

1-1-1986

A Study Of Teachers' And Principals' (Supervisors') Perceptions Toward Teacher Evaluation Practices

Kenneth C. Hendriksen

Eastern Illinois University

This research is a product of the graduate program in [Educational Administration](#) at Eastern Illinois University. [Find out more](#) about the program.

Recommended Citation

Hendriksen, Kenneth C., "A Study Of Teachers' And Principals' (Supervisors') Perceptions Toward Teacher Evaluation Practices" (1986). *Masters Theses*. 665.
<http://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/665>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

A STUDY OF TEACHERS' AND PRINCIPALS' (SUPERVISORS')
PERCEPTIONS TOWARD TEACHER EVALUATION PRACTICES

KENNETH C. HENDRIKSEN

THESIS REPRODUCTION CERTIFICATE

TO: Graduate Degree Candidates who have written formal theses.

SUBJECT: Permission to reproduce theses.

The University Library is receiving a number of requests from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow theses to be copied.

Please sign one of the following statements:

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

8-6-86

Date

Kenneth C. Spindler

Author

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University not allow my thesis be reproduced because _____

Date

Author

A STUDY OF TEACHERS' AND PRINCIPALS' (SUPERVISORS')

PERCEPTIONS TOWARD TEACHER EVALUATION PRACTICES

(TITLE)

BY

Kenneth C. Hendriksen

FIELD EXPERIENCE

XXXI **THESIS**

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

Specialist in Education

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1986

YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

25 July 1986
DATE

Harry Mengis
ADVISER

July 25, 1986
DATE

Donald W. Smalley
DEPARTMENT HEAD

ABSTRACT

With the passage of Senate Bill 730 (P.A.84-126), the Illinois State Board of Education was summoned to establish administrators' training workshops. This field experience investigated the perceptions of Macon County teachers and principals' (supervisors') toward past evaluation practices. A two tailed t-test for the difference of means at the .05 level of significance was used to analyze the data collected from a modified random sample of the 1417 teachers and a total sample of the 85 principals (supervisors) within Macon County. The hypothesis that teacher and principal (supervisor) perceptions would differ was rejected for 12 of the 54 items and accepted for 42 of the items tested. Two-tailed t-tests were conducted on the perceptions of elementary and secondary principals (supervisors) and found that only 3 of the 54 items showed statistically significant differences. Statistically significant differences in perceptions of elementary and secondary teachers were found on only 4 of the 54 items. Results of the study indicated that principals (supervisors) and teachers generally agreed with past evaluation practices, although teachers agreed less than did the principals (supervisors). This data provides baseline information for future studies of the impact of the Illinois Administrators' Academy training workshops on teachers' and administrators' perceptions of teacher evaluation practices.

A Study of Teachers' and Principals' (Supervisors')
Perceptions Toward Teacher Evaluation Practices

Field Experience Paper

Kenneth C. Hendriksen

July, 1986

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES	ii
--------------------------------------	----

CHAPTER

I. OVERVIEW OF THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction.	1
Hypothesis.	2
Statement of the Problem.	2
Limitations of the Study.	3
Definition of Terms	3
II. RATIONALE, RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH.	7
Rationale	7
Review of Literature and Related Research	8
Uniqueness of the Study	11
III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY	13
Overview.	13
Sample and Population	13
Data Collection and Instrumentation	14
Data Analysis	15
IV. RESULTS	18
Overview.	18
Specific Results for Each Item.	19
Items on Which Teachers and Principals Differed Most Significantly	33
Items on Which Elementary and Secondary Principals (Supervisors) Differed Significantly	36
Items on Which Elementary and Secondary Teachers Differed Significantly	38
Principal (Supervisor) Evaluation Methods in General (Items 1,4,11,21)	40
Various Uses of Teacher Evaluations (Items 12-16,22).	41
Teacher Evaluations Conducted by Someone Other than the Principal (Items 2,3,5-10,17-20,23).	42
Pre-Observation Conferences Conducted by the Principal or Supervisor (Items 24-31)	43
Classroom Observations Conducted by the Principal or Supervisor (Items 32-42)	44
Post-Observation Conferences Conducted by the Principal or Supervisor (Items 43-54)	45
V. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	47
APPENDICIES	52
LIST OF REFERENCES.	64

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE:

1. Percentages and Frequencies of Returned Surveys.	17
2. Total Items Showing Significant Differences.	18
3. Analysis of 54 Items	19
4. Significant Differences between Elementary and Secondary Principals (Supervisors)	36
5. Significant Differences between Elementary and Secondary Teachers	38
6. Group 1 - Principal (Supervisor) Evaluation Methods.	40
7. Group 2 - Various Uses of Teacher Evaluations.	41
8. Group 3 - Teacher Evaluations Conducted by Someone Other than Principal	42
9. Group 4 - Pre-Observation Conferences.	43
10. Group 5 - Classroom Observations	44
11. Group 6 - Post-Observation Conferences	45

CHAPTER I

OVERVIEW OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

As part of the education reforms contained in Senate Bill 730 (P.A. 84-126), the State Board of Education was directed to establish an Illinois Administrators' Academy for all administrators who evaluate teachers and who will be listed in their district's evaluation plan to be submitted in October, 1986. This task was assigned to Education Service Centers throughout the State of Illinois, who were directed to conduct administrative training under the following guidelines:

1. The training on classroom observation of teachers will be of 24 hours duration. That training can be offered as a session of three consecutive days, three one-day sessions, or six half-day sessions. All administrators who evaluate teachers must attend this training workshop.
2. The training on evaluation of principals as instructional leaders must be two days in length. This training will probably be offered in a single two-day workshop, but other configurations could be designed to meet the needs of all those assigned to the evaluation of principals, especially superintendents and assistant superintendents.

3. The selection of the academy's trainers are made by the Education Service Centers using the following criteria outlined in the November 19, 1985 memorandum addressed to all Regional Superintendents from Richard A. Haney, Asst. Superintendent of the Illinois State Board of Education, Mt. Vernon office. Trainers should have: (a) experience in training, (b) training skills in lecture methods and group process skills, (c) interpersonal skills, (d) awareness of teacher observation systems and research on effective teaching, (e) awareness of adult learning theory, and (f) prior teaching experience.

The purposes of Senate Bill 730 (P.A. 84-126) regarding the requirement for an Administrators' Academy were twofold:

1. To offer principals alternative techniques and procedures in the teacher evaluation process, thereby resulting in the improvement of instruction provided by classroom teachers.

2. To provide an outline to administrators of the procedural requirements for remediation and/or dismissal of unsatisfactory teachers.

Hypothesis

This study was conducted under the hypothesis that principals (supervisors) perceived that they were doing a better job of evaluating teachers than their teachers

perceived them to be doing and that teachers feel past evaluation practices have been ineffective.

Statement of the Problem

This study was conducted to investigate teachers' and principals' (supervisors') perceptions toward teacher evaluation practices prior to the Macon County Illinois Administrators' Academy training workshops.

This study was also conducted to provide baseline data for future studies regarding the effectiveness of the Administrators' Academy in changing principal (supervisor) and teacher perceptions of teacher evaluation in Macon County. Furthermore, the baseline data can help administrators gain a clearer understanding of teacher perceptions of evaluation as it has been practiced in the past.

Limitations of the Study

There were two major limitations related to this study:

1. It was conducted only in Macon County, where there is one large unit district of 12,000 students, one medium sized unit district of 2,600 students, and seven very small unit districts. There were no elementary or high school districts surveyed. Thus, this study is not representative of all geographic areas or school types in Illinois.

2. This study dealt solely with administrator and

teacher perceptions. There was no objective data to establish the accuracy of these perceptions included in the study.

Definitions of Terms

In order that a more accurate understanding of this study can be achieved, the following operational definitions are provided:

1. Evaluation process - the complete procedure (start to finish) used by a school district when a teacher is evaluated.
2. Classroom observation - when the principal (supervisor) enters a classroom for the purpose of evaluating a teacher.
3. Administrators' Academy - a recognized agency of the State of Illinois that conducts required workshops for those administrators who have the responsibility of evaluating teachers.
4. Teachers - those professional educators listed in the Macon County Directory, to include classroom teachers, special education teachers, guidance counselors, librarians, Chapter I specialists, and other itinerate teachers who are evaluated by administrators.
5. Elementary teachers - those professional educators whose main teaching assignment deals with kindergarten through sixth grade students.
6. Secondary teachers - those professional educators

whose main teaching assignment deals with seventh through twelfth grade students.

7. Pre-Conference - a meeting conducted by a principal (supervisor) prior to the formal observation.

8. Post-Conference - a meeting conducted by a principal (supervisors) after the formal observation is completed.

9. Elementary Principals (Supervisors) - those professional educators whose main administrative assignment deals with the evaluation of kindergarten through sixth grade teachers.

10. Secondary Principals (Supervisors) - those professional educators whose main administrative assignment deals with the evaluation of seventh through twelfth grade teachers.

11. Trainers - the university personnel, practicing administrators, or consultants assigned to the duty of conducting the evaluation workshops for principals (supervisors).

12. Criteria for Effective Teaching - those teaching behaviors and techniques demonstrated by effective teachers as substantiated by research.

