the context of the school are all changing rapidly, becoming more complex and problematic.

- Principals need opportunities to grow and learn.

- Principals have the capacity and need for personal and professional growth - as much after they have assumed their position as before.

- Principals are as capable of life-long learning as other professionals.

- All of the conditions necessary for principals' learning and growth exist: problems, a context, and someone who wants the problem addressed.

- The major element missing is the existence of a sympathetic, nonpunitive, nonjudgemental, helpful resource and support system.

- A principals' center can mediate among principals, help without judging or condemning, and assist principals in acquiring, strengthening, and sharing their schools leadership skills."40

In a study conducted in 1985, Unikel and Bailey suggested that the primary purpose of principals' centers should be to "...provide opportunities for practicing principals to become actively engaged in their own personal and professional development."41


As a result of Senate Bill 730, Illinois established its version of the principals' center - the Administrators' Academy. The State Board of Education expanded the principals' center concept to include the training needs and interests of participating administrators at all levels of instructional leadership and incorporated the four conditions for "invigoration" of administrators in its design.

The Academy has two levels of operation. At the state level, the State Board of Education's staff offer statewide direction, identify guidelines for operation, and give the necessary leadership for the development of the basic curriculum and training opportunities.

Eighteen satellites located throughout the state represent the regional level and are referred to as Educational Service Centers. These centers utilize the service of a local Academy committee comprised primarily of administrators who guide the development, coordination, and implementation of the Academy programs and services. This local representation assures that the needs of the administrators in the service region are met.

Cognizant of the varying needs and time constraints, the Academy established a flexible framework for participants. The framework includes the following: a required strand designed to meet legislative requirements; a selective strand designed to develop or improve specific
skills in a short length of time; a designated strand which permits the participant to earn professional recognition; and a clinical strand designed to assess instructional leadership skills or climate for instructional leadership.

The Academy was devised to develop skills in the following areas: instructional staff development, effective communication, public relations, and evaluation of personnel. The "evaluation of certified personnel" plan is presented here because the Chicago Board of Education's evaluation procedures are directly related to this area.

A. Local school boards must require those administrators who evaluate other certified personnel to participate, at least every two years, in an inservice workshop on evaluation of certified personnel provided by the State Board of Education (Section 24a-3).

B. The Illinois Administrators' Academy must provide training to all public school district administrators who evaluate other certified personnel and must report to the local school board any administrator not in attendance at these sessions at least once every two years (Section 2-3.56).

C. Evaluation plans submitted by the school districts must specify the evaluation activities conducted by administrators who have completed the required training on evaluation of certified personnel (Section 2-3.57).42 43

42 Illinois School Code (1985), Chapter 122, Article 24A
David Townsend agrees with this concept of training for administrators but extends this training exercise to teachers as well.

Administrators prepared to commit themselves to training and long term professional development in supervision and evaluation are more likely to earn the trust and respect of their teachers than those who choose to do otherwise. Moreover, principals who engage in training with their teachers have been seen to exert a positive influence on their teachers' attitudes towards supervision and evaluation. 44

A review of the procedure followed by Medicine Hat School District No. 76 indicated the following:

...It was believed that teachers and supervisors seeking to develop expertise in the area of teacher supervision and evaluation should be prepared to participate in an extensive inservice education program. The program emphasized analysis of teaching, teaching effectiveness, classroom observation, clinical supervision, teacher evaluation procedures and evaluation report writing. The district administrator reasoned that his training program should be made available to all professional staff over a three-year period to demonstrate the system's commitment to a successful


implementation.\textsuperscript{45}

While the Illinois State Board of Education's training program does not include teachers, it does address issues similar to those identified by the Medicine Hat School District. Namely it:

- provides specific support for the curriculum through ongoing supervisory contact.

- uses an indirect rather than a direct model of instructional management. Distinguishes between stimulating and monitoring the outcomes of the instructional program and dictating the means by which the goals will be accomplished.

- makes more frequent observations of classroom instruction and gives useful feedback to both students and teachers.

- coaches and counsels in a helpful, supportive, nonthreatening manner and acts more like a "professional consultant", "senior colleague" or "mentor" than like a boss.

- conducts regular sessions with the teachers to discuss and review teacher performance.

- focuses on the characteristics of teaching that are substantive and minimizes attention to long lists of static or weak variables and characteristics.

- encourages teachers to evaluate their own professional competence and to set goals for their own growth.\textsuperscript{46}

The above summarizes the Administrators' Academy's component related to teacher evaluation. The other strands

\textsuperscript{45} Ibid, p. 13.

\textsuperscript{46} Illinois State Board of Education, Illinois Administrator's Academy, Monograph Series, Paper #1, (July 1986) p. 4.
- instructional staff development, effective communication, and public relations - are integral parts of the Academy but are not addressed here because the research was focused on teacher evaluation.

Conclusion

In examining this chapter, one will note that the present system of teacher evaluation is a result of the changes which have taken place in organizational growth and development in the last one hundred years. Accompanying those changes is a definite move towards collegiality in the supervision and evaluation of teaching. The studies identified in the chapter give recognition to the idea involving teachers in decisions which affect them directly.

The need to improve instruction in our public schools is also evident by the studies presented here. State and local boards of education throughout the country are implementing supervisory and evaluation practices designed specifically to improve the instruction which their charges receive. The models selected by the various boards of education rely heavily on the practices identified in the literature as effective.

