

1977

# The Observation and Evaluation of Elementary Teachers in Illinois

Paul C. Burton  
*Eastern Illinois University*

---

## Recommended Citation

Burton, Paul C., "The Observation and Evaluation of Elementary Teachers in Illinois" (1977). *Masters Theses*. 3281.  
<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/3281>

This 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](mailto:tabruns@eiu.edu).

PAPER CERTIFICATE #2

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.

July 13, 1977  
Date

Author

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Author

pdm

The Observation and Evaluation

of Elementary Teachers in Illinois

(TITLE)

BY

PAUL C. BURTON

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF

Master of Science in Education

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY  
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1977

YEAR

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

July 13, 1977  
DATE

ADVISER

July 13, 1977  
DATE

THE OBSERVATION AND EVALUATION  
OF ELEMENTARY TEACHERS IN ILLINOIS

BY

PAUL C. BURTON

M. S. in Ed., Eastern Illinois University, 1977

ABSTRACT OF A THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of Master of Science in Education at the Graduate School  
of Eastern Illinois University

CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1977

Basic research into the observation and evaluation of elementary teachers in Illinois was conducted during the 1976-77 school year. The research was divided into two major sections. Section I consisted of the development and administration of a 42-question survey instrument designed to probe observations, evaluations, and elementary teachers' opinions concerning such. The sample universe was restricted to full-time elementary classroom teachers taking graduate courses. Section II consisted of obtaining and analyzing evaluation instruments from various size and type school districts in Illinois. Significant findings of the research include:

1. The majority of elementary principals are male, have in-classroom elementary teaching experience, and perform the evaluations of the teachers at their attendance centers.
2. There is a close relationship between the number of evaluations required and those actually performed. A majority of evaluations are done without prior notification.
3. Informing teachers of the specifics going to be looked for in observations may be useful in reducing teacher resistance.
4. Informing teachers of the intended duration of observations may be useful in reducing teacher anxiety. However, this would have to be determined on an individual basis.
5. Teachers generally feel that evaluators are at least somewhat familiar with the children in their classrooms. It remains indeterminate if the extent of familiarity is sufficient to render accurate judgment in cases where evaluation criteria required such.
6. Correlation of specific questions to frequency distribution of criteria for evaluation mentioned in those questions strongly indicates that evaluators are superficial in their rating of teaching performance.
7. A majority of evaluators give teachers feedback of some kind regarding the observation of their teaching performance. However, a majority of that feedback does not deal with specific ways in which performance can be improved in spite of a majority of evaluators giving feedback on strengths and weaknesses of teaching performance. In those cases in which feedback is specific as to ways of improving instructional performance, teachers agree with the suggestions, try them, and feel that their performance improves as a result.
8. A positive correlation exists between evaluators who consider the various learning styles and cognitive levels of a particular teacher's students and evaluators who suggest specific ways in which a particular teacher can improve instructional performance.

9. Teachers do not believe they are adequately observed for the purpose of evaluation.
10. Elementary teacher perception of the value of an evaluator's suggestions for instructional improvement are apparently significantly tied to the variables of that evaluator's in-classroom elementary teaching experience. The teacher's perception of such value is positively correlated to an evaluator's having such experience. No significance is apparent in the amount of that experience.
11. Listed in order of occurrence frequency, the ten most frequently used evaluation criteria are:

Individualization of instruction--by recognition of pupil needs--psychological, social.

A variety of materials--equipment--used effectively, wisely--for enrichment.

Classroom conditions--physical, various.

Instructional skills--variety of techniques.

Planning--no descriptor--complete, thorough, well written, indication of, smooth transition.

Teacher's enthusiasm--interest, effort.

Knowledge of subject matter--use of.

Appearance--clean, appropriate dress, hair.

An education atmosphere is maintained--wholesome atmosphere.

Works cooperatively with others--effective, helpful, harmonious, no descriptor. Is cooperative.

12. An additional three-hundred and seventy-three criteria used for evaluation are ranked according to their frequency of occurrence.

Research is continuing.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction. . . . .	1-7
-----------------------	-----

### 1. Research Flow Chart

General Objectives. . . . .	8
Specific Objectives . . . . .	8-9
Samples . . . . .	9-10
Questionnaire . . . . .	10-11
Field Work. . . . .	12
Content Analysis. . . . .	12
Analysis Plan . . . . .	12-15
Analysis and Reporting. . . . .	15-16

### 2. Section I--Survey - Data and Analysis

Demographic Data. . . . .	18-23
Synopsis of Demographic Data. . . . .	24-26
Questions 1-3 . . . . .	27-28
Questions 4-5 . . . . .	28-29
Questions 6-8 . . . . .	29-31
Questions 9-10. . . . .	31-32
Questions 11-12 . . . . .	33-34
Questions 13-14 . . . . .	34-35
Question 15 . . . . .	35-37
Questions 16-18 . . . . .	37-38
Question 19 . . . . .	39
Questions 20-21 . . . . .	40-41
Question 22 . . . . .	41-42
Questions 23-24 . . . . .	42-43
Questions 25-28 . . . . .	43-44
Questions 29-31 . . . . .	44-45
Question 32 . . . . .	45
Questions 33-34 . . . . .	45-46
Questions 35-36 . . . . .	47
Questions 37-38 . . . . .	47-49
Questions 39-40 . . . . .	49-50
Questions 41-42 . . . . .	50-51

Summary of Data Analysis Significance. . . . .	52-53
--	-------

Further Research--Suggestions for Improving the Survey Instrument . . . . .	54
--	----

### 3. Section II--Evaluation Instruments and Criteria

Guide - Table I . . . . .	56-57
Table I . . . . .	58
Guide - Tables II and III , . . . .	59

Table II. . . . .	60
Table III . . . . .	61
Guide - Evaluation Criteria . . . . .	62-63
Evaluation Criteria . . . . .	64-81

#### 4. Conclusion

Research to Follow . . . . .	82
------------------------------	----

#### 5. Appendices

Appendix A. . . . .	82-88
Appendix B. . . . .	89



## INTRODUCTION

Education is in an era where demands for accountability and mandates for improvement are widespread and increasingly intense. Prospects for the foreseeable future indicate an increase in such demands and mandates. Clearly, the challenge to the educational community is to meet those demands and mandates with a concentrated and continuous effort to improve education. This research is part of that effort.