13. Evaluation instrument - a district approved form (or group of forms) used in the teacher evaluation process.

14. Other methods of evaluation - those methods used by evaluators other than the classroom observation, such

as video tapes, checklists, student evaluation forms, and peer evaluation methods.

15. Formative Evaluation - the process of evaluating teachers in an on-going and non-threatening mode, one where personnel decisions will not be made.

16. Summative Evaluation - the process of evaluating teachers for making personnel decisions related to employment or dismissal. This is a more threatening process than the formative one.

CHAPTER II

RATIONALE, RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

Rationale

This study was conducted prior to the Illinois Administrators' Academy training workshops in order that baseline data could be provided for future follow-up studies relating to the effectiveness of these required workshops. One indicator of effectiveness would be an improved perception by both teachers and principals of many of the evaluation practices in use. Another indicator might be a narrowing of the gap in perceptions of teachers as compared to the perceptions of principals.

Having been a high school principal for seven years, the author felt that principals (supervisors) perceived themselves doing a better job with teacher evaluations than teachers perceived them to be doing. It was felt that an analysis of the data from this study could help principals (supervisors) gain a clearer understanding of teacher perceptions of evaluation as it has been practiced in the past. Since the author is a trainer for the Illinois Administrators' Academy, it was also hoped that the results of this study could be used for motivating principals (supervisors) during the training sessions.

The survey used in this study together with the baseline data which results from the study should be beneficial in the conducting of subsequent studies

related to administrator and teacher perceptions of evaluation practices.

Review of Literature and Related Research

The attitudes possessed by teachers and principals toward the evaluation process influence the success ratio of the teacher evaluation process (Klassen, 1983). Recent interest in the State of Illinois and national debate on teacher evaluation underscores the need for increased understanding of teachers' attitudes toward this topic. At a philosophical level, the idea of professionalism demands that teachers' perspectives be considered in the design of any evaluation system (Kauchah, 1984). At a pragmatic level, the views of teachers on the validity of various teacher evaluation practices influence their acceptance of these practices, and ultimately their levels of support for the total system.

Attitudes possessed by teachers regarding the evaluation process certainly relate to whether or not evaluation results in a change in the teacher's teaching performance. Klassen (1983) indicates that the supervisors' behavior is the role model, that people need full information, trust and correction, and that teacher attitudes, whether negative or positive, are important for purposes of evaluation. Teachers need to know the purpose and areas of evaluation, feedback system, record keeping and its consequences in an atmosphere of mutual trust. Key

conclusions drawn from the literature suggest that there is a positive relationship between a teacher's perception of the main purpose of evaluations and changes made in teaching techniques after evaluation (Drake, 1984). Natriello (1984) examined the relationship between teacher perceptions of the frequency of evaluation activity and their assessments of their effort and success ratio. He noted that principals feel that they are doing a much better job with teacher evaluations than teachers perceive them to be doing.

Blai (1982) found that teachers and administrators differ widely in their perceptions of what is important in determining teacher effectiveness. He also reported that there was a significant variance between the responses about the success rate of the traditional evaluation process as reported by administrators and teachers.

Coker (1985) studied the correlation between principals' ratings of teacher effectiveness and pupil growth. In this study, Coker assessed the accuracy of principals' judgments of the effectiveness of the teachers they supervise. Coker's findings revealed the relationship between principals' judgments of teacher effectiveness and pupils' gains on achievement tests is very low.

Studying evaluation as a mechanism to link the work of administrators to the work of teachers, Ducksworth (1981) argued that teachers must ultimately internalize the

evaluation process by articulating their tasks, criteria, outcome samples, and appraisals. He continued by suggesting that teachers will do this only if it poses no threat to their personal status and if the results not only improve their efficacy but also lead to necessary changes in administrative practices and policies.

McGreal (1983) stated that positive attitudes promoted by both the teacher and administrator will enhance the ratio of success. He stated that there was no reason for districts to continue traditional evaluation practices that have promoted disdain and dissatisfaction among teachers and supervisors. McGreal offered better ways to develop and conduct teacher evaluation.

McGreal stated that teacher feelings toward evaluation are negatively affected by systems that promote such practices as high-supervisor, low-teacher involvement. Systems of this nature provide no reliable measures of accountability and provide less valuable documentation for potential dismissal procedures. Because of the negativism a system of this nature promotes, administrators seldom offer encouragement for altering classroom instructional behavior. He concluded that systems built around attitudes truly directed toward improving instruction, and having procedures, processes, and instrumentation complementary to positive attitudes, have been shown to significantly increase the likelihood

or promoting change in teacher behavior.

Poor plans and approaches for evaluating teachers raise anxiety among staff, create tension between teachers and administrators, and are the cause of strife between boards and teacher unions (Brodinsky, 1983). One in every five of the returned questionnaires in Brodinsky's study indicated that teacher evaluation plans are indispensable for teacher morale, motivation, and effectiveness.

The analysis of the data collected by Goldsherry, Lee, and others (1984) summarized supervisors' perceptions of the key components of their jobs. The collective responses of the effective principals as reported by teachers defined their principals' role as supportive. They spent a great deal of time interacting with teachers in formal observations or informal contact. These principals perceived their visits to be helpful to teachers, and eighty percent reported that teachers changed as a result of their observations. They perceived their evaluations as being fair and accurate.

Uniqueness of the Study

As the review of the literature suggests, successful evaluation procedures rely largely on the attitudes and perceptions possessed by both the supervisor and teacher. Furthermore, as a result of Senate Bill 730 imposing the requirement that principals (supervisors) attend an

Illinois Administrators' Academy training workshop, it was felt that some type of evaluation should be conducted on the effectiveness of these workshops.

With the above in mind, this study will provide baseline data for future follow-up studies related to the Illinois Administrators' Academy. It will also provide information that should be helpful to those studying the importance of attitudes and perceptions as related to effective teacher evaluation processes.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Overview

This study included a 54 item survey designed to establish baseline data on the perceptions of teachers and principals of past evaluation practices prior to the Illinois Administrators' Academy training workshops. This survey was conducted prior to the participation of any Macon County principals (supervisors) in the initial training sessions.

Further follow-up studies will be able to evaluate whether principal (supervisor) and teacher perceptions of teacher evaluation in Macon County change as a result of the required participation of administrators in the Illinois Administrators' Academy training. In addition, careful review of this field study by principals (supervisors) should give them a clearer understanding of teacher perceptions of evaluation as it has been practiced in the past.

Sample and Population

This study included a modified random sample of the 1,417 public/Catholic elementary and secondary teachers in Macon County. It also included the sampling of all of the 85 Macon County principals (supervisors) who were required to attend the Illinois Administrators' Academy workshops due to the fact that they were responsible

for evaluating teachers. Names and addresses of the teachers and administrators were obtained from the Macon County School Directory prepared by Dr. David Coopridner, Regional Superintendent. This directory is arranged alphabetically according to school districts, and sub-divided alphabetically by individual buildings. The author sampled every tenth (1/10) teacher in the directory, additionally assuring that at least one teacher was surveyed in each building in Macon County. To insure randomness, if an incident occurred where a building was not represented in the selection process, the author assigned a number value of (1-9) to each teacher in that building and drew numbers until one of the assigned numbers was selected.

Data Collection and Instrumentation

The survey (Appendix A) was distributed under a separate cover letter, signed by the author and Dr. Gary Blade, Eastern Illinois University, asking the participants to return responses in a self-addressed envelope enclosed by the author. The Macon County Regional Superintendent's Office mailing network was utilized to distribute and collect the surveys. Macon County teachers were quite familiar with this mailing network, and Mrs. Karen Camp of the Regional Office agreed to collect the responses for the author. Seventy-two percent of the surveys were returned.

Items 1-23 of the survey were used in a study conducted by Kauchah, Peterson, and Driscoll from the University of Utah (1984) when they compared attitudes between Utah and Florida teachers. Approximately half of the items assessed teacher perceptions of practices and procedures used in the two states, while the other half measured teacher perceptions of specific evaluation methods used by administrators such as peer review, student assessments, and evaluation tied to standardized test scores. The questionnaire employed a Graphic format in which teachers were asked to rate the validity of various teacher evaluation practices on a scale from 1 (invalid) to 7 (valid), and 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

Items 24-54 of the survey were mainly developed from a study conducted by Townsend from the Alberta Department of Education (1984). Parts of Townsend's study were taken from a survey completed by J. L. Shinn, when that researcher tried to determine changes in teachers' and supervisors' perceptions of Usual and Ideal Supervision Behavior (1976). This survey employed a scale from 1 (never) to 5 (often) with descriptors.

Data Analysis

A two-tailed t-test for the difference of means was used to analyze the results from the surveys. The author

consulted with the Eastern Illinois Data Processing Department to insure that each response was correctly added and entered into the computer for analysis.

The participants surveyed were broken down into four general groups:

1. Elementary principals (supervisors)
2. Secondary principals (supervisors)
3. Elementary teachers
4. Secondary teachers

Three comparisons were conducted in this study. The first statistical comparison was made between elementary and secondary principals' responses and elementary and secondary teachers' responses. The second statistical comparison was made between elementary principals' and secondary principals' responses. Finally, the third comparison was made between elementary teachers' and secondary teachers' responses.