The teacher evaluation plan identified by the Illinois State Board of Education takes into account not only models it considers effective for supervising and
evaluating teachers but also the notion that administrators must constantly have their skills honed. This perspective reinforces the vision/mission of the State Board of Education and establishes a setting in which static principals have the opportunity to change their attitudes towards teacher supervision and evaluation.
CHAPTER III

Presentation and Analysis of Data

The purpose of this chapter is to present and analyze the data collected as a result of this study. The primary concern of the data presentation and analysis was to answer the questions posed in Chapter I regarding Chicago Public School principals and their evaluation practices. Those questions are repeated here.

1. What are Chicago Public School principals doing in terms of the implementation of the Chicago Board of Education’s teacher evaluation plan?

2. How do identified practices for evaluation adhere to methods suggested in the literature as effective?

In order to secure the data, an extensive review of the literature was conducted and interviews were scheduled with nineteen Chicago Public School principals from the same sub-district. The sub-district investigated was selected because it closely represented Chicago Public School principals in terms of age, tenure, size of school, and racial make-up. While there were twenty-eight schools
assigned to the sub-district, only principals with three or more years of experience were selected to participate in the study because principals under this time constraint had experience in the previous evaluation system and the one presently in place. Of the nineteen identified principals, two proved to be unavailable on numerous occasions thereby reducing the number of subjects to seventeen.

Instrument

A semistructured interview instrument was created in order to compile the data for this study. This research technique was selected because of the benefits ascribed to it by Borg and Gall. Their position relative to the structured interview is that:

The semistructured interview is generally most appropriate for interview studies in education. It provides a desirable combination of objectivity and depth and often permits gathering valuable data that could not be successfully obtained by any other approach.¹

Its principal advantage is its adaptability...The interview permits you to follow-up leads and thus obtain more data and greater clarity...[The interviewer] through the careful motivation of the subject and maintenance of rapport can obtain information that the subject would not reveal under other circumstances.²

² Ibid, p. 446.
C. W. Charles, in agreement, says, "...It [the well conducted interview] provides the most useful information in the shortest period of time...the respondents may offer information that is especially illuminating."³

The researcher in this study needed to find out what principals were actually doing in teacher evaluation. In order to accomplish this task, the structured interview technique offered the most promise. It allowed for a face-to-face setting in which the researcher could secure personalized comments as well as probe for more information or clarification.

**Procedures for Administration**

A field test of the instrument was conducted prior to its administration. Three principals who were not a part of the sample were selected to take part in the field test. Their interviews were tape-recorded and transcribed. Those questions not meeting validity or reliability standards were revised. The revised semistructured instrument was then administrated to the principals in the study. Each interview took about one hour.

At the beginning of each of the scheduled interviews, the researcher engaged in conversation not associated with the subject under investigation in order to

break the ice and to establish a level of trust. After the brief introductory engagement, principals were reminded of the purpose of the interview, given a copy of the interview questions, and asked if comments could be tape-recorded. The audio-taping of the interviews permitted the investigator to secure a verbatim record of the interviewees' comments. This practice is advocated by Borg and Gall who indicate that it:

...reduces the tendency of the interviewer to make an unconscious selection of data favoring their biases...tape recorded data can be played back more than once and can be studied much more thoroughly than notes.4

In order to facilitate the analysis of the data, the researcher had each tape-recorded interview transcribed. The interview notes, transcripts, and tape-recordings were reviewed. The data from the interviews were coded and tabulated to assist in the presentation and analysis of data.

**Interview Questions**

A series of questions were developed and presented to the principals in face-to-face interviews. The interview questions are listed below:

1. How do you prepare faculty for the evaluation

---

process?

2. How do you assess teacher performance?

3. What techniques are you using in evaluating your teachers?

4. How did you come to use these particular techniques?

5. How often do you make classroom observations during the course of the schools year for: probationary teachers? tenured teachers? others?

6. Describe your follow-up activity after an observation.

7. Identify obstacles to evaluation observations.

8. How do your practices compare with those mandated by the Chicago Board of Education's evaluation plan?

9. What purpose(s) do you have in mind when you make your observations visits. Please rank.

10. What do you consider to be the purpose of the Chicago Board of Education's teacher evaluation plan?

11. What do you consider to be the strengths of your evaluation procedures?

12. What do you consider to be the strengths of the Board of Education's mandated teacher evaluation plan?

13. What are some problems in your evaluation procedures?

14. What are some problems in the Chicago Board of Education's evaluation plan?

Data Presentation and Analysis

Demographic information gathered during the interview is presented here in order to give the reader an
overview of the principals who took part in this study. Table 3.0 identifies those characteristics.

Table 3.0
Demographic Characteristics of Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-400</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401-600</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601-800</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801-1000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001-1500</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Principals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Principals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Service as Principal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Plus 36</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Plus 37-70</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters - ABD</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D/Ed.D</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interview Question 1: How do you prepare faculty for the evaluation process?

Interview Data:

An examination of the data gathered through interviews with the principals indicated that fifteen of the respondents provided teachers with evaluation guidelines. These guidelines generally emerged from those presented in the Chicago Board of Education’s evaluation handbook and/or the Agreement Between the Board of Education and the Chicago Teachers’ Union. The respondents indicated that this activity generally takes place at the beginning of the school year.

Several principals said that, in addition to the above, they prepare faculty by reviewing the previous year’s evaluations. As a part of this process, they set goals for the present school year.