One area in which great potential for improving education exists is that of teacher observation and evaluation. By focusing on what actually takes place in classrooms, astute observers/evaluators can substantially contribute to helping individual teachers improve their own performances. Unfortunately, there does not appear to be any in-depth research which examines the observation/evaluation process and points out where improvement might be made in the process. Such research is necessary as a first step toward improving instruction through the improvement of the observation/evaluation process. The following research examines this process and codifies the criteria being utilized for such. By examining the results of this research, it is hoped that areas identified for improvement will prompt both an improved process and further research toward improvement. The purpose of this research then, is to put the observation/evaluation process into perspective, thereby contributing to the efforts of the education community to meet the demands for accountability and mandates for improvement of education.

As stated, the following research is an initial effort to put elementary teacher evaluations into perspective. In order to accomplish this, three distinct topics of elementary teacher evaluations are examined in the research:

1. The scope of observations of elementary teachers for the purpose of evaluation.
2. The attitudes and opinions of elementary teachers toward observations and evaluations.
3. The criteria utilized by evaluators in performance rating of elementary teachers.

#### Comparative Research

Prior to initiating this research project, a concentrated effort was made to determine what, if any, similar research existed on the topic of elementary teacher evaluation: All three of the topics previously stated were considered in the effort. It was felt that any similar research could substantially contribute to directing the focus of this effort, thereby effecting more useful results. Four areas were examined in the search for comparable research:

1. An ERIC search using CIJE citations with abstracts.
2. An ERIC search using ERIC citations with abstracts.
3. A search of recent periodicals through indexes.
4. A search of publications through the library and catalogue.

No research was found which examines the evaluation/observation process or codifies the evaluation criteria used. However, several studies were found which are relevant to putting this thesis into focus.

#### 1. Ten Problems in Search of a Solution<sup>1</sup>

This research identified what elementary student teachers considered to

be the ten most pressing problems which they had faced during their period of student teaching. Though the findings are not generally applicable to the research reported in this thesis, one finding is significant. Elementary student teachers reported that the biggest problem faced during their period of student teaching was "Discourtesy and discipline on the part of the students." This concern on the part of student teachers is shared by the school districts in Illinois. Three of the twenty-five most frequently occurring evaluation criteria appearing on evaluation instruments are directly related to student discipline. The criteria and their rank-order are:

1. An educational atmosphere is maintained - 9th
2. Classroom control - 16th
3. Discipline - 20th

The significance here is that even though student discipline is ranked as a major problem by student teachers, and is considered a major concern for evaluation of teaching performance, the help that teachers are getting via the evaluation process in dealing with the problem is inadequate.<sup>2</sup>

## 2. Teacher, Take a Test on Grading<sup>3</sup>

Tests taken by student teachers from 1972-1976 indicate that "there is no doubt about what future teachers hear as bad news: merit rating practices, absolute marking standards, high reliance on administrative evaluation of teachers." The opinions of the student teachers in that research correspond to those expressed by teachers in this research. As expressed in stating the problem which prompted this research, much room for improvement of the evaluation process and product is needed to meet the "for improvement of instruction" imperative

### 3. Why First-Year Teachers Fail<sup>4</sup>

This eleven-year study by Central Missouri State University at Warrensburg points out, again, the importance of discipline and classroom control to teaching success. First-year teachers' failures were most often a result of inadequate discipline and classroom control. Supervisors also identified lack of classroom control and discipline as overriding causes of first-year teacher failure.

### 4. Importance of This Research

As substantial research data is available to establish the importance of discipline and classroom control to effective teaching, it may be assumed that successful practicing teachers have acceptable classroom control and discipline. The logical next step in viewing successful teaching is determining what constitutes such once discipline and classroom control are established. Here the consensus of opinion and point of facts breaks down. Four major "schools" of influence were surveyed to determine indicated criteria of successful teaching: research of the teaching act; public opinion; administrator/evaluator/school district opinion; and teacher opinion. The results of this survey are indicative of the problem expressed as the basis of this research. Research of the teaching act is overwhelmingly concentrated on the verbal-communication-interaction process. The evidence available does not, however, indicate that the findings of this plethora of research have found general applicability in either teacher preparation or teacher in-service training. Public opinion, expressed largely through the past few years of the Gallup Poll of Public Attitudes Toward Education, reveals that the interest of laymen is in education placing major emphasis on students

developing salable skills which result in getting better jobs and achieving financial success. The teachers themselves, especially in recent years, have emphasized the value of education in terms of effective development of the individual, i.e. self-satisfaction and intellectual stimulation. The administrator/evaluator/school district has emphasized as major in importance accountability for the school product to the public and en masse in-service training to effect better teaching. The problem of bringing these various "schools" together in focusing upon the task of improving the overall education of this nation's young people is, obviously, an enormous one. The following research is an initial attempt to begin the process of bringing those forces to bear on a more central focal point. If educational research was conducted to determine how the criteria currently being used to evaluate teachers "for the purpose of instructional improvement" might be best updated and utilized, much would be gained in terms of efforts expended in training teachers and actualizing current teachers' best efforts. If administrators/evaluators/school districts had access to the substantive information which could result from a thorough examination of evaluations and criteria used in such as it relates to improved instructional performance by teachers, much would be gained which could manifest itself in an improved product of education. The lay public's concern for education producing salable skills and financial success would still be subject to the overwhelming forces of economy which do not lie within the province of education's ability to control. The subsequent increased ability of education to be accountable, and the efforts of education in general to improve, would, however, undoubtedly lend itself to increased public support of educational efforts in terms of both attitude and financial support. These factors would not meet deaf