A two-tailed t test was chosen since the researcher had an explicit hypothesis on only 1 of 3 comparisons conducted. If an item showed a significant difference using a two-tailed t-test, it would also show a significant difference using a one-tailed test. The null hypothesis was accepted if the two-tailed probability for H was less than the .05 level of significance. A t is the statistic used in calculating the probability associated with H (Nie, 1975).

In May, 1986, 235 surveys were distributed to the

participants. Table 1 provides the reader with a chart outlining the percentages and frequencies of returned surveys.

Table 1:

Percentages and Frequencies of Returned Surveys

	<u>Surveyed</u>	<u>Surveys Returned</u>	<u>% Returned</u>
Elementary principals (supervisors)	40	31	78
Secondary principals (supervisors)	45	38	84
Elementary Teachers	81	55	68
Secondary Teachers	69	46	67
<u>TOTAL</u> principals (supervisors)	85	69	81
<u>TOTAL</u> teachers	150	101	67

Of the 85 principals (supervisors) surveyed in the study, 69 participants responded resulting in a 81% return rate. Of the 150 teachers surveyed, 101 responded for a 67% return rate. These rates of return are generally considered to be sufficiently large to permit the assumption that the questionnaires returned were indeed representative of the population sampled.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Overview

The study revealed that 42 of 54 items showed a significant difference when comparing the means between principals' (supervisors') and teachers' responses. It is evident from the data that administrators perceived present evaluation practices more positively than teachers did. An analysis of the frequency of items outlining significant differences (Table 2) in the study found that there were only 3 items which showed a significant difference between elementary principals' and secondary principals' responses, and that only 4 of 54 items in the survey showed a significant difference when elementary and secondary teachers were compared.

Table 2:

Total Items Showing Significant Differences

<u>Groups Compared</u>	<u>No. of Items Showing Significant Difference at .05 Level</u>
Principals (Supervisors) Teachers	42
Elementary Principals (Supervisors) Secondary Principals (Supervisors)	3
Elementary Teachers Secondary Teachers	4

Specific Results for Each Item

Table 3 contains a detailed analysis of each item in the survey, including the mean, N (number of respondents), standard deviation, t-value, and level of significance in the comparison between the three general groups.

Table 3:

Analysis of 54 Items

On items 1-10, a seven point scale with the following description was used.

Examine the following teacher evaluation practices and determine their validity in evaluating the quality of teaching. By valid is meant that the practice is relevant, fair, and appropriate - (Circle a number for each statement.)

		Invalid				Valid		
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<u>Groups Compared</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>t-value</u>	<u>Level of Signif.</u>			
<u>Item 1: Classroom visits by principal</u>								
Prin.(Super.)	69	.75	6.64					
Teachers	101	1.42	5.90	3.95	.001*			
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	.85	6.58					
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	.66	6.68	-.57	.571			
Elem.Teachers	55	1.38	5.95					
Sec.Teachers	46	1.48	5.85	.34	.732			
<u>Item 2: Classroom visits by other teachers</u>								
Prin.(Super.)	69	1.76	4.42					
Teachers	101	1.80	3.83	2.12	.036*			
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	1.79	4.26					
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	1.75	4.56	-.69	.493			
Elem.Teachers	55	1.76	3.36					
Sec.Teachers	46	1.69	4.39	-2.98	.004*			

Table 3 (cont.)

<u>Groups Compared</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>t-value</u>	<u>Level of Signif.</u>
<u>Item 3: Student evaluations through a questionnaire</u>					
Prin.(Super.)	69	1.56	3.83		
Teachers	100	1.59	3.31	2.09	.038*
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	1.35	3.68		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	1.72	3.95	-.71	.479
Elem.Teachers	55	1.49	3.00		
Sec.Teachers	45	1.65	3.69	-2.19	.033*
<u>Item 4: Systematic observation with a check list or observation instrument by a trained observer</u>					
Prin.(Super.)	69	1.09	6.23		
Teachers	101	1.64	5.17	4.73	.001*
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	.97	6.26		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	1.19	6.21	.18	.858
Elem.Teachers	55	1.62	5.13		
Sec.Teachers	46	1.67	5.22	-.27	.785
<u>Item 5: Pupil achievement as measured by standardized achievement tests</u>					
Prin.(Super.)	67	1.52	3.88		
Teachers	101	1.58	3.43	1.85	.066
Elem.Prin(Super.)	29	1.69	3.69		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	1.39	4.03	-.90	.374
Elem.Teachers	55	1.62	3.38		
Sec.Teachers	46	1.56	3.48	-.30	.762
<u>Item 6: Observable teacher skills</u>					
Prin.(Super.)	68	.73	6.37		
Teachers	101	1.16	5.84	3.31	.001*
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	.73	6.37		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	37	.69	6.41	-.46	.645
Elem.Teachers	55	1.16	5.87		
Sec.Teachers	46	1.17	5.80	.29	.769

Table 3 (cont.)

<u>Groups Compared</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>t-value</u>	<u>Level of Signif.</u>
<u>Item 7:</u> Examination of teaching materials such as syllabi, texts, and handouts					
Prin.(Super.)	69	1.23	5.26		
Teachers	101	1.59	4.69	2.49	.014*
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	1.30	5.32		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	1.19	5.21	.37	.710
Elem.Teachers	55	1.65	4.58		
Sec.Teachers	46	1.53	4.83	-.77	.445
<u>Item 8:</u> Teacher self evaluation					
Prin.(Super.)	68	1.13	5.25		
Teachers	101	1.42	5.17	.40	.692
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	1.15	5.48		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	37	1.08	5.06	1.59	.117
Elem.Teachers	55	1.46	5.11		
Sec.Teachers	46	1.39	5.24	-.46	.649
<u>Item 9:</u> Check list focusing on personal characteristics such as friendliness, grooming, and personal appearance					
Prin.(Super.)	68	1.51	4.29		
Teachers	101	1.76	4.21	.33	.742
Elem.Prin(Super.)	30	1.50	4.20		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	1.53	4.37	-.45	.651
Elem.Teachers	55	1.71	4.25		
Sec.Teachers	46	1.84	4.15	.29	.773
<u>Item 10:</u> Check list focusing on teaching characteristics such as organization, pacing, and presentation					
Prin.(Super.)	69	.81	6.39		
Teachers	101	1.09	5.87	3.37	.001*
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	.81	6.45		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	.82	6.34	.56	.579
Elem.Teachers	55	.98	6.04		
Sec.Teachers	46	1.19	5.67	1.68	.097

Table 3 (cont.)

On items 11-23, a seven point scale with the following description was used.

Circle the number which most reflects your feelings about the following statements:

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

<u>Groups Compared</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>t-value</u>	<u>Level of Signif.</u>
<u>Item 11:</u> Teachers should be evaluated at least annually					
Prin.(Super.)	69	2.27	4.72		
Teachers	101	2.17	4.12	1.76	.081
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	2.16	5.16		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	2.32	4.37	1.16	.150
Elem.Teachers	55	2.24	4.11		
Sec.Teachers	46	2.10	4.13	-.05	.961
<u>Item 12:</u> Teacher evaluations should be used to eliminate incompetent teacher(s)					
Prin.(Super.)	69	1.62	5.83		
Teachers	101	2.09	4.44	4.65	.001*
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	1.71	5.77		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	1.56	5.87	-.24	.812
Elem.Teachers	55	2.08	4.47		
Sec.Teachers	46	2.12	4.39	.19	.847
<u>Item 13:</u> Teacher evaluations should be used to identify superior teachers					
Prin.(Super.)	68	1.48	5.90		
Teachers	101	1.88	4.60	4.76	.001*
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	1.62	5.81		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	37	1.36	5.97	-.46	.647
Elem.Teachers	55	1.96	4.64		
Sec.Teachers	46	1.81	4.57	.19	.851

Table 3 (cont.)

<u>Groups Compared</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>t-value</u>	<u>Level of Signif.</u>
<u>Item 14:</u> Teachers should be paid according to how well they teach (merit pay)					
Prin.(Super.)	68	1.86	4.15		
Teachers	100	1.96	2.98	3.87	.001*
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	2.18	3.90		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	1.53	4.35	-.99	.325
Elem.Teachers	55	1.71	2.45		
Sec.Teachers	45	2.07	3.62	-3.09	.003*
<u>Item 15:</u> It is possible to identify good teaching when it occurs					
Prin.(Super.)	69	.98	6.46		
Teachers	100	1.51	5.64	3.99	.001*
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	.89	6.48		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	1.06	6.45	.15	.879
Elem.Teachers	54	1.53	5.70		
Sec.Teachers	46	1.50	5.57	.46	.649
<u>Item 16:</u> It is possible to identify poor teaching when it occurs					
Prin.(Super.)	69	1.46	6.28		
Teachers	100	1.50	5.74	2.30	.023*
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	1.25	6.36		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	1.63	6.21	.40	.687
Elem.Teachers	54	1.40	5.93		
Sec.Teachers	46	1.60	5.52	1.35	.181
<u>Item 17:</u> Most teachers in a school know who the good and bad teachers are in that school					
Prin.(Super.)	69	1.12	5.84		
Teachers	100	1.57	5.70	.64	.524
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	1.17	5.68		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	1.08	5.97	-1.09	.277
Elem.Teachers	55	1.43	5.96		
Sec.Teachers	46	1.69	5.39	1.83	.070

Table 3 (cont.)