One principal indicated that he does not do much to prepare faculty for the evaluation process because his faculty is established and has been under his direction for a number of years. He did say that he does allude to the process at faculty meetings.
Analysis of the Interview Data:

The conclusion that can be reached by analyzing the data secured relative to how principals prepare faculty for the evaluation process was that principals do share with faculty the policies and procedures associated with teacher evaluation via the teacher evaluation handbook, Union Agreement, or some general statement at faculty meetings. There was only cursory treatment of the process to be implemented.

Principals did not indicate that teachers were involved in the process in any manner other than "top down." Principals read the guidelines to the faculty and indicated their expectations relative to the guidelines.

Failure to involve teachers to a greater degree is contrary to the position taken by the National Association of Elementary School Principals. According to the NAESP,

...it is imperative that people being evaluated know the 'game plan.' They must understand the criteria upon which the evaluation will be based and, in fact, have a role in identifying those criteria. They must be told how often formal observation will be made and what matters will be considered. If informal 'drop-in' observations are possible, they must know about that, too. And, it is crucial that they understand the evaluator's expectations.\(^5\)

The NAESP position is reinforced by David Townsend's

research in Alberta School Jurisdictions. His findings suggested that both the principal and teachers commit themselves to long term training in teacher supervision and evaluation. This mutual training is said to provide the participants with a common understanding of the evaluation process. This arrangement, according to Townsend, permits a more collegial approach to the improvement of instruction.  

The perspectives of the NAESP and Townsend were not evident in the comments of the principals interviewed in this study. Rather, they provided a cursory view of the evaluation process and did not engage in extended professional dialogue relative to the evaluation process and their varying roles in that process.

Interview Question 2: How do you assess teacher performance?

Interview Data:

When asked how they assess teacher performance, the principals in this study identified twenty-five separate components which they take into account when assessing teacher performance. These responses are presented in table 3.4. The totals do not equal the number of principals interviewed because of the possibility of multiple responses.

on the part of some principals.

The most frequent responses centered around classroom management, student progress, drop-in visitations, teacher attendance, formal classroom observation, and established goals. Three respondents suggested the review of lesson plan books and punctuality as means of assessing teacher performance. The least frequent responses addressed individual conferences with teachers, records, observations outside of the classroom, parent interactions, student attendance, committee work, prior knowledge of teacher, classroom appearance, personality, items on the evaluation sheet, varying methods, and other (not specified).
Table 3.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How do you assess teacher performance?</th>
<th>Frequency*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom management</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Progress</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop-in visits</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher attendance</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal classroom observations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established goals</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson plans</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuality</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual conference</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations outside of class</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent interaction</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student attendance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of the curriculum</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom appearance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods vary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of evaluation form</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go through the motions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The number of responses is greater than seventeen due to the fact that some principals gave multiple responses.

Analysis of Interview Data:

Although the literature on teacher evaluation identifies the importance of classroom observation as a major tool in the assessment of teacher performance, only four of the seventeen principals in this study identified observation as a major component used by them in assessing teacher performance. Frequent observation and discussion has not been, to any great degree, a technique utilized by the principals in this study.

It should also be noted that a considerable number of
responses were aligned primarily with summative evaluation techniques. While the most used responses (classroom management, student progress, drop-in visits, teacher attendance, formal classroom observation and established goals) do contain elements that can be considered formative, the principals' comments during the interviews led the researcher to believe that the respondents were concerned essentially with the summative nature of those areas.

The evidence presented here supports Stiggins and Duke's notion that "...the spirit of evaluation has been so structured by teacher contract agreements that it is almost pro forma." The techniques used seem to do little to meet the needs of the school and does little to promote the professional development of the teachers.

Interview Question 3: What Techniques are you using in evaluating your teachers?

Interview Data:

An examination of the data collected (Table 3.3) related to the techniques employed by principals in evaluating teachers indicates that nine of the principals use the observation/post-observation conference model; five use the pre-observation/observation/post-observation conference model; and two implemented a variety of methods.

Two of the nine principals using the observation/post-observation conference model volunteered that they rarely use the pre-observation conference because it is too cumbersome.

Several of those who said that they use the pre-observation/observation/post-observation conference model stated that when they use the pre-observation conference with experienced teachers it is used to address specific problems.

Table 3.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observation/Post-observation conference</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-observation/Observation/Post-Observation conference</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods vary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Interview Data:

The literature on teacher evaluation is not in total agreement on the best techniques to be employed when evaluating teaching. Goldhammer, Cogan and their followers, like Manatt, offer a full range of activities to be used in evaluation - specifically the clinical supervision process.

Others, like Madeline Hunter, suggest evaluation stages
that exclude the pre-conference. Still others advocate goal setting, performance base, product models, etc.

The principals in the present study adhere, with little variation, to the observation/post-observation model. Frequent observation and discussion, as suggested by the clinical supervision model or by Manatt or in the Hunter model, has not been incorporated into the techniques identified by the principals in this study. Additionally, assessment methods that would provide more adequate and objective data about classroom interaction were not volunteered (such as: verbatim records, charts of classroom interaction, records of questioning, or reinforcement strategies).

The reliance of these principals on a single evaluation method is contrary to the literature relative to effective teacher evaluation techniques. As suggested by Stiggins and Duke, these singular evaluation practices seem to be "superficial, pro forma affairs involving few moments of classroom observation followed by the completion of a required report form signed by all interested parties and filed away."