ears in the teaching ranks. Applicable research, increased effort and sensitivity by school authority, and favorable public opinion and financial support could only intensify the efforts of teachers. The following research, then, is an initial attempt to begin this process. Its focus is to reveal where improvements in the evaluation process and processor might be made in the short term, and to codify the criteria utilized in the process. The research is directly aimed at filling some of the gap which exists between the various "schools" mentioned previously, so that subsequent research efforts might have a starting point for correlation of data which will significantly affect actual teaching practice for the better.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- <sup>1</sup> Bernice Seiferth, "Ten Problems in Search of a Solution," Illinois School Research, Vol. 11, No. 3/Spring, 1975, p. 36-40.
- <sup>2</sup> George H. Gallup, "The Seventh Annual Gallup Poll of Public Attitudes Toward Education," Phi Delta Kappan, December, 1975, reprint.
- <sup>3</sup> Arsene O. Boykin and Cedric Pope, "Teacher, Take a Test on Grading," Phi Delta Kappan, March 1977, p. 561-563.
- <sup>4</sup> Jack O. Vittetoe, "Why First-Year Teachers Fail," Phi Delta Kappan, January, 1977, p. 429.

## RESEARCH FLOW CHART

### I. General Objectives

This research is an initial attempt to determine, analytically, what is and is not being done in the field in regard to observation and evaluation of elementary teachers in Illinois.

### II. Specific Objectives

To determine:

1. who conducts the evaluation of elementary teachers in Illinois;
2. the frequency and duration of observations;
3. the frequency and scope of evaluations;
4. the frequency and scope of pre-evaluation notification;
5. the extent of evaluator knowledge in applying evaluation criteria;
6. the extent and timing of evaluation/observation feedback;
7. the content of evaluation instruments;
8. the format of evaluation instruments;
9. the extent of evaluation instrument use;
10. the extent of in-classroom elementary teaching experience of observer/evaluators;
11. the extent to which elementary teachers feel observations/evaluations have affected instructional improvements;



12. elementary teacher opinion on the desirability of evaluators having in-classroom teaching experiences;
13. elementary teacher opinion on the necessity for evaluation to be based on direct observation(s);
14. the extent to which evaluation/observation procedure is being improved from year to year.

### III. Samples

#### Section I - Information and Opinion Survey

The large-scale survey format was used. The universe was narrow.

This survey is limited to those currently employed as full-time elementary classroom teachers who were likewise employed throughout the 1975-1976 school year and who are currently enrolled in one or more graduate-level education courses.

The universe was so described to facilitate obtaining accurate information on all questions. Allowing first-year teacher respondents would have reduced the amount of obtainable data, and resulted in more than one universe description. This would have significantly reduced the validity of the sample. In addition, teachers with more than one year of experience were viewed as having more consolidated and tempered opinions on the subjects of the survey. Such opinions of first-year teachers were viewed as being substantially more fluid, possibly adversely affecting validity. Those teachers taking graduate courses were viewed as being the best informed, most current in information, and, generally, the best targetable group of teachers in terms of interest in improving education. Using university graduate school classes as target centers was viewed as the atmosphere most conducive to obtaining data of the sort represented by the survey. Additionally, university instructors were viewed as the

best source for controlling the survey sample without pre-instruction, as well as being most willing to participate by helping obtain data.

## Section II - Evaluation Instruments

The random sample technique was used. The universe was restricted to K(N)-6, K(N)-8, K(N)-12 school districts in Illinois. All districts within this description were used in determining the random sample. School districts which did not have 1-6 grade students were not sampled, and were considered to not be within the sample universe description. This, in conjunction with the letter requesting evaluation instruments, restricted the sample to evaluation instruments used for elementary teachers. Data analysis was performed on instruments from various sized districts to determine relationships and differences of instruments and formats used exclusively for elementary teachers and those possibly used for both elementary and secondary teachers. Exclusive use of instruments for elementary teachers was not considered significant. Sample size was 300 with a target of 50% response. Target response size was exceeded.

Sample size was determined by pretesting for responses. Twenty-five letters were sent to randomly selected districts falling within the universe description. Twelve responses were received. It was determined that obtaining a sample of one hundred and fifty responses would require three hundred requests. The three hundred requests sent included the pretest twenty-five.

## IV. Questionnaire

### Section I - Information and Opinion Survey

The survey contained questions requiring a yes-no answer, forced choice selection, check mark answers with both two and three choices, combination

yes-no and single-word narrative answers, agree-disagree answers, and short narrative answers (two-words). Forty-two questions were used, plus 17 demographic data questions. The degree of probing was considered moderate. Questions were sequentially placed to best facilitate the high degree of specific recall required. This was accomplished by placing pre-observation questions first, and post-evaluation questions near the end. Some mixing was done to facilitate consistency correlations. Most opinion questions immediately followed fact-finding questions on that specific subject area. The survey was pretested with the Thesis Committee, and subsequently with a group of four elementary teachers. As a result of these pretests, several questions were reconstructed, to render them more specific and add clarity. A number of minor changes were made in question sequence for the same purpose. Six universities in Illinois were contacted requesting assistance in obtaining survey completions by students within the sample population. Four responded in time to complete survey mailing, distribution, return and analysis. Two-hundred and ten surveys were mailed. Forty-six completed surveys were eventually received from all sources (3 universities). See appendix A for the survey instrument.