<u>Groups Compared</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>t-value</u>	<u>Level of Signif.</u>
<u>Item 18:</u> Most teachers agree on what constitutes good teaching					
Prin.(Super.)	69	1.19	4.93		
Teachers	101	1.69	4.81	.49	.624
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	1.30	5.10		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	1.09	4.79	1.07	.290
Elem.Teachers	55	1.60	4.93		
Sec.Teachers	46	1.80	4.67	.75	.456
<u>Item 19:</u> Students can tell if a teacher is a good teacher or not (Respond in terms of <u>your</u> teaching levels)					
Prin.(Super.)	69	1.29	4.86		
Teachers	101	1.85	4.35	1.98	.049*
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	1.35	4.81		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	1.25	4.89	-.28	.779
Elem.Teachers	55	1.83	3.71		
Sec.Teachers	46	1.57	5.10	-4.08	.001*
<u>Item 20:</u> Parents can tell if a teacher is a good teacher or not					
Prin.(Super.)	68	1.37	3.94		
Teachers	101	1.47	3.58	1.63	.104
Elem.Prin(Super.)	30	1.42	3.83		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	1.35	4.02	-.57	.568
Elem.Teachers	55	1.56	3.62		
Sec.Teachers	46	1.38	3.52	.33	.745
<u>Item 21:</u> The principal in a school can tell if a teacher is a good teacher or not					
Prin.(Super.)	69	.61	6.55		
Teachers	100	1.45	5.39	6.28	.001*
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	.67	6.39		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	.53	6.68	-2.07	.042*
Elem.Teachers	54	1.49	5.39		
Sec.Teachers	46	1.42	5.39	-.01	.993

Table 3 (cont.)

<u>Groups Compared</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>t-value</u>	<u>Level of Signif.</u>
<u>Item 22:</u> Teaching evaluations should only be used to improve teaching and not for retention or firing					
Prin.(Super.)	68	2.15	3.47		
Teachers	101	2.07	4.51	-3.14	.002*
Elem.Prin(Super.)	30	1.91	2.77		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	2.19	4.03	-2.49	.015*
Elem.Teachers	55	2.09	4.47		
Sec.Teachers	46	2.07	4.54	-.17	.865
<u>Item 23:</u> Teachers know if they are doing a good job					
Prin.(Super.)	69	1.18	4.90		
Teachers	101	1.21	5.70	-4.30	.001*
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	1.17	4.90		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	1.20	4.89	.03	.977
Elem.Teachers	55	1.29	5.76		
Sec.Teachers	46	1.12	5.63	.55	.585

On items 24-54, a five point scale with the following description was used.

Circle the number which most reflects your perception of supervisor behaviors:

1 2 3 4 5
Never Seldom Sometimes Usually Often

<u>Groups Compared</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>t-value</u>	<u>Level of Signif.</u>
<u>Item 24:</u> Supervisor meets with teacher					
Prin.(Super.)	69	.80	4.48		
Teachers	101	1.06	3.72	5.03	.001*
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	.89	4.55		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	.72	4.42	.66	.513
Elem.Teachers	55	1.14	3.67		
Sec.Teachers	46	.96	3.78	-.52	.606

Table 3 (cont.)

<u>Groups Compared</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>t-value</u>	<u>Level of Signif.</u>
<u>Item 25:</u> Supervisor finds out about teacher's objectives					
Prin.(Super.)	69	.65	4.43		
Teachers	101	1.10	3.76	4.57	.001*
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	.62	4.55		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	.67	4.34	1.31	.191
Elem.Teachers	55	1.05	3.84		
Sec.Teachers	46	1.16	3.67	.74	.461
<u>Item 26:</u> Supervisor finds out about what teacher expects students to be doing					
Prin.(Super.)	68	.66	4.35		
Teachers	100	1.07	3.69	4.55	.001*
Elem.Prin(Super.)	30	.63	4.50		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	.68	4.27	1.64	.102
Elem.Teachers	54	1.08	3.76		
Sec.Teachers	46	1.06	3.61	.70	.486
<u>Item 27:</u> Supervisor finds out about teacher's problems and/or concerns					
Prin.(Super.)	68	.68	4.25		
Teachers	100	1.07	3.52	4.99	.001*
Elem.Prin(Super.)	30	.62	4.40		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	.70	4.13	1.64	.105
Elem.Teachers	54	1.08	3.52		
Sec.Teachers	46	1.07	3.52	0.01	.988
<u>Item 28:</u> Supervisor involves teacher in deciding the focus of observation					
Prin.(Super.)	69	.98	3.96		
Teachers	101	1.27	3.41	3.04	.003*
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	.88	4.03		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	1.06	3.89	.58	.565
Elem.Teachers	55	1.28	3.35		
Sec.Teachers	46	1.26	3.48	-.52	.602

Table 3 (cont.)

<u>Groups Compared</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>t-value</u>	<u>Level of Signif.</u>
<u>Item 29:</u> Supervisor helps teacher translate concerns into specific teaching behaviors					
Prin.(Super.) Teachers	69 100	.81 1.17	4.10 3.37	4.51	.001*
Elem.Prin(Super.) Sec.Prin(Super.)	31 38	.75 .82	4.32 3.92	2.11	.039*
Elem.Teachers Sec.Teachers	55 45	1.21 1.12	3.45 3.27	.80	.427
<u>Item 30:</u> Supervisor suggests a variety of observational techniques					
Prin.(Super.) Teachers	69 100	.85 1.21	3.67 2.91	4.49	.001*
Elem.Prin(Super.) Sec.Prin(Super.)	31 38	.88 .84	3.61 3.71	-.47	.639
Elem.Teachers Sec.Teachers	55 45	1.20 1.22	2.96 2.84	.49	.626
<u>Item 31:</u> Supervisor suggests data-gathering methods teacher can use alone					
Prin.(Super.) Teachers	69 99	.91 1.22	3.35 2.73	3.59	.001*
Elem.Prin(Super.) Sec.Prin(Super.)	31 38	1.00 .83	3.45 3.26	.86	.393
Elem.Teachers Sec.Teachers	55 44	1.30 1.12	2.78 2.66	.50	.621
<u>Item 32:</u> Supervisor makes verbatim notes of classroom interactions					
Prin.(Super.) Teachers	69 100	1.10 1.14	4.13 4.03	.57	.569
Elem.Prin(Super.) Sec.Prin(Super.)	31 38	1.22 1.00	4.10 4.16	-.23	.820
Elem.Teachers Sec.Teachers	55 45	1.08 1.22	4.09 3.96	.59	.558

Table 3 (cont.)

<u>Groups Compared</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>t-value</u>	<u>Level of Signif.</u>
<u>Item 33:</u> Supervisor writes down teacher's questions					
Prin.(Super.)	69	.96	3.54		
Teachers	99	1.32	3.37	.87	.384
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	1.03	3.42		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	.91	3.63	-.91	.367
Elem.Teachers	54	1.27	3.51		
Sec.Teachers	45	1.38	3.20	1.20	.234
<u>Item 34:</u> Supervisor writes down student responses					
Prin.(Super.)	69	.93	3.49		
Teachers	99	1.26	3.31	1.01	.315
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	1.03	3.52		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	.86	3.47	.19	.853
Elem.Teachers	54	1.21	3.46		
Sec.Teachers	45	1.31	3.13	1.30	.196
<u>Item 35:</u> Supervisor records student at-risk behavior					
Prin.(Super.)	69	.87	3.72		
Teachers	98	1.19	3.36	2.19	.030*
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	.87	3.68		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	.88	3.76	-.40	.688
Elem.Teachers	54	1.15	3.52		
Sec.Teachers	44	1.22	3.16	1.50	.137
<u>Item 36:</u> Supervisor charts pattern and amount of student responses					
Prin.(Super.)	69	1.06	3.06		
Teachers	99	1.23	2.70	1.98	.050*
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	1.09	3.06		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	1.04	3.05	.05	.963
Elem.Teachers	54	1.33	2.67		
Sec.Teachers	45	1.12	2.73	-.27	.790

Table 3 (cont.)

<u>Groups Compared</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>t-value</u>	<u>Level of Signif.</u>
<u>Item 37:</u> Supervisor makes audiotape recordings					
Prin.(Super.)	69	.76	1.58		
Teachers	100	.71	1.34	2.10	.038*
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	.67	1.61		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	.83	1.55	.33	.744
Elem.Teachers	55	.73	1.35		
Sec.Teachers	45	.71	1.33	.08	.933
<u>Item 38:</u> Supervisor charts physical movements of teacher and/or students					
Prin.(Super.)	69	1.10	3.07		
Teachers	98	1.34	2.45	3.18	.002*
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	.99	3.13		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	1.20	3.03	.38	.703
Elem.Teachers	54	1.36	2.46		
Sec.Teachers	44	1.34	2.43	.11	.910
<u>Item 39:</u> Supervisor makes videotape recordings					
Prin.(Super.)	68	.91	1.68		
Teachers	99	.64	1.29	3.20	.002*
Elem.Prin(Super.)	30	.94	1.77		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	.89	1.60	.73	.469
Elem.Teachers	54	.56	1.26		
Sec.Teachers	45	.74	1.33	-.57	.571
<u>Item 40:</u> Supervisor observes a specific child					
Prin.(Super.)	69	1.05	3.09		
Teachers	100	1.13	2.63	2.66	.009*
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	.82	3.16		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	1.22	3.02	.53	.600
Elem.Teachers	55	1.14	2.64		
Sec.Teachers	45	1.11	2.62	.06	.951

Table 3 (cont.)