The perfunctory nature of the evaluation process identified by some of the principals in this study suggests that the methods are not totally in-line with the present thinking in teacher evaluation. Even when a full-scale process is in place, it reflects more of a summative hue.
than a formative approach to the improvement of instruction.

Interview Question 4: How did you come to use these particular techniques?

Interview Data

This question was a follow-up to the previous question in which principals were asked to identify techniques they were using in evaluating teachers. Question five sought to determine how the principals came to use the techniques identified in the previous question.

Nine of the principals indicated that they acquired the techniques via professional training (including: Board of Education training, university training, or evaluation literature read on their own); three said that the techniques used by them were developed over time through on-the-job experience; others indicated that they had developed the identified techniques through knowledge of the staff, for convenience, by intuition, or under the guidance of their former principal. The responses are summarized in table 3.4.
Table 3.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional training</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-the-job experience</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the staff</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuition</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example of former principal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Interview Data:

A majority of the principals in this study suggested that they use a specific technique or set of techniques as a direct result of training. This evidence supports the objectives of the literature on teacher evaluation and the goals of the Illinois Administrators' Academy to provide teacher evaluators with information and training in evaluating teachers.

The principals in the study seemed enthusiastic about the opportunities for training. They specifically mentioned the Illinois Administrators' Academy, the reading materials provided by the Chicago Board of Education, and literature published by professional organizations. The exposure to the above was characterized by principals as a means of improving their understanding of the evaluation process.
While the subjects of this study supported the notion of evaluation training for principals, only one of the interviewees suggested that both principal and teachers participate in evaluation training. The principal advancing the notion of including teachers in the evaluation training felt that both parties needed to be engaged in the same training at the same time for the training to have its maximum benefit. As stated by David Townsend in his research:

...It was believed that teachers and supervisors seeking to develop expertise in the area of supervision and evaluation should prepare to participate in an extensive inservice education program.  

This idea is also reinforced by McLaughlin and Pfeifer who say that "Joint training makes important substantive and symbolic contributions to teacher evaluation."

There was no evidence that the principals involved in this study, save one, viewed joint training of principals and teachers as a viable component to be added to the present method of training.

---


Interview Question 5: How often do you make formal teacher observations during the course of the school year?

Interview Data:

When asked about the frequency with which they visit teachers during the course of the school year, the principals in this study provided the data in table 3.5.

**TABLE 3.5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you make formal teacher observations during the course of the school year?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Formal Visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * FTB's are full-time basis substitute teachers not assigned on a regular certificate.
** Probationary teachers are assigned teachers who have not gained tenure.

In addition to the information presented in the table, the principals offered several variations in the schedules reported above. Three principals said that more visits would be scheduled for individual teachers requiring more attention. Several principals indicated that they visit
superior teachers less often and one said that his schedule ignores superior teachers.

Analysis of Interview Data:

The data collected relative to the frequency of observations by principals during the course of the school year seem to be in-line with the position advocated by the National Association of Elementary School Principals in its publication - Effective Teachers: Effective Evaluation in America’s Elementary and Middle Schools. This organization suggests that principals conduct one observation at the beginning of the school year and another near the end of the school year, and others during the school year as needed.

Those educators who view classroom observations as a formative tool would suggest more frequent observations than advocated by NAESP or by the principals in this study. They certainly would not exclude superior teachers from this process as did one principal in this investigation.

Interview Question 6: Describe your follow-up activities after an observation.

Interview Data:

An examination of the data relative to follow-up

---

"National Association of Elementary School Principals, "Effective Teachers: Effective Evaluation in America’s Elementary and Middle Schools," (Alexandria, Va.: NAESP)."
activities conducted by principals after classroom observation revealed a high degree of uniformity on the part of the principals interviewed. The principals, with few exceptions, indicated that they do the following:

- withdraw and write down what was observed
- organize thoughts to share with teacher
- convene a post-observation conference with teacher
- share observations and note problems and concerns
- mutually agree on areas in need of improvement
- identify resources
- set date of follow-up observation (if called for)
- file documentation of observation for end-of-year evaluation

Additionally, two principals indicated that they would initiate staff development activities designed to address areas of concern identified during their observations - when these concerns were noticed in a significant number of their observations.

One principal stated that he could not think of anything that he does as a result of his observations.

Analysis of Interview Data:

The literature on teacher evaluation clearly states
that principals should complete the follow-up activities identified by the principals in this study. The only areas wanting, as identified by the principals’ comments, were related to the concepts of true formative evaluation and relating classroom observation to staff development. Only two of the seventeen principals in this study commented on the need to establish a linkage between classroom observation and staff development.

One might question the lack of true formative evaluation in the programs described by the subjects of this study. There comments echo almost verbatim the summative function of evaluation described by Stiggins who says:

...Accountability systems are generally defined by state law and/or collective bargaining agreements between teachers and school districts to include a pre-observation conference between teacher and supervisor followed by classroom observations by the supervisors. The participants then meet again to review and discuss the results. A written record of evaluation is often placed on file...If the principal finds a problem, written evaluation records become evidence of a need for some personnel action.7

In order for an evaluation system to permit growth on the part of the teaching staff, there must be opportunities for staff to become involved in formative evaluation activities. The literature on evaluation clearly identifies

the advantage of formative activities over summative activities in improving instruction.