## Section II

Three hundred school districts were randomly selected from all school districts within the sample universe description, resulting in 50 each requests being sent to school district types and sizes as follows:

- K(N) - (6)8 - below 500 students
- K(N) - (6)8 - between 500 and 1,000 students
- K(N) - (6)8 - 1,000 or more students
- K(N) - 12 - below 750 students
- K(N) - 12 - between 750 and 1,500 students
- K(N) - 12 - 1,500 or more students

See appendix B for letter sent.

## V. Field Work

### Section I and II

As no interviewing was required, no training, instruction, or supervision was necessary.

## VI. Content Analysis

### Section I and II

All analysis was done by hand. Transcription of data was done on large graph paper. Codification of data for Section I was done by question number. For Section II, three-hundred and eighty-three different evaluation criteria were codified by number. Each instrument was then analyzed by assigning the corresponding code number to that criteria. Data was then transcribed on graph paper from each instrument. Separate graph sheets were used for each cluster of instruments from the six different types and sizes identified as falling within the sample population universe.

## VII. Analysis Plan

### Section I - Information and Opinion Survey

In order to meet the general and specific objectives of the research, the following analysis plan was used:

1. Exclusive and extensive use of percentages and averages data analysis. This was also intended to facilitate interpretation for field use.
2. Reliability was tested by consistency correlation to individual related questions and question clusters. Limited use was made of inferential consistency correlation.

3. Comparison, correlation, and cross-correlation of data was used in analysis of both individual questions and question clusters.

I. Comparison, Correlation, and Cross-Correlation

1. Questions (4,5) to various demographic data--evaluation requirements for tenured and non-tenured teachers to actual evaluations performed.
2. Questions (11, 12) to question 31--specifics of observation.
3. Questions (13,14) to questions (37,35)--observation time.
4. Question 15 to questions (17,18)--familiarity with children in a particular classroom.
5. Question 15 to evaluation criteria.
6. Question 15 to question 35--achievement scores.
7. Question 15 to question 23--learning styles and cognitive levels of students.
8. Questions (20,21) to questions (25-28, 32)--observation feedback.
9. Questions (4,5) to question 6--evaluation and observation frequency.
10. Questions (4,5,6) to 37--observation time per evaluation.
11. Questions (31,32,33) to data from evaluation instruments received.

II. Consistency Correlation

1. Question 5 to questions 9, 11, 13, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21--number of observations.
2. Questions 9, 11, 13, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21--number of observations.
3. Question 41 to questions 33 and 34--evaluator's in-classroom elementary teaching experience.



4. Question 15 to questions 17, 18, 23, 35--observer familiarity with children's learning style and cognitive level.
5. Questions 7 and 8 to question 6--observation duration.

## Section II

Evaluation instruments were analyzed to predetermine the number of different criteria occurring throughout the total sample. Four hundred and twenty-two different criteria were initially listed. Criteria of a very similar nature were then combined. The final number of criteria listed for analysis application was three hundred and eighty-three. Each of these criteria was assigned a number. Each evaluation instrument was then analyzed by assigning the corresponding number of the predetermined criterion to that criterion occurring on the instrument.

### Frequency Distribution (the unweighted frequency of occurrence)

The overall frequency of a single criterion's occurrence throughout the sample was determined by assigning a value of one to each occurrence regardless of weighted frequency value. Frequency distribution was the sole consideration in ranking the criteria in order of occurrence for both individual district size/type groups and the overall sample. Frequency distribution is represented by "F.D."

### Weighted Frequency Distribution

Where evaluation instruments utilized criteria for narrative comment only, a full value of one was assigned to each criterion occurrence. Evaluation instruments utilizing criteria for rating purposes, regardless of subsequent narration, had a full value of one assigned to each criterion occurrence only if that occurrence was not in combination with one or more other criteria for the purpose of a single rating. If there was more than one criterion occurring for purposes of a single rating, each criterion received

the fractional value that resulted in a total value of one for that rating. Weighted frequency distribution is represented by "W.F.D."

Occurrence Percentage (unweighted frequency of occurrence percentage)

The percentage of occurrence was determined by dividing the unweighted frequency distribution total for each criterion by the number of instruments received. Occurrence percentage was computed for each individual district size/type sample as well as for the sample as a whole. More than 100% was possible as some criteria occurred more than once on individual evaluation instruments. Occurrence percentage is represented by "O.P."

VIII. Analysis and Reporting

Section I

Data was analyzed from both individual and clustered questions. The analysis statement appears directly after the question or question cluster data. Cluster question data appears separately by individual question to facilitate reader understanding of analysis. The significance of findings appears within the analysis of questions and question clusters. Major significance is restated in the summary of findings at the end of Section I. As no retest was used to determine validity, individual comparisons to data from other sources are referred to, where appropriate, within data analyses. No restatement of validity appears except to note in the summary of findings that this research is considered marginally valid. Use of this research is recommended for further research.

## Section II

Data was analyzed in district size/type clusters, and as a whole.

Clustered data appears in Table I. Data Tables II and III include the ten most frequently occurring criteria from each cluster. The weighted frequency distribution and occurrence percentage appears for each of these. Complete guides for Tables I, II, and III appear on the pages preceding the tables. This is followed by the three hundred and eighty-three criteria used for analysis. They appear in order from the most to least frequently occurring. This final ordered list of criteria fulfills that specific objective of the research stated to the Thesis Committee as "Identifying the twenty-five most frequently occurring criteria used in evaluating elementary classroom teachers in Illinois." Research in Section II is considered valid. Data from Section II was used in Section I analysis. Therefore, no further analysis or statement of significance was necessary. It is recommended that data from Section II be used by evaluation committees and for further research.