<u>Groups Compared</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>t-value</u>	<u>Level of Signif.</u>
<u>Item 41:</u> Supervisor records subjective feelings about the lesson					
Prin.(Super.)	69	.97	3.61		
Teachers	99	1.15	3.42	1.09	.279
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	1.05	3.61		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	.92	3.60	.03	.974
Elem.Teachers	54	1.27	3.39		
Sec.Teachers	45	1.01	3.47	-.33	.740
<u>Item 42:</u> Supervisor stays for at least 30 minutes					
Prin.(Super.)	69	.62	4.71		
Teachers	100	1.17	4.03	4.42	.001*
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	.81	4.58		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	.39	4.82	-1.58	.118
Elem.Teachers	55	1.07	4.16		
Sec.Teachers	45	1.27	3.87	1.27	.207
<u>Item 43:</u> Supervisor meets with teacher each time					
Prin.(Super.)	69	.57	4.64		
Teachers	99	1.09	4.33	2.13	.035*
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	.62	4.55		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	.52	4.71	-1.18	.241
Elem.Teachers	54	1.14	4.30		
Sec.Teachers	45	1.03	4.38	-.37	.713
<u>Item 44:</u> Supervisor provides teacher with direct advice for improvement					
Prin.(Super.)	69	.63	4.49		
Teachers	100	1.12	3.90	3.97	.001*
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	.68	4.52		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	.60	4.47	.28	.784
Elem.Teachers	55	1.04	3.95		
Sec.Teachers	45	1.22	3.84	.45	.657

Table 3 (cont.)

<u>Groups Compared</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>t-value</u>	<u>Level of Signif.</u>
<u>Item 45:</u> Supervisor provides opinions regarding teacher's teaching					
Prin.(Super.)	69	.64	4.36		
Teachers	100	.92	4.20	1.27	.207
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	.62	4.45		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	.65	4.29	1.05	.299
Elem.Teachers	55	.93	4.18		
Sec.Teachers	45	.93	4.22	-.22	.829
<u>Item 46:</u> Supervisor relates teacher's perceptions to the collected data					
Prin.(Super.)	69	.78	3.96		
Teachers	99	1.11	3.60	2.34	.021*
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	.75	4.10		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	.79	3.84	1.37	.177
Elem.Teachers	55	1.06	3.73		
Sec.Teachers	44	1.15	3.43	1.33	.188
<u>Item 47:</u> Supervisor encourages teacher to analyze the collected data					
Prin.(Super.)	69	.90	3.88		
Teachers	99	1.20	3.42	2.70	.008
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	.73	4.06		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	1.01	3.74	1.52	.134
Elem.Teachers	55	1.21	3.44		
Sec.Teachers	44	1.19	3.40	.11	.911
<u>Item 48:</u> Supervisor asks teacher clarifying and probing questions					
Prin.(Super.)	69	.83	3.84		
Teachers	99	1.16	3.22	3.80	.001*
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	.73	4.00		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	.90	3.71	1.45	.153
Elem.Teachers	55	1.12	3.18		
Sec.Teachers	44	1.21	3.27	-.39	.700

Table 3 (cont.)

<u>Groups Compared</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>t-value</u>	<u>Level of Signif.</u>
<u>Item 49:</u> Supervisor encourages teacher to consider alternative strategies					
Prin.(Super.)	69	.71	3.97		
Teachers	100	1.10	3.36	4.08	.001*
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	.73	4.00		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	.70	3.95	.31	.761
Elem.Teachers	55	1.11	3.46		
Sec.Teachers	45	1.09	3.13	1.44	.153
<u>Item 50:</u> Supervisor is willing to modify personal objectives for the conference					
Prin.(Super.)	66	.86	3.56		
Teachers	97	1.10	3.32	2.71	.007*
Elem.Prin(Super.)	30	.82	3.77		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	36	.91	3.75	.08	.938
Elem.Teachers	54	1.15	3.46		
Sec.Teachers	43	1.04	3.13	1.44	.153
<u>Item 51:</u> Supervisor listens more than talks					
Prin.(Super.)	69	.80	3.35		
Teachers	100	1.11	2.97	2.42	.017*
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	.93	3.48		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	.68	3.27	1.28	.205
Elem.Teachers	55	1.10	3.11		
Sec.Teachers	45	1.12	2.80	1.39	.169
<u>Item 52:</u> Supervisor acknowledges teacher's comments and suggestions					
Prin.(Super.)	69	.59	4.36		
Teachers	100	.99	3.93	3.25	.008*
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	.56	4.42		
Sec.Prin(Supr.)	38	.62	4.32	.72	.475
Elem.Teachers	55	.91	4.05		
Sec.Teachers	45	1.06	3.77	1.40	.164

Table 3 (cont.)

<u>Groups Compared</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>t-value</u>	<u>Level of Signif.</u>
<u>Item 53:</u> Supervisor gives praise and encouragement for specific growth					
Prin.(Super.)	69	.44	4.74		
Teachers	100	1.15	4.04	4.83	.001*
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	.45	4.74		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	.45	4.74	.05	.962
Elem.Teachers	55	1.11	4.15		
Sec.Teachers	45	1.18	3.91	1.02	.311
<u>Item 54:</u> Supervisor recommends additional resources					
Prin.(Super.)	69	.73	4.06		
Teachers	99	1.12	3.37	4.46	.001*
Elem.Prin(Super.)	31	.80	4.03		
Sec.Prin(Super.)	38	.67	4.08	-.26	.792
Elem.Teachers	54	1.06	3.50		
Sec.Teachers	45	1.19	3.22	1.23	.221
<u>Note:</u> Prin.=principals; Super.=supervisors; N=number of respondents to item; Level of Signif.=level of significance; Elem.=elementary; and Sec.=secondary.					

Items on Which Teachers and Principals (Supervisors)

Differed Most Significantly

A discussion of the five items from Table 3 that showed a t-value of 4.76 or greater follows, as does a discussion of those items which show a statistically significant difference between responses of elementary and secondary principals (supervisors) and between elementary and secondary teachers. Finally, items are grouped according to common factors and general concepts as to the difference

between teachers' and principals' (supervisors') perceptions on formal evaluation procedures. In discussion of the following items, the average mean score for all teacher responses to items 1-23 was 4.74, and the average mean score for the same group for items 24-54 was 3.31. Furthermore, the average mean score for all principals (supervisors) to items 1-23 was 5.23, and the average mean score for that group for items 24-54 was 3.79.

Item 27: Prior to formal observation supervisor finds out about teacher's problems and/or concerns.

The t-value calculated for item 27 showed a numerical computation of 4.99. The level of significance of .001 showed a statistical disparity in the perceptions of principals (supervisors) and teachers replying to this item, but the mean score of 3.52 for teacher responses was between sometimes and usually. Principals with a mean score of 4.25, said they usually to always find out about teacher problems and/or concerns.

Item 24: Prior to formal observation supervisor meets with teacher

The t-value calculated for item 24 showed a numerical computation of 5.03. A comparison of the responses made by teachers and principals (supervisors) to this item item signified that teachers perceived a meeting before

formal observations as taking place less often than the principals (supervisors) perceived themselves as conducting a pre-observation meeting. The mean score of 3.72 for teacher responses showed that teachers perceived pre-observation conferences taking place between sometimes and usually, where principals (supervisors) perceived pre-observation conferences taking place between usually and often.

Item 21: The principal in a school can tell if a teacher is a good teacher or not.

The t-value calculated for question 21 showed a numerical computation of 6.28. Of all the items contained in the survey, the response to item 21 showed the greatest disparity in teacher and principal (supervisor) perceptions concerning the evaluation process. Although the analysis of this item showed the largest statistical significance in the responses between principals

(supervisors) and teachers, the mean score of 5.39 for teachers' responses revealed that teachers agreed less with the idea that the principal can tell if a teacher is good or not. However, both groups showed a moderate to strong agreement that the principal can tell if a teacher is good or not.

Item 53: Supervisor gives praise and encouragement for specific growth

The t-value for question 53 was 4.83. The mean score for the teacher responses for this question was 4.04, higher than the average mean score of 3.31 for teacher responses to questions 24-54. The mean score for the principals (supervisors) was 4.74. Thus, principals perceived themselves as giving praise and encouragement between usually and often, where teachers responded that this takes place usually.

Item 13: Teacher evaluations should be used to identify superior teachers

The t-value for item 13 was 4.76. This item showed a statistical significant difference between the teachers' mean of 4.60 and principals' (supervisors') mean of 5.90. Teachers, on average, mildly agreed that evaluations should be used to identify superior teachers, while principals (supervisors) clearly agreed that this practice should take place.