The principals in this study relied primarily on evaluation as a summative function thereby not being totally in synchronization with the literature on teacher evaluation.

Interview Question 7: Identify obstacles to the evaluation observation.

The principals under study offered multiple responses relative to obstacles they encounter in the evaluation process. Thirteen principals cited day-to-day operations as an impediment to evaluation observations. Under this category they included such things as student discipline, interruptions from parents, telephone calls, and other managerial functions.

Eleven principals identified time constraints associated with observations. Administrivia or activities initiated by the central and or district office were flagged by four principals. One or two respondents suggested each of the following: false teaching situation; feedback of formative data; impracticality of observation techniques; teacher reluctance or anxiety; requirements for dealing with unsatisfactory teachers; the concept of the evaluation process itself; difficulty in maintaining a schedule; and the observation evaluation form. Table 3.7 summarizes the
responses offered above.

Table 3.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day-to-day operations</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time constraints</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administravia</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The false situation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impracticality of techniques</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling difficulties</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback of formative data</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher reluctance/anxiety</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff size</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The concept itself</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The evaluation form</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple responses on the part of some principals cause the totals to be greater than the sample size.

Analysis of Interview Data:

In identifying the obstacles classified above, the respondents exhibited a great deal of frustration related to their inability to execute an evaluation observation schedule. The principals noted that while the Chicago Board of Education indicates that it wants evaluation to be a high priority activity, it continues to saddle principals with activities and responsibilities which take their focus away
from the evaluation process.

The findings here are similar to those of Stiggins and Duke in which administrators identified the following needs: improved methods of conducting observations, more time allocated for evaluation and observation, emphasis on improvement as a distinct priority, and a stronger link between evaluation and staff development.

Further reinforcement of the principals' comments was found in the research conducted by Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLoughlin and Bernstein, in which they concluded that:

> Evaluators need time to make reliable and valid judgements and offer assistance. Administrators and teachers who evaluate other teachers must not have urgent competing activities which take precedence over evaluation.

Interview Question 8: How do your practices compare with those mandated by the Chicago Board of Education?

Interview Data:

When asked to compare their practices with those mandated by the Chicago Board of Education, the principals, with only five exceptions, indicated that they either meet or exceed the guidelines provided by the Chicago Board of Education. The four principals who said that they exceed

---

* Ibid., 21.

the Board's guidelines stated that they incorporated such additional components as anecdotal records and additional observation visits.

The respondents who indicated that their practices were less stringent than the required procedures identified the following: fewer evaluation visits, the use of a less standard approach, and the omission of the post conference component. One principal indicated that his were much looser, more instructional, and based on the philosophy that teachers are professional and should be treated as such.

Analysis of Interview Data

The responses to the questions presented here are consistent with the comments given by the principals to the earlier questions in this study. In each instance, the subjects identify the procedures established in the "Teacher Evaluation Plan and Handbook of Procedures." The plan specifically calls for the following:

Subsequent to review of this handbook with the faculty but prior to June 1, a visitation/observation will be made by the principal, using the designated criteria and applicable visitation/observation form.

A Conference with the teacher will be held following visitation/observation at which time a copy of the completed form will be given to the teacher.

On or before the Friday immediately prior to the final week of the teacher's regular work year, the principal will prepare, in triplicate, the Teacher
The principals in this study seem to stick religiously to this plan. The one principal who shuns the approach identified above seems to be more congruent with the formative component of teacher evaluation identified throughout the literature.

Interview Question 9: What purpose(s) do you have in mind when you make your observation visits?

Interview Data:

When asked what purpose or purposes they had in mind when they make their observation visits, the principals in this study identified ten purposes. There existed a high degree of consensus regarding their intent. Fourteen of the principals identified improvement of instruction as their major intent when visiting teachers. Seven of the respondents said that they make classroom observations to meet their administrative obligation, while six indicated that they complete this exercise to see what’s going on. Five of the principals suggested that they visit in order to encourage teachers. The last six categories "stimulate teacher, note student progress, get feedback on needs/problems, get rid of people not doing their job, let
teachers/students know I'm here, and to learn about good
teaching" were mentioned infrequently, and consequently are
not major factors for purposes in classroom observation as
identified by the principals in this study.

The table below summarizes the responses.

Table 3.9

| What purpose(s) do you have in mind when you make your observation visits? |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Responses                  | Frequency | Category   |
| Improve instruction        | 14        | Formative  |
| Meet administrative         | 7         | Summative  |
| responsibility              |           |            |
| See what's going on         | 6         | Summative  |
| Encourage teacher           | 5         | Formative  |
| Stimulate teacher           | 3         | Formative  |
| Note student progress       | 2         | Summative  |
| Get feedback on             | 2         | Formative  |
| needs/problems              |           |            |
| Get rid of people who       | 1         | Summative  |
| are not doing their job     |           |            |
| Let teachers/students       | 1         | Summative  |
| know I'm here               |           |            |
| Learn about good teaching   | 1         | Formative  |
|                             |           |            |

In addition to the purposes identified above, the
reader will note the classification of that function as
either summative or formative was included in the table.
Although five functions are formative and five are
summative, the frequency of formative functions total 25
while the frequency of summative functions total 17.

Analysis of Interview Data:

When the literature speaks of the purpose or purposes of teacher evaluation, it generally identifies two major intentions, formative and summative. The formative function is seen as improving instruction and the summative is seen as establishing accountability. The formative function seeks to move the teacher towards reaching his full potential as a professional and the summative mode assures minimal competencies.