SURVEY  
DATA AND ANALYSIS

SECTION I

The Observation and Evaluation  
of Elementary Teachers in Illinois

### DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

What is your sex?    M    F

Sex    N = 44

F = 40 = 90%

M = 4 = 9%

What is your age? \_\_\_\_\_

Age    N = 44

High = 53

Low = 23

What was your undergraduate major:

U. Maj.    N = 45

El. Ed.        = 27 = 60%

Eng.            = 2 = 4%

Hist.           = 2 = 4%

Music Ed.     = 2 = 4%

Art Ed.        = 1 = 2%

Psy.            = 1 = 2%

Soc.            = 1 = 2%

Pre Law        = 1 = 2%

Sec. Ed.        = 3 = 8%

Spec. Ed.      = 3 = 8%

Bio.            = 2 = 4%

What is your graduate major, if any? \_\_\_\_\_

Grad. Major N = 38

Ed. = 3	8%
El. Ed. = 8	21%
Read. = 14	37%
Spec. Ed. = 6	16%
Ed. Admin. = 2	5%
Ed. Instruct. Lead = 3	8%
Counseling = 2	5%

From what institution(s) did you receive your degree(s)?

Institutions: N = 43

UICC	= 8	19%	St. Olaf Col.	= 1	2%
U of I	= 3	7%	Hunter Col.	= 1	2%
SIU	= 3	7%	Oakland City		
NIU	= 1	2%	College--IN	= 1	2%
EIU	= 4	9%	Mundaline Col.		
U of Dayton	= 1	2%	(Chicago)	= 1	2%
Bradley	= 3	7%	Millikin	= 1	2%
Loyola	= 1	2%	Chicago State	= 1	2%
Ball State U	= 1	2%	Manchester Col.		
IL Wesleyan	= 1	2%	IN	= 1	2%
Wis. St. U	= 1	2%	ISU	= 7	16%
Col. of St.					
Francis-Joliet	= 1	2%			
St. Joseph Col.	= 1	2%			

Do you hold a standard elementary teaching certificate in Illinois?

Yes No

Stand. El. Ed. Cert. N = 45

Yes - 38 84%

No - 7 16%

Do you hold any other type of teaching certificate?

Yes No

Other Certificate N = 43

Yes - 18 42%

No - 25 58%

If yes, what type? \_\_\_\_\_

Type of Certificate N = 18

Chicago Cert. 7 = 39%

Art 1 = 5%

Limit Secondary 1 = 5%

Limit State Special 1 = 5%

Guidance 1 = 5%

El. Super 1 = 5%

NY State Provisional 1 = 5%

L.D. 5 = 28%

At what level did you teach during the 1975-1976 school year?

K 1 2 3 4 5 6

Level--1975-1976 N = 45

1 - 2 = 4%	K-6 - 1 = 2%
2 - 4 = 9%	K-3 - 1 = 2%
3 - 8 = 18%	5-6 - 2 = 4%
4 - 5 = 11%	1-3 - 2 = 4%
5 -10 = 22%	4-5-6 - 1 = 2%
6 - 4 = 9%	4-5 - 1 = 2%
8 - 1 = 2%	Sr. High - 1 = 2%
K - 2 = 4%	

At what level are you teaching during this 1976-1977 school year?

K 1 2 3 4 5 6

Level--1976-1977 N = 45

1 - 1 = 2%	K-3 - 1 = 2%
2 - 6 = 13%	6-8 - 1 = 2%
3 - 7 = 16%	5-6 - 1 = 2%
4 - 5 = 11%	4-5-5 - 1 = 2%
5 -10 = 22%	5-6-7-8 - 1 = 2%
6 - 4 = 9%	2-3-4-5 - 1 = 2%
7 - 1 = 2%	Jr. High - 1 = 2%
K - 2 = 4%	Pre School - 1 = 2%
K-6 - 1 = 2%	

Were you on tenure during the 1975-1976 school year? Yes No

Tenure--1975-1976 N = 46

Yes - 28 = 61%

No - 18 = 39%

Are you on tenure during this 1976-1977 school year?    Yes    No

Tenure--1976-1977    N = 46

Yes - 33 = 72%

No - 13 = 28%

How many years of teaching experience at the elementary level do you have? (Do not include this current school year) \_\_\_\_\_ yrs.

Experience    N = 46

1 - 3 = 6%                      12 - 2 = 4%

2 - 7 = 15%                    13 - 2 = 4%

3 - 5 = 11%                    14 - 1 = 2%

4 - 6 = 13%                    15 - 3 = 6%

5 - 7 = 15%                    16 - 1 = 2%

6 - 3 = 6%                      17 - 1 = 2%

7 - 2 = 4%                      18 - 1 = 2%

8 - 1 = 2%                      20 - 1 = 2%

In what school district were you employed during the 1975-1976 school year? \_\_\_\_\_

In what school district are you currently employed?

\_\_\_\_\_

What was the minimum number of evaluations required per teacher, per year, by the district in which you were employed during the 1975-1976 school year?

For tenured \_\_\_\_\_ For non-tenured \_\_\_\_\_ No requirement \_\_\_\_\_

### 1975-1976 Evaluations Required

Tenure    N = 42	Non-Tenure    N = 37
0 times - 8 = 19%	0 times - 8 = 22%
1 time - 21 = 50%	1 time - 8 = 22%
2 times - 10 = 24%	2 times - 16 = 43%
1 per - 1 = 2%	3 times - 2 = 5%
2 yrs.	4 times - 2 = 5%
1 per - 2 = 5%	6 times - 1 = 3%
3 yrs.	

What is the minimum number of-evaluations required per teacher, per year, by the district in which you are employed during this 1976-1977 school year.

### 1976-1977 Evaluations Required

Tenure    N = 39	Non-Tenure    N = 34
0 times - 7 = 18%	0 times - 7 = 21%
1 time - 19 = 48%	1 times - 8 = 24%
2 times - 9 = 23%	2 times -13 = 38%
3 times - 1 = 3%	3 times - 4 = 12%
1 per - 1 = 3%	4 times - 2 = 6%
2 yrs.	
1 per - 2 = 5%	
3 yrs.	