Items on Which Elementary and Secondary Principals (Supervisors) Differed Significantly

Table 4 outlines the three items on the survey where there were statistically significant differences when elementary and secondary principals' (supervisors') responses were compared.

Table 4

Significant Differences between Elementary and Secondary Principals (Supervisors)

Items	Elem.Prin. (Supervisors)	Sec.Prin. (Supervisors)	t-value	Level of Significance
	Mean	Mean		
21	6.39	6.68	-2.07	.042
22	2.77	4.03	-2.49	.015
29	4.32	3.92	2.11	.039

Those items showing a statistical significant difference are discussed individually below.

Item 21: The principal in a school can tell if a teacher is a good teacher or not

Although there was a statistically significant difference between elementary and secondary principals' (supervisors') mean responses to this item, the average mean scores were very high on this topic for both groups. Thus, both groups had a high degree of confidence that the principal in a school could tell who the good teachers in the building were.

Item 22: Teaching evaluations should only be used to improve teaching and not for retention or firing

The results of this item were quite interesting. The mean score of 2.77 for elementary principals (supervisors) as compared to 4.03 for secondary principals (supervisors)

showed that the elementary participants disagreed heavily with their secondary counterparts on this issue, although the secondary principals (supervisors) tended to be neutral on this item.

Item 29: Supervisor helps teacher translate concerns into specific teaching behaviors

Although there was a significant difference in the responses between the two groups on this item, elementary principals (supervisors) responded that they translated teacher concerns into specific teaching behaviors between usually and often, where secondary principals (supervisors) stated that they usually practiced the above.

Items on Which Elementary and Secondary Teachers Differed Significantly

Table 5 outlines the four items of the survey where a statistical difference occurred between elementary and secondary teacher responses.

Table 5

Significant Differences between Elementary and Secondary Teachers

<u>Items</u>	<u>Elementary Teachers Mean</u>	<u>Secondary Teachers Mean</u>	<u>t-value</u>	<u>Level of Significance</u>
2	3.36	4.39	-2.39	.004
3	3.00	3.69	-2.19	.033
14	2.45	3.62	-3.09	.003
19	3.71	5.10	-4.08	.001

Those items showing a statistical significant difference are discussed individually below.

Item 2: Classroom visits by other teachers

There was a significant difference in the response to this item when the two groups were compared. The mean score of 3.36 for the elementary teachers indicating a mild trend toward judging this as invalid surprised the author since he perceived a high level of cooperative teaching and horizontal articulation at the elementary level. Secondary teachers with a mean score of 4.39 tended slightly above neutral toward classroom visits by other teachers being valid in determining quality teaching.

Item 3: Student evaluations through a questionnaire

Although there was a significant difference in the responses of elementary and secondary teachers to students evaluating teachers, there was agreement between the two groups that this practice was invalid in determining quality teaching. Since elementary teachers deal with younger students, the significant difference probably reflects less confidence by elementary teachers in student ratings as a result of the students' maturity levels.

Item 14: Teachers should be paid according to how well they teach (merit pay)

Although the mean scores for both groups were below the neutral point of 4.00 for this item, it was surprising

that the two groups differed significantly on the topic of merit pay. Secondary teachers disagreed less toward this practice than elementary teachers did.

Item 19: Students can tell if a teacher is a good teacher or not

The mean score for the elementary teachers to this item was 3.71, as compared to the secondary teachers' mean score of 5.10. Elementary teachers tended toward disagreement where secondary teachers indicated a moderate tendency toward agreement.

Principal (Supervisor) Evaluation Methods in General
(Items 1,4,11,21)

Table 6

Group 1 - Principal (Supervisor) Evaluation Methods in General

<u>Item</u>	<u>Principals (Supervisors) Mean</u>	<u>Teachers Mean</u>	<u>t-value</u>	<u>Level of Significance</u>
1	6.64	5.90	3.95	.001
4	6.23	5.17	4.73	.001
11	4.72	4.12	1.76	.081
21	6.55	5.39	6.28	.001
Ave.	6.04	5.15	4.18	

All four items in Group 1 were significantly different with the exception of item 11. Although the comparison of the mean scores between these two participating groups

shows that principals' (supervisors') perceptions were more positive than the teachers' perceptions, the teacher responses were well above the neutral point of 4.00. Thus, it can be concluded that teachers generally believed past evaluation methods were valid.

Various Uses of Teacher Evaluations (Items 12-16,22)

Table 7

Group 2 - Various Uses of Teacher Evaluations

<u>Item</u>	<u>Principals (Supervisors) Mean</u>	<u>Teachers Mean</u>	<u>t-value</u>	<u>Level of Significance</u>
12	5.83	4.44	4.65	.001
13	5.90	4.60	4.76	.001
14	4.15	2.98	3.87	.001
15	6.46	5.64	3.99	.001
16	6.28	5.74	2.30	.023
22	3.47	4.51	-3.14	.002
Ave.	5.35	4.65	3.75	

All six items in Group 2 were significantly different different when principal (supervisor) and teacher responses were compared. Although there was a high degree of significance in the responses to the use of teacher evaluations, the average mean score for the teachers was still above the neutral point of 4.00. An analysis of the results from item 22 shows that teachers tend to agree that all evaluations should be formative while the average mean score of 3.47 for principals (supervisors) shows a mild

trend to agree that evaluations should be used to make personnel decisions.

Item 14 dealt with merit pay. A review of the results relating to this concept shows that teachers tended to disagree with using teacher evaluation as a means for compensation. Principals (supervisors) were essentially neutral on this approach.

It can be concluded from the results from Group 2 that although there were significant differences between teachers' and principals' (supervisors') scores on all six items addressing the topic of uses of evaluations, teachers and principals (supervisors) generally agreed with the ways the evaluations have been used in the past. However, teachers disagreed with the use of evaluations for merit pay. Principals (supervisors) were neutral on this concept.

Teacher Evaluations Conducted by Someone Other Than
Principal (Items 2,3,5-10,17-20,23)

Table 8

Group 3 - Teacher Evaluations Conducted by Someone
Other Than Principal

(Data on following page)

Group 3 - Teacher Evaluations Conducted by Someone
Other Than Principal

<u>Item</u>	<u>Principal (Supervisor) Mean</u>	<u>Teachers Mean</u>	<u>t-value</u>	<u>Level of Significance</u>
2	4.42	3.83	2.12	.036
3	3.83	3.31	2.09	.038
5	3.88	3.43	1.85	.066
6	6.37	5.84	3.31	.001
7	5.26	4.69	2.49	.014
8	5.25	5.17	.40	.692
9	4.29	4.21	.33	.742
10	6.39	5.87	3.37	.001
17	5.84	5.70	.64	.524
18	4.93	4.81	.49	.624
19	4.86	4.35	1.98	.049
20	3.94	3.58	1.63	.104
23	4.90	5.70	-4.30	.001
Ave.	4.94	4.65	1.92	

A review of the findings from Group 3 shows that teachers felt alternative types of evaluation as compared to evaluation by principals (supervisors) were invalid or disagreed with such alternatives. Principals (supervisors) tended to be neutral or show a slight tendency to agree with such alternatives. The alternative methods addressed on the survey included: (a) peer evaluation (item 2), (b) students evaluating teachers (item 3), (c) teacher evaluation using results from standardized test scores (item 5), and (d) parents evaluating teachers (item 20).

Seven of the 13 items in this group showed a significant difference in principal (supervisor) and teacher

perceptions. Nevertheless, the results show that teachers felt that the process of principals evaluating them was a more valid one than when they were evaluated by alternative methods. Furthermore, principals (supervisors) felt that evaluations conducted by principals (supervisors) were certainly valid.

Pre-Observation Conferences Conducted by the Principal or Supervisor (Items 24-31)

Table 9

Group 4 - Pre-Observation Conferences

<u>Item</u>	<u>Principal (Supervisor) Mean</u>	<u>Teachers Mean</u>	<u>t-value</u>	<u>Level of Significance</u>
24	4.48	3.72	5.03	.001
25	4.43	3.76	4.57	.001
26	4.35	3.69	4.55	.001
27	4.25	3.52	4.99	.001
28	3.96	3.41	3.04	.003
29	4.10	3.37	4.51	.001
30	3.67	2.91	4.49	.001
31	3.35	2.73	3.59	.001
Ave.	4.07	3.39	4.35	

A review of the findings from Group 4 relating to pre-observation conferences shows much consistency. Although the teachers' perceptions of the frequency of pre-observation conferences and specific topics covered during the meeting were that they occurred less often than the principals' (supervisors') perceptions, there

was still a feeling that they usually or sometimes took place. Principals (supervisors) generally responded that pre-observation meetings took place between usually and often.

A review of the teachers' responses to items 30 and 31 shows that the mean scores for teachers indicate they seldom or only sometimes occur when addressing suggestions related to observational techniques and teacher data-gathering methods.

Results on all items in Group 4 were significantly different when the two participating groups' responses were compared.