The purposes as identified by the principals in this study adhere to the literature on teacher evaluation. There is a high degree of consensus on the part of the principals that the major purpose of teacher evaluation is to improve instruction.

Interview Question 10: What do you consider to be the purpose(s) of the Board of Education’s teacher evaluation plan?

Interview Data:

The responses of the principals relative to their perceptions of the purpose of teacher evaluation as conceived by the Board of Education, indicated a high degree of accord. While there were multiple responses, the vast majority of those responses (fourteen) centered on the improvement of instruction. Four principals felt that the
Board’s purpose was to provide a legal basis for giving teacher ratings. The following items were identified by one or two principals: "remove incompetent teachers, to make certain that responsibilities are being met, to make sure that minimum standards are being met, to make sure that instruction is being monitored, to see that the curriculum is being implemented, to make sure that mandated evaluation procedures are being met, to adhere to the Union/Board Agreement, to adhere to state guidelines and to keep the principal busy.

Analysis of Interview Data:

The explanations given by the principals relative to their reasons for making classroom observations and their perceptions regarding the Board of Education’s purpose for evaluating teachers are closely aligned. In each instance, fourteen respondents indicated that the improvement of instruction was the major reason for the evaluation process.

These positions are in line with the literature on teacher evaluation but not consistent with some of the activities identified by the principals in questions addressed earlier in this study. The principals may have indicated that they believe the purpose of the evaluation process is to improve instruction but their activities fall more in the summative arena.

The subjects in this study seem to link their summative
activities to the improvement of instruction. Summative activities can purge the system of incompetent teachers. It does little, however, to build upon the skills of the moderate to superior teacher. The literature speaks often of the need for evaluation systems to incorporate those elements which will lead to growth on the part of the teacher. The evidence presented here has not convinced the researcher that the principals in this study have bought into the development concept associated with teacher evaluation.

Interview Question 11: What do you consider to be the strengths of your evaluation procedures?

Interview Data:

The principals in this study identified a number of strengths, as they perceive them, associated with their evaluation procedures. Nine of the interviewees felt that their evaluation procedures "provided encouragement/support." Five of the respondents suggested that their approach "offered a non-threatening setting." An equal number said that the "feedback provided" was a strength. Each of the following responses was offered by two principals: "provided a standard schedule; "provided documentation; "fostered individual guidance; and "offered a fair setting." One principal said that his practices "created a professional and serious atmosphere." One
principal believed that his evaluation procedures "had no strengths."

Table 3.11 provides a summary of these responses.

Table 3.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What do you consider to be the strengths of your evaluation procedures?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided encouragement/support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered a non-threatening environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided a standard schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostered individual guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created a professional and serious atmosphere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No strengths</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Multiple responses were offered by some interviewees.

Analysis of Interview Data:

An analysis of the responses presented above revealed that the following were perceived as strengths of the evaluation procedures as implemented by the principals in this study:

- provided encouragement and support;
- offered a non-threatening setting;
- provided feedback;
- provided a standard schedule of
visits;
- provided documentation;
- fostered individual guidance;
- offered a fair setting; and
- created a professional and serious atmosphere.

From the responses of the subjects of this study relative to the strengths of their evaluation systems, one can glean that the principals are concerned with presenting an attitude of support for the teachers involved in the evaluation process. The perceived strengths were directed toward developing the teachers as well as establishing a comfort level for the teachers. These strengths are positive in that they seek to establish the type of collegial relationship suggested in the literature.

The major exception was presented by the principal who suggested that his evaluation procedures had no strengths. His comments here are consistent with his responses to earlier questions in which he demonstrated an indifference for his role in the evaluation process.

Interview Question 12: What do you consider to be the strengths of the Board of Education’s mandated teacher evaluation plan?

Interview Data:
When asked to identify the strengths of the Chicago
Board of Education's mandated teacher evaluation plan, the principals in this study identified twelve areas which they considered strong points. The majority of the respondents (10) felt that the "standard/comprehensive" nature of the plan was a strength while five of the principals considered the plan's "indication of expectations" a mainstay. Three principals identified the "procedures for dealing with problem teachers" as a strength. Three also felt that the plan's requirement that principals do classroom observations was a strong point.

The following attributes were each suggested by one principal: "permits local criteria;" "fair;" "fulfills the letter of the law;" "effective;" "adequate for large faculties;" "formal;" "sets minimal standards;" and "saves time." Three of the respondents stated that the Board's evaluation plan had no strengths at all.

Analysis of Interview Data:

A review of the data presented above reveals that the principals are not in agreement relative to the strengths of the Chicago Board of Education's mandated teacher evaluation plan.

Those areas mentioned most frequently - "standard/comprehensive," "establishes procedures for dealing with problem teachers," and "forces principals to do classroom observations" - seem to fall outside of the
positive characteristics of the evaluation plans presented in the literature.

McGreal's identification of commonalities said to be incorporated into the best evaluation plans are not evident in the principal's responses analyzed here. The strengths he found in sound practices are related to: positive attitudes, flexible practices, good setting, narrow focus on teaching, the use of alternative data sources, varying requirements for tenured and non-tenured teachers. The principals in this study did not offer any of these components as strengths in the plan that they are required to implement. This deficit is further reinforced by the three principals who felt that the Board's plan had no strengths.