### Synopsis of Demographic Data

1. 95% of those surveyed provided their sex. 90% were female and 9% male. Those figures generally correspond to figures published by the Illinois Office of Education. This indicated that the elementary teaching population of Illinois is accurately represented in this survey in terms of sex.
2. 95% of those surveyed provided their age. No data was available on the average age of the elementary teaching population in Illinois. It was, therefore, not possible to determine if this survey accurately represents said population.
3. 97% of those surveyed provided their undergraduate major. 82% majored in the education field, 60% in elementary education and 16% in special education. The number of elementary teachers not majoring in education as undergraduates does not appear significant.
4. 78% of those surveyed indicated a graduate major. 100% were in the education field. The 100% figure indicates that the choice of a rather narrow population universe, for the reasons previously mentioned, proved somewhat valid.
5. 93% of those surveyed provided the name of the institution(s) from which they received their degree(s). A total of 21 different institutions were noted.
6. 97% of those surveyed responded to the question on holding a standard elementary teaching certificate. 84% indicated they did hold such a certificate. Of the 93% of those surveyed who responded to the ques-



tion on certification other than the standard elementary type (not necessarily in addition to), 42% indicated that they did hold other certification.

7. 97% of those surveyed provided the level they taught at during the 1975-76 and 1976-77 school years. Responses indicate the sample population is representative of the general Illinois teaching population. No significant differences exist in strata distribution between the two school years.
8. 100% of those surveyed provided their tenure status for the 1975-76 and 1976-77 school years. No data on tenure status for the Illinois teaching population in general was found. Therefore, it was not determined if those surveyed were accurately representative of the Illinois teaching population in general.
9. 100% of those surveyed provided the name or number of the school district in which they were employed during both the 1975-76 and 1976-77 school years. A total of 28 different school districts was noted as employers for the 1975-76 school year and 29 for the 1976-77 school year. No significant differences existed in the strata distribution percentages between the two school years. The names and/or numbers of the school districts employing those surveyed are not listed in the appended data tables in compliance with the promise of confidentiality extended in the requests for information from both the survey of individuals and individual school districts.
10. 69% of those surveyed furnished information on the number of evaluations required for both tenured and non-tenured teachers for the 1975-76 and

1976-77 school years. The largest percentage of responses for both school years indicated tenured teachers were required to be evaluated once and non-tenured twice. The range of requirements for tenured teachers in both years were from no evaluation requirement to three per year, and for non-tenured from no requirement to six per year. No significant differences were noted in strata distribution percentages not in the range of requirements for the two years. Significant variances did exist between the requirements indicated by an individual respondent and the number of evaluations actually performed on that respondent (tenure status noted). The percentage of those individual surveys in which such variances existed was significant. However, it is notable that evaluations can be performed without the knowledge of the evaluatee. In that case the significance of the noted variance is in the notification of evaluation and not in the apparent difference that exists between the number of required evaluations and the actual number of evaluations performed, as no difference may actually exist. As no information is available to determine the actual degree of variance between required and performed evaluations, either individually or survey wide, further analysis is not possible.

1. Who conducted your evaluation(s)? Principal \_\_\_\_\_ Others \_\_\_\_\_

2. If someone other than the principal conducted your evaluations,  
please identify by title. \_\_\_\_\_

N = 43

Principal - 41 = 94%

Director - 1 = 2%

No one - 1 = 2%

Title One Super. - 1 = 2%

Asst. Principal  
(along w/Principal) - 1 = 2%

Asst. Super.  
(along w/Principal) - 1 = 2%

3. Was the evaluator male or female? M F

N = 43

Male - 33 = 76%

Female - 10 = 23%

Data available from various sources indicates that the clear majority of administrators (doing observations and evaluations) in Illinois are male. The general responsibilities recognized in administrator job descriptions, and data available from various sources, indicates that the clear majority of observations and evaluations at the elementary level are conducted by principals. The data from questions #1 and #2 show the survey sample population is a reasonably accurate representation of the total administrator/principal population, by sex and responsibility, in Illinois.

It is significant to note that though the clear majority of elementary teachers in Illinois are female, the majority of elementary principals are

male. However, when correlated with question #33, the frequently heard hypothesis that the majority of elementary principals do not have in-classroom teaching experience is not supported. 68% of all observers and evaluators in this survey do have elementary classroom teaching experience. Male principals noted as the observer/evaluators by the survey sample show a similar clear majority having in-classroom elementary teaching experience.

4. How many times were you evaluated during the school year?

Evaluated N = 45

No. of times	No. of teachers	%
0	4	9%
1	28	62%
2	11	24%
6	1	2%
don't know	1	2%

5. How many times were you observed during the school year?

Observed N = 45

No. of times	No. of teachers	%	No. of times	No. of teachers	%
0	6	13%	6	1	2%
1	12	27%	8-10 (9)	1	2%
2	8	18%	Many	5	11%
3	3	6%	Daily	2	4%
4	2	4%	Don't know	2	4%
5	3	6%			

Questions #5 and #6 should have had the word "formal" or "formally" precede each "evaluation" and "observation." The data obtained from these questions are rendered less significant as a result of their being unspecific. The data does suggest a close relationship between the number of evaluations required and those actually performed. Data showing the average number of observations per evaluation were obtained by correlating the average number of evaluations (question #4 data) with the average number of observations (question #5 data). Only those responses which indicated a specific number were used in computing averages and correlated averages. The average number of observations per evaluation was cross-correlated to question #6 to determine the average observation time per evaluation. That information was compared to question #37.