Classroom Observations Conducted by the Principal or Supervisor (Items 32-42)

Table 10

Group 5 - Classroom Observations

<u>Item</u>	<u>Principal (Supervisor) Mean</u>	<u>Teacher Mean</u>	<u>t-value</u>	<u>Level of Significance</u>
32	4.13	4.03	.57	.569
33	3.54	3.37	.87	.384
34	3.49	3.31	1.01	.315
35	3.72	3.36	2.19	.030
36	3.06	2.70	1.98	.050
37	1.58	1.34	2.10	.038
38	3.07	2.45	3.18	.002
39	1.68	1.29	3.20	.002
40	3.09	2.63	2.66	.009
41	3.61	3.42	1.09	.279
42	4.71	4.03	4.42	.001
Ave.	3.24	2.90	2.12	

Seven of the 11 items related to the topic of classroom observation were significantly different when principals' (supervisors') and teachers' responses were compared. The average mean scores for items 37 and 39 show that there are few principals (supervisors) using audiotape or videotape recordings in the teacher evaluation process. The mean score for teacher responses to item 36 indicate that teachers perceived principals charting student responses between seldom and sometimes, while principals responded between sometimes and usually.

The results from Group 5 show that most classroom observations are conducted by principals (supervisors) who enter and take verbatim notes, record teacher and student responses, and do not use audiotape and videotape recordings as supporting data. This was generally agreed upon by both principals (supervisors) and teachers.

Post-Observation Conferences Conducted by the Principal or Supervisor (Items 43-54)

Table 11

Group 6 - Post-Observation Conferences

(Data on following page)

Group 6 - Post-Observation Conferences

<u>Item</u>	<u>Principal (Supervisor) Mean</u>	<u>Teacher Mean</u>	<u>t-value</u>	<u>Level of Significance</u>
43	4.64	4.33	2.13	.035
44	4.49	3.90	3.97	.001
45	4.36	4.20	1.27	.207
46	3.96	3.60	2.34	.021
47	3.88	3.42	2.70	.008
48	3.84	3.22	3.80	.001
49	3.97	3.36	4.08	.001
50	3.56	3.32	2.71	.007
51	3.35	2.97	2.42	.017
52	4.36	3.93	3.25	.008
53	4.74	4.04	4.83	.001
54	4.06	3.37	4.46	.001
Ave.	4.10	3.64	3.16	

Eleven of the 12 items related to post-observation conferences showed a significant difference in administrator and teacher responses to this topic. There was notable consistency in the mean scores for the two groups.

Comparison of the mean scores showed that teachers perceived that the post-conference took place sometimes to usually and suggestions were given to them by the principal (supervisor). Principals (supervisors) responded that the process usually took place.

CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS,
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study examined teacher and principal (supervisor) perceptions of teacher evaluation in Macon County prior to the principals' (supervisors') participation in the Illinois Administrators' Academy workshops. A detailed analysis of each of the 54 items on a survey distributed to a modified random sample of the teachers and to all principals (supervisors) in that county showed that significant differences in the responses submitted by teachers and principals (supervisors) existed on 42 of the 54 items.

Although there were statistically significant differences between the mean responses of principals (supervisors) and teachers, the surprise was that, as a practical matter, there was a general agreement on the part of both Macon County principals (supervisors) and teachers with past evaluation practices. This is demonstrated by the fact that the mean scores on the majority of both teachers' and principals' (supervisors') responses were above the neutral scores of 4.00 for items 1-23 and 3.00 for items 24-54.

Elementary and secondary principals (supervisors) were also compared. Only 3 of the 54 items on the survey showed a statistical significant difference when the two

groups were compared. One, item 22, produced a surprise result. Secondary principals (supervisors) disagreed more that teacher evaluations should be used for improving teachers and not for retention or firing. In retrospect, the author found the wording of this item to be ambiguous.

When elementary and secondary teachers were compared, only 4 of the 54 items on the survey showed statistically significant differences.

Findings

The findings from the survey were quite surprising. Although teachers' perceptions of the evaluation process were less positive than the principals' (supervisors') perceptions, there was a general positive attitude on the part of teachers and principals (supervisors) toward past evaluation practices. Macon County teachers responded in a positive fashion as demonstrated by the fact that the average score for all teachers responding to items 1-23 was 4.74, and the average mean score for the same group for items 24-54 was 3.31. Since the neutral for point for items 1-23 was 4.00, and the neutral point for items 24-54 was 3.00, it seems logical to infer that teachers tended to be mildly positive toward past practices. Macon County principals (supervisors) also responded quite positively. The average mean score for items 1-23 was 5.23, and the average mean score for the principals (supervisors) for items 24-54 was 3.31.

Conclusions

There was a remarkable agreement between teacher and principal (supervisor) perceptions of the teacher evaluation process, even though 42 of 54 items on the survey showed statistically significant differences.

After review of the findings from this study, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Although there were statistically significant differences in 3 of the 4 items addressing principal (supervisor) perceptions related to evaluation methods, teachers generally believed past evaluation practices were valid.
2. Elementary teachers disagree with the concept of using the evaluation as a basis for compensation (merit pay). Secondary teachers and elementary principals are neutral with a slight trend toward disagreeing with such a use. Secondary principals are neutral with a trend toward agreeing on the topic of merit pay.
3. Although there were significant differences in all six items relating to the uses of teacher evaluations, teachers generally agreed with the ways evaluations have been used in the past. However, they disagreed with the concept of using teacher evaluation for personnel decisions.
4. Teachers responded that alternative methods of teacher evaluation such as peer evaluation, teacher evaluations conducted by students with the use of

standardized achievement test scores, were invalid or that they disagreed with their usage. Principals (supervisors) tended to be neutral or show a slight tendency to agree with such alternatives.

5. Mean responses of both principals and teachers indicate that most classroom observations are conducted by principals (supervisors) who enter and take verbatim notes, record teacher and student responses, and do not use audiotape and videotape recordings as supporting data. Principals (supervisors) agree, on average, more strongly with this description than do teachers, on average.

6. When mean responses of elementary and secondary principals (supervisors) were compared, the results showed that elementary principals (supervisors) disagreed with the use of evaluation for improvement of instruction only. Secondary principals (supervisors) were neutral on this item.

7. When mean responses of elementary and secondary teachers were compared, the results showed that the secondary teachers disagreed less strongly than elementary teachers with the use of evaluations for merit pay.

8. Elementary teachers perceived the practice of students evaluating teachers as invalid. Secondary teachers tended to be closer to neutral on this issue.

Recommendations

Based upon the results of this study, the following

recommendations are offered:

1. At least one follow-up study using this baseline data should be conducted to study the effectiveness of the Illinois Administrators' Academy workshops.
2. A review of the results from this study should help improve principals' (supervisors') understanding of teachers' perceptions about the evaluation process.
3. Future follow-up studies could perform more detailed analyses of the comparison of elementary and secondary teachers and elementary and secondary principals (supervisors).
4. Since the author collected data relating to the participants sex and levels of experience, future follow-up studies could also analyze these variables.
5. Future follow-up studies should utilize this baseline data. The author will maintain all original data for the use of a future researcher for at least five years from the date of this study.

APPENDICIES

Appendix A:

TEACHER EVALUATION PERCEPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Sex: _____

of years teaching experience: _____

Levels taught: _____

Present teaching assignment: _____

of hours post-baccalaureate: _____

Part I

Examine the following teacher evaluation practices and determine their validity in evaluating the quality of teaching. By valid is meant that the practice is relevant fair, and appropriate - (Circle a number for each statement).

	Invalid									Valid
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
1. Classroom visits by principal									1	2 3 4 5 6 7
2. Classroom visits by other teachers									1	2 3 4 5 6 7
3. Student evaluations through a questionnaire									1	2 3 4 5 6 7
4. Systematic observation with a check list or observation instrument by a trained observer									1	2 3 4 5 6 7
5. Pupil achievement as measured by standardized achievement tests									1	2 3 4 5 6 7

- | | |
|--|---------------|
| 6. Observable teacher skills | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 7. Examination of teaching materials such
as syllabi, texts, and handouts | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 8. Teacher self evaluation | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 9. Check list focusing on personal
characteristics such as friendliness,
grooming, and personal appearance | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 10. Check list focusing on teaching
characteristics such as organization,
pacing, and presentation | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |

Part II

Circle the number which most reflects your feelings about
the following statements:

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

- | | |
|---|---------------|
| 11. Teachers should be evaluated at least
annually | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 12. Teacher evaluations should be used to
eliminate incompetent teacher(s) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 13. Teacher evaluations should be used to
identify superior teachers | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 14. Teachers should be paid according to how
well they teach (merit pay) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |

15. It is possible to identify good teaching
when it occurs 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
16. It is possible to identify poor teaching
when it occurs 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
17. Most teachers in a school know who the
good and bad teachers are in that school 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
18. Most teachers agree on what constitutes
good teaching 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
19. Students can tell if a teacher is a good
teacher or not (Respond in terms of your
teaching levels) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
20. Parents can tell if a teacher is a good
teacher or not 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
21. The principal in a school can tell if
a teacher is a good teacher or not 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
22. Teaching evaluations should only be
used to improve teaching and not for
retention or firing 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
23. Teachers know if they are doing a good
job 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Part III

Circle the number which most reflects your perception of supervisor behaviors:

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Usually	Often

PRIOR TO FORMAL OBSERVATION

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 24. Supervisor meets with teacher | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 25. Supervisor finds out about teacher's objectives | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 26. Supervisor finds out about what teacher expects students to be doing | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 27. Supervisor finds out about teacher's problems and/or concerns | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 28. Supervisor involves teacher in deciding the focus of observation | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 29. Supervisor helps teacher translate concerns into specific teaching behaviors | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 30. Supervisor suggests a variety of observational techniques | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 31. Supervisor suggests data-gathering methods teacher can use alone | 1 2 3 4 5 |

DURING THE FORMAL OBSERVATION

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 32. Supervisor makes verbatim notes of classroom interactions | 1 2 3 4 5 |
|---|-----------|

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 33. Supervisor writes down teacher's questions | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 34. Supervisor writes down student responses | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 35. Supervisor records student at-risk behavior | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 36. Supervisor charts pattern and amount of
student responses | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 37. Supervisor makes audiotape recordings | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 38. Supervisor charts physical movements of
teacher and/or students | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 39. Supervisor makes videotape recordings | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 40. Supervisor observes a specific child | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 41. Supervisor records subjective feelings
about the lesson | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 42. Supervisor stays for at least 30 minutes | 1 2 3 4 5 |

AFTER THE FORMAL OBSERVATION

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 43. Supervisor meets with teacher each time | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 44. Supervisor provides teacher with direct
advice for improvement | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 45. Supervisor provides opinions regarding
teacher's teaching | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 46. Supervisor relates teacher's perceptions
to the collected data | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 47. Supervisor encourages teacher to analyze
the collected data | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 48. Supervisor asks teacher clarifying and
probing questions | 1 2 3 4 5 |

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 49. Supervisor encourages teacher to consider
alternative strategies | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 50. Supervisor is willing to modify personal
objectives for the conference | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 51. Supervisor listens more than talks | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 52. Supervisor acknowledges teacher's comments
and suggestions | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 53. Supervisor gives praise and encouragement
for specific growth | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 54. Supervisor recommends additional resources | 1 2 3 4 5 |

Appendix B:

PRINCIPAL (SUPERVISOR) EVALUATION PERCEPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Sex:

of years supervising teachers:_____

Present administrative assignment: _____

Part I

Examine the following teacher evaluation practices and determine their validity in evaluating the quality of teaching. By valid is meant that the practice is relevant, fair, and appropriate - (Circle a number for each statement).

Invalid								Valid
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

- | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Classroom visits by principal | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 2. Classroom visits by other teachers | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 3. Student evaluations through a
questionnaire | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 4. Systematic observation with a check list
or observation instrument by a trained
observer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 5. Pupil achievement as measured by
standardized achievement tests | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 6. Observable teacher skills | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

- | | |
|--|---------------|
| 7. Examination of teaching materials such
as syllabi, texts, and handouts | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 8. Teacher self evaluation | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 9. Check list focusing on personal
characteristics such as friendliness,
grooming, and personal appearance | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 10. Check list focusing on teaching
characteristics such as organization,
pacing, and presentation | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |

Part II

Circle the number which most reflects your feelings about
the following statements:

- | Strongly Disagree | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Strongly Agree |
|---|---------------|----------------|
| 11. Teachers should be evaluated at least
annually | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | |
| 12. Teacher evaluations should be used to
eliminate incompetent teacher(s) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | |
| 13. Teacher evaluations should be used to
identify superior teachers | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | |
| 14. Teachers should be paid according to how
well they teach (merit pay) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | |
| 15. It is possible to identify good teaching
when it occurs | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | |

16. It is possible to identify poor teaching
when it occurs 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
17. Most teachers in a school know who the
good and bad teachers are in that school 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
18. Most teachers agree on what constitutes
good teaching 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
19. Students can tell if a teacher is a good
teacher or not (Respond in terms of your
teaching levels) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
20. Parents can tell if a teacher is a good
teacher or not 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
21. The principal in a school can tell if
a teacher is a good teacher or not 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
22. Teaching evaluations should only be
used to improve teaching and not for
retention or firing 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
23. Teachers know if they are doing a good
job 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Part III

Circle the number which most reflects your perception of supervisor behaviors:

1 2 3 4 5
Never Seldom Sometimes Usually Often

PRIOR TO FORMAL OBSERVATION

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 24. Supervisor meets with teacher | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 25. Supervisor finds out about teacher's objectives | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 26. Supervisor finds out about what teacher expects students to be doing | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 27. Supervisor finds out about teacher's problems and/or concerns | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 28. Supervisor involves teacher in deciding the focus of observation | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 29. Supervisor helps teacher translate concerns into specific teaching behaviors | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 30. Supervisor suggests a variety of observational techniques | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 31. Supervisor suggests data-gathering methods teacher can use alone | 1 2 3 4 5 |

DURING THE FORMAL OBSERVATION

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 32. Supervisor makes verbatim notes of classroom interactions | 1 2 3 4 5 |
|---|-----------|

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 33. Supervisor writes down teacher's questions | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 34. Supervisor writes down student responses | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 35. Supervisor records student at-risk behavior | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 36. Supervisor charts pattern and amount of
student responses | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 37. Supervisor makes audiotape recordings | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 38. Supervisor charts physical movements of
teacher and/or students | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 39. Supervisor makes videotape recordings | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 40. Supervisor observes a specific child | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 41. Supervisor records subjective feelings
about the lesson | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 42. Supervisor stays for at least 30 minutes | 1 2 3 4 5 |

AFTER THE FORMAL OBSERVATION

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 43. Supervisor meets with teacher each time | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 44. Supervisor provides teacher with direct
advice for improvement | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 45. Supervisor provides opinions regarding
teacher's teaching | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 46. Supervisor relates teacher's perceptions
to the collected data | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 47. Supervisor encourages teacher to analyze
the collected data | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 48. Supervisor asks teacher clarifying and
probing questions | 1 2 3 4 5 |

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 49. Supervisor encourages teacher to consider
alternative strategies | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 50. Supervisor is willing to modify personal
objectives for the conference | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 51. Supervisor listens more than talks | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 52. Supervisor acknowledges teacher's comments
and suggestions | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 53. Supervisor gives praise and encouragement
for specific growth | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 54. Supervisor recommends additional resources | 1 2 3 4 5 |

List of References

- Blai, Boris, Jr. (1982). Faculty perceptions of "effective" teachers: a parallel-perceptions inquiry. Eric No. ED 219 029.
- Brightman, Harvey J. (1984). Improving principals' performance through training in the decision sciences. Educational Leadership; V4, N5, pp 50-56.
- Brodinsky, Ben; Neill, Shirley Boes. Ed. (1983). Building morale, motivating staff: problems and solutions. AASA Critical Issues Report. Eric No. ED 227549.
- Coker, Homer (1985). A study of the correlation between principals' ratings of teacher effectiveness and pupil growth. Eric No. ED 259 460
- Drake, Jackson M. (1984, February). Improving teacher performance through evaluation and supervision. Eric No. ED 250 782.
- Ducksworth, K. (1981). Linking educational policy and management with student achievement. Eugene, Oregon: Center for Educational Policy and Management.
- Glasman, Naftaly S. (1983). The school principal as evaluator. Administrators Notebook; V31, N2, P1-4.
- Goldhammer, R., Anderson, R. & Krajewski, R. (1980). Clinical supervision: special methods for the supervision of teachers. (2nd ed.), New York: Holt, Reinhart & Winston.
- Goldsberry, Lee, and others (1984). The survey of supervisory practices. A symposium on instructional supervisors held at the annual meeting of the American Research Association. Eric No. ED 259456.
- Johnston, Gladys S. (1985). The relationship between elementary school climate and teachers' attitudes toward evaluation. Educational and Psychological Measurement, V5, N2, P89-112.
- Kauchak, Donald & others (1984). An interview study of teachers' attitudes toward teacher evaluation practices. Eric No. ED 246 106.

- Klassen, Marlene (1983, March). So you've been promoted. Supervisor, P12-15.
- Klausmeier, Herbert J. (1982). A research strategy for educational improvement. Educational Digest 48, P19-22.
- Lemby, R. (1983). The principal's dozen: effectiveness re-examined. NASSP Bulletin, 67(459), 107-110.
- McGreal, Thomas L. (1983). Successful teacher evaluation. Eric No. ED 236 776
- Manasse, A. (1984). A policymaker's guide to improving conditions for principals' effectiveness. Alexandria, Virginia: National Association of State Boards of Education.
- Natriello, Gary (1984). Teachers' perceptions of the frequency of evaluation and assessments of their effort and effectiveness. American Educational Research Journal; V21; N3, P579-95.
- Nie, Norman and others (1975). SPSS, Second Edition. McGraw Hill Book Company, pp. 267-270.
- Shinn, J. L. (1976). Teacher perceptions of ideal and actual supervisory procedures used by California elementary principals. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon.
- Stark, Joan S. & Lawther, Malcolm A. (1984). Predictors of teachers' preferences concerning their evaluation. Educational Administration Quarterly; V20, N4, P76-106.
- Townsend, David (1984). Teacher evaluation in secondary schools. Alberta, Canada, Eric No. ED 249 662
- Wise, Arthur E. & others (1984, June). Case studies for teacher evaluation: a study of effective practices. Santa Monica, Ca: Rand Corp., Eric No. ED 251 181.