Interview Question 13: What are some problems with your evaluation system?

Interview Data:

The following items were identified as problems associated with their evaluation procedures by the principals interviewed in this study:

- time to follow established procedures;
- faculty morale;
- vulnerability of procedures;

- teachers know evaluation pattern;
- pinpointing exactly what to evaluate;
- personality problems;
- teachers' acceptance of evaluation;
- inability to link to staff development;
- getting staff to buy into goals;
- not principal's area of expertise;
- problem resolution is not evident;
- improvement is not always evident;
- not that effective;
- not properly trained to execute function;
- indicating weaknesses;
- using forms in a timely fashion.

Only two of the above responses were mentioned more than once. "Time to follow established procedures" was mentioned by seven principals and "faculty morale" was listed by four of the interviewees.

Analysis of Interview Data:

An analysis of the data presented here underscores the need to provide evaluators of teachers with extensive training in the use of the procedures identified in the literature as effective.

The issue of time identified by seven of the principals is a
sore spot for Manatt who concludes,

The foot draggers who say 'yes-but-it takes too much time!'... Ineffective school take too much time, thirteen years for your children and mine. Ineffective teachers cost too much. A twenty-three year-old teacher granted tenure despite his or her low quality teaching will cost the school system over a million dollars before he or she retires. Good performance appraisal doesn't cost, it PAYS.\textsuperscript{12}

The principals in this study did not seem to be able to reconcile the time expended in the evaluation process with the payoff suggested by Manatt.

The issue of faculty morale, and other faculty related items, does not seem to be in syncopation with those proponents of teacher evaluation who recommend that increased involvement and training of teachers in the evaluation process results in higher levels of understanding of and appreciation for evaluation systems and procedures.

Interview Question 14: What are some of the problems of the Board of Education's evaluation plan?

Interview Data:

In their examination of the Chicago Board of Education's teacher evaluation plan, the principals outlined a number of problems. The responses are listed in their order of frequency. There were multiple responses from the

principals therefore, the totals exceed the number of principals interviewed. The responses are:

- implementation time (10);
- difficult to carry out to the letter (5);
- inflexible (5);
- teachers don't see plan being implemented fully (4);
- refers to "weaknesses" rather than "concerns" (3);
- should advocate greater use of the anecdotal format (1);
- limits response areas (1);
- has little or no meaning for teachers (1);
- does not provide for sufficient teacher input (1);
- threatening (1);
- too many teachers to evaluate (1).

Analysis of Interview Data:

An analysis of the data relative to problems associated with the Board of Education's evaluation plan as perceived by the subjects of this study indicated that the principals have some real concerns.

Some of the concerns reinforce the findings of other researchers who indicate that time management issues be addressed so as to permit the principal to dedicate himself/herself almost exclusively to the teacher evaluation process. In addition, the issue of training resurfaces. It
is obvious from the answers given by the principals to this question that more work needs to be done to shore-up the skills of principals so that they can more adequately implement the evaluation plan outlined by the Board of Education.

Chapter Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to present and analyze the data collected as a result of this study. In the process, the researcher reiterated the guideline questions that were to be addressed as a part of this research. In addition, the instrument and procedures for administering the instrument were described. Prior to presenting and analyzing the data, the researcher outlined the interview questions presented to the subjects of this inquiry.

The presentation and analysis of data gathered during the research provided insights into the evaluation practices and procedures employed by the subjects of this study. A review of the subjects' comments during the interview process suggested that their exposure to and implementation of evaluation practices provided them with a base from which to carry out their function as teacher evaluators. Their comments also indicated that a great deal more effort needs to be expended on their part to make the evaluation process meet their expectations and the expectations of the teacher
evaluation process characterized in the literature as effective.

The researcher was also able to identify some of the strengths and weaknesses of the Chicago Board of Education's evaluation plan as that plan is perceived by the subjects of this study and the literature on teacher evaluation. The strengths were generally associated with the evaluation plan's attempt to improve instruction in a professional and objective manner. The weaknesses dealt with the plan's inflexibility and its link to the contractual agreement with the teaching force.

Finally, principals' comments indicated that there were varying degrees of implementation of the evaluation plan by the subjects of this study. While some principals said that implementation is cursory and others adhered closely to the plan as outlined by the Board of Education, still others exceeded the mandated procedures.
CHAPTER IV

Chapter IV is divided into four parts. A summary of the sample investigated and the procedures used are presented in part one. The conclusions reached as a result of this study are reported in part two. Recommendations emerging from this investigation are presented in part three. Finally, suggestions for further research are outlined in part four.

Sample and Procedures

This study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What are Chicago Public School principals doing in terms of the implementation of the Chicago Board of Education's teacher evaluation plan?

2. How do identified practices for evaluation adhere to methods suggested in the literature as effective?

In order to address the questions identified above, the researcher selected a sub-district considered to be representative of the Chicago Public Schools in terms of age and tenure of the principals, school sizes, and racial composition of students. Of the twenty-eight school identified in the sub-district, nineteen of the principals in that sub-districts were selected. Their selection was predicated on the fact that they had experience as principals under the present teacher evaluation plan as well as the previous evaluation plan.
The procedures called for the development of and field testing of an interview instrument designed to meet the concerns of the investigation. The revised interview document was then presented to the subjects of this study in a semistructured format. Responses were noted, tape-recorded, and transcribed. The data from the interviews were then coded, tabulated and analyzed.