Average number of evaluations = 1.27

Average number of observations = 2.08

Average number of observations per evaluation = 1.63

6. What was the average duration of each observation?

<u>Average Duration</u> N = 39			<u>Time</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Time</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>	20 min.	6	15%
0	1	2%	25 min.	3	8%
30 sec.	1	2%	30 min.	9	23%
2 min.	2	5%	40 min.	2	5%
5 min.	5	13%	45 min.	2	5%
10 min.	5	13%	50 min.	1	2%
15 min.	1	2%	60 min.	1	2%

Overall Average - 21 min.

7. What was the duration of the longest observation?

Longest N = 37

<u>Time</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
0	1	3%	30 min.	6	16%
1 min.	1	3%	35 min.	1	3%
5 min.	4	11%	40 min.	2	5%
10 min.	3	8%	45 min.	7	19%
15 min.	3	8%	60 min.	2	5%
20 min.	5	13%	90 min.	1	3%
25 min.	1	3%			

Overall Average - 28 min.

8. What was the duration of the shortest observation?

Shortest N = 35

<u>Time</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
0	1	3%	10 min.	2	6%
Pass by room	2	6%	15 min.	3	9%
5 secs.	1	3%	20 min.	6	17%
1 min.	2	6%	25 min.	1	3%
2 min.	3	9%	30 min.	5	14%
3 min.	2	6%	40 min.	1	3%
5 min.	5	14%	45 min.	1	3%

Overall Average - 14 min.

Questions #7 and #8 were averaged to determine the consistency of data on question #5. Consistency was established inferring computational

validity. The average observation time per evaluation was established by cross correlating the data from questions #4 and #5 to question #6. Subsequent data was compared to question #37.

Average observation time per evaluation = 34.23 minutes

9. Were you notified of the evaluator's intent to observe your teaching performance prior to the actual observation?

Notification

Observation #1 (N = 43)

Yes - 15 = 35%

No - 28 = 65%

---

(N = 11)

<u>Time</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
2 days	1	9%
7 days	6	55%
14 days	2	18%
30 days	2	18%

Observation #2 (N = 25)

Yes - 8 = 32%

No - 17 = 68%

---

(N = 6)

<u>Time</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
1 hour	1	17%
1 day	1	17%
7 days	2	33%
14 days	1	17%
30 days	1	17%

Observation #3 (N = 17)

Yes - 2 = 12%

No - 15 = 88%

---

(N = 1)

<u>Time</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
30 days	1	100%



10. Do you prefer notice prior to being observed for the purpose of evaluation?

Preference (N = 44)

Yes - 25 = 56%

No - 19 = 43%

Data shows that the clear majority of observations, regardless of their sequential place or the number performed throughout the school year, are done without prior notification. A slight majority of those teachers responding prefer notification prior to observation. It is, therefore, inferentially significant to note that teacher resistance to evaluation could be substantially reduced by prior notification. Prior notification of some observations and no prior notification in other cases would apparently balance the need for a teacher to be favorably disposed toward observation and the observers need to see a teacher's "normal" performance. The data indicates that those observers who do more than one observation do use this procedural guideline with prior notification being made mostly for the first observation. The total number of second observations made is 40% fewer than first observations. The total number of third observations made is 60% fewer than first observations and 32% fewer than second observations. Several sources cite 48 hours as a minimum guideline for prior notification. The clear majority of those who do notify prior to observation honor the "48 hours +" guideline. A slim majority of first observation notifications were made exactly seven days prior.



Some inconsistency was noted in individual respondents' answers to question #5 and question #9.

11. Were you notified of what specifics the evaluator would be looking for during the observation?

Specifics of Observations

Observation #1	Observation #2	Observation #3
(N = 42)	(N = 23)	(N = 16)
Yes - 10 = 24%	Yes - 5 = 22%	Yes - 2 = 13%
No - 32 = 76%	No - 18 = 78%	No - 14 = 88%

12. Would you prefer such notification?

Preference

(N = 40)

Yes - 31 = 77%

No - 9 = 22%

The clear majority of the survey sample taught in the same school district in 1975-76 as in 1976-77. No substantial percentage of respondents in that particular category indicated any changes being made in evaluation criteria or procedures for the 1976-77 school year. Therefore, it is inferentially notable that the respondents in this category could have been aware of the specifics the observer would be looking for by previous experience with the observer/evaluator, the district's evaluation instrument (its criteria), the observation instrument used, if any, (see Q. 31), and the various interactions between these elements which serve to inform the teacher being

observed of the specifics noted in the question. It is not possible to determine whether those indicating a desire to know the specifics an observer would be looking for actually did know, and/or whether or not such knowledge was the result of experience with the aforementioned elements. Therefore, the significance of the data resulting from analysis of this question is confined to inferring that it may be desirable to inform the new teacher of the specifics looked for in observing performance. However, due to the 22% response which indicated that they did not care to know the specifics, this would have to be determined on an individual basis. There is an indication that a minority of observers do inform particular teachers of the specifics they will be looking for (on a slightly decreasing frequency from first through third observation) in observing, but little if any significance can be derived from such data without more specific correlatable and cross-correlatable data.

13. Were you notified of the intended duration prior to each observation?

Duration

Observation #1

(N = 43)

Yes - 7 = 16%

No - 36 = 83%

Observation #2

(N = 24)

Yes - 4 = 17%

No - 20 = 83%

Observation #3

(N = 17)

Yes - 1 = 6%

No - 16 = 94%

14. Would you prefer such notification?

Preference

(N = 42)

Yes - 20 = 47%

No - 22 = 52%

The same problems exist in questions #13 and #14 as in questions #11 and #12. With this in mind, the data on these questions indicates, to a small degree, the desire on the part of a minority of teachers to be informed of an observer's intended observation time. A minority of evaluators do inform their teachers of intended observation times.