Conclusions

This section of Chapter IV presents the conclusions drawn from the inquiry. The following areas will be used to cluster the conclusions: preparation for evaluation, purpose of evaluation, assessment process and problems.

Preparation for Evaluation.

Evaluators prepared themselves and their faculty for the evaluation process in a variety of ways. These ways include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Evaluation training by way of university courses or district initiated workshops/inservices.

2. Sharing with faculty the policies and procedures associated with teacher evaluation via the teacher evaluation handbook, Board/Union agreement, and/or local guidelines.

3. Exercising limited professional dialogue with staff relative to their role or the principal’s role in the evaluation process.
Purpose of Teacher Evaluation.

Several conclusions based on the purpose of teacher evaluation as viewed by the principals in this study are enumerated here:

1. Principals relied on teacher evaluation as primarily a summative function.

2. Principals viewed teacher evaluation as a means of improving instructions and felt that this was the intention of the Board of Education's teacher evaluation program.

Assessment Process.

Conclusions related to the assessment process indicate that variations in perceptions, and practices exist among the principals. Specifically:

1. A considerable number of techniques utilized by the principals are aligned with summative functions: class management, student progress, teacher attendance, drop-in visits, etc.

2. Observation of instruction was not considered a major element in assessing teacher performance.

3. Principals acknowledged the value of frequent observation and discussion of instruction but few used such a practice.

4. Bi-annual formal visitations by principals seemed to be the norm.

Problems.

A number of problems associated with the evaluation process were identified by the principals who took part in this study. The conclusions related to those problems are
indicated below:

1. Evaluators exhibited frustration related to their inability to maintain an observation schedule because of their other administrative responsibilities.

2. Other problems were related to: faculty morale, vulnerability of the process, personality problems, teacher acceptance of the evaluation, inflexibility of the plan, difficulty in following to the letter, inability to link to staff develop, etc.

Strengths.

The conclusions listed below identify some of the strengths offered by the principals who took part in this investigation.

1. Principals directed their attention toward establishing a level of comfort for teachers involved in the evaluation process.

2. The subjects attributed the following characteristics to the evaluation plan/process: encouraging and supportive, non-threatening, standard and comprehensive.

Recommendations

The following recommendations were developed as a result of this research and by a review of the literature on teacher evaluation:

1. Principals should be more deliberate in their preparation of teachers for the evaluation process. Such preparation should take into account the necessity to share with faculty the institutional and local goals of improvement of instruction addressed in the evaluation process.
2. Those responsible for evaluating teachers should engage in extended professional dialogue with teachers in order to establish mutual goals and to determine the role each will play in the process.

3. Principals should select methods to match the purpose of evaluation and should vary those methods to meet the unique needs of the teachers involved.

4. Evaluators must recognize that the primary purpose of evaluation is the improvement of instruction and consequently, must tailor their activities to give greater weight to formative evaluation rather than summative evaluation.

5. Assessment of teacher performance should be based heavily on observations of the teaching process made by the principal or his designee.

6. Principals should continue to recognize the value of teacher evaluation training and should take steps to pursue additional training.

7. Chicago Public School principals involved in this study should recognize the need to participate in evaluation training which includes both evaluators and teachers.

8. Those responsible for evaluating teachers must increase the number of formative evaluation visits conducted during the course of the school year. These increased visits may be conducted by the principal or by other professionals trained in the evaluation process.

9. Principals must prioritize their responsibilities and do what is necessary to make teacher evaluation top priority.

10. The Chicago Board of Education and sub-district personnel must demonstrate
their support for the evaluation process by offering support to the evaluation process rather than causing distractions.

11. Principals must continue to recognize the importance of the Board of Education’s evaluation plan but must broaden their techniques to incorporate those components identified in the literature as effective.

12. Evaluators must recognize the importance of giving more than lip-service to the evaluation process.

13. Improvement of instruction must continue to be perceived by evaluators as the major purpose of the evaluation system designed by the Board of Education. The Board must reinforce that perception by providing the resources necessary to make the process effective.

14. Principals should continue to initiate evaluation activities which make teachers feel a sense of security and thereby be willing to be risk-takers in the evaluation process.

15. Participants in this study must continue to make the evaluation process as anxiety-free as possible.

16. Teacher evaluators must recognize the attributes of the system-wide evaluation procedures and align their goals with the system’s goals.

17. The Chicago Board of Education should provide principals and teachers with the resources necessary to make their evaluation practices effective.

18. Problems with which principals are confronted relative to the evaluation process must be examined by all parties concerned. Solutions must be generated from such an examination.

19. The Chicago Principals Association
and the Chicago Teachers' Union should co-sponsor an institute which has teacher evaluation training as one of its major components. The Chicago Board of Education, the Illinois Administrators' Academy and local universities should serve as resources in the endeavor.

Suggestions for Further Research

The following recommendations are made for further research:

1. This study should be replicated to strengthen the conclusion reached here.

2. The study should be broadened to generate conclusions reflective of the entire school system.

3. Research should be conducted in this school system to determine the effect that mutual training of evaluators and teachers would have on the evaluation process.

4. Research should be conducted to determine the effect that level of training has on the evaluation process.

5. A study should be conducted to determine the impact of separating the formative and summative functions which a principal has to execute when those functions are handled by two different individuals.

6. Research should be conducted to determine the validity of making formative evaluation the function of a peer review board independent of the principal.
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