It is noted that partially reducing a teacher's anxiety caused by observation/evaluation may be accomplished by informing that teacher of the intended length of the observation. It is significant to note that 90% of respondents to question #37 believe that two hours or more of direct observation is a minimum for accurate and meaningful evaluation of teaching performance. 60% believe four hours or more to be minimum. In response to question #38, 89% of respondents indicated that they had never been observed for the amount of time they considered a minimum for an accurate and meaningful single evaluation. It is, therefore, quite significant to note that teacher anxiety caused by not knowing the intended length of observation is directly attributable to the matter of being uninformed, and not a result of observations being too long. However, as the positive response to question #14 was only 47%, it does not appear that informing all teachers of the intended length of observations is necessary or desirable. Such informing might best be determined on an individual basis.

15. Was the evaluator at least somewhat familiar with the children in your classroom prior to observation(s)?

Yes      No

Evaluator Familiarity with Children

(N = 40)

Yes - 28 = 70%

No - 12 = 30%

There are large numbers of evaluation criteria used to evaluate elementary classroom teachers in Illinois which require the evaluator to be somewhat familiar with the children in a particular teacher's classroom. The clear majority of teachers apparently do feel that their observers/evaluators are somewhat familiar with their students. It remains indeterminate whether or not the teachers believe that the extent to which the observer/evaluator is familiar with a particular teacher's children is sufficient to render an accurate judgment in cases where evaluation criteria require such knowledge, (see Q. 23-24). Responses to questions #16, #17, and #18 clearly show that in the course of observations, the majority of evaluators do not check student lesson plans. A slight majority of evaluators do consider the various cognitive levels and learning styles of students in evaluating a teacher's technique(s) of instruction, according to this survey's respondents, (see Q. 23). It is obvious that some inconsistency exists here. If a majority of evaluators are somewhat familiar with the children in a particular teacher's classroom, but for the most part do not check cognitive levels, learning styles, student progress, nor lesson plans, a considerable question exists as to how meaningful or accurate that "somewhat familiar" is. A comparison of the responses to the various questions #15, 16, 17, 18 and 24, when the response to question #25 is considered, indicates that those respondents who felt that evaluators were not "somewhat familiar" with their children, and many of those who felt evaluators were "somewhat familiar" with their children, feel that evaluation would be more accurate and meaningful if familiarity with the children in that particular classroom was increased. Indications are that such familiarity could be increased by checking student work, making an effort to determine student progress, and knowing student cognitive levels and learning styles.

The application of this increased familiarity to evaluating a teacher's lesson plans and teaching techniques would, undoubtedly, increase the overall accuracy and meaningfulness of evaluations. It is notable, however, that the clear majority of teachers do consider their performances to be benefited by evaluation feedback in spite of the significant percentage of evaluators who do not check the various items mentioned in questions #16, 17, 18 and 23, (see Q. 25-28). It is entirely possible that the improved teaching performance reported by the majority of respondents as a result of evaluation feedback resulted from general procedural suggestions and not specifics related to a particular classroom. This is speculative, however, and remains indeterminate. No significance is notable in the response to question #15 as the degree of familiarity, and the relationship of that degree to other questions, is not evident.

16. Did the evaluator check your lesson plans?

Observation #1	Observation #2	Observation #3
(N = 42)	(N = 25)	(N = 17)
Yes - 11 = 26%	Yes - 6 = 24%	Yes - 4 = 24%
No - 31 = 73%	No - 19 = 76%	No - 13 = 76%

17. Did the evaluator check any student work?

Observation #1	Observation #2	Observation #3
(N = 42)	(N = 24)	(N = 16)
Yes - 19 = 45%	Yes - 11 = 46%	Yes - 7 = 44%
No - 23 = 54%	No - 13 = 54%	No - 9 = 56%

18. Did the evaluator make any effort to determine the progress or improvement of students under your supervision during observation(s)?

Observation #1	Observation #2	Observation #3
(N = 42)	(N = 24)	(N = 16)
Yes - 9 - 21%	Yes - 7 = 29%	Yes - 5 = 31%
No - 33 = 78%	No - 17 = 71%	No - 11 = 69%

When data from questions #16, 17 and 18 are compared to the distribution frequency of evaluation criteria used to evaluate elementary teachers in Illinois, it reveals that a significant question of accuracy and treatment in evaluation exists in relation to the items mentioned in the questions. It is possible that previous knowledge of a particular teacher's planning and implementation effort render the evaluation accurate in spite of not having checked for the purpose of the evaluation in question. It is also possible that the evaluation is accurate without previous or current knowledge of the teacher's performance in relation to those specific criteria. However, positive knowledge of the teacher's performance on the items in question for any particular evaluation can only come as a result of checking for that particular evaluation. As the distribution frequency of the items mentioned in these questions is quite high, and the respondents to this survey indicate a majority of evaluators do not check these items during observation, it appears that evaluation criteria is being used superficially.



19. Did the evaluator speak to you regarding your teaching performance during the course of any observation?

(N = 43)

Yes - 6 = 14%

No - 37 = 86%

This question was included to determine if any significant percentage of evaluators spoke to teachers during the course of observation in such a manner as to constitute a violation of professional ethics. Though the question did not accurately reflect the intention, no significant percentage of evaluators speak to the teachers being observed at all. It is therefore inferred that no significant violation of professional ethics exists, if any does at all, in the evaluator's speaking to the teacher regarding performance during the course of observation. It should be noted that the evaluator could speak to the teacher in regard to performance during the course of observation without violating professional ethics. It may even be desirable to do so in some cases.

20. Were observations followed by written or oral communication regarding your performance?

Communication

Observation #1 (N = 29)	(N = 43)
Written - 8 = 28%	Yes - 30 = 69%
Oral - 7 = 24%	No - 13 = 30%
Both - 14 = 48%	



Observation #2 (N = 17)	(N = 22)
Written - 2 = 12%	Yes - 18 = 82%
Oral - 3 = 18%	No - 4 = 18%
Both - 12 = 71%	

Observation #3 (N = 8)	(N = 12)
Written - 3 = 38%	Yes - 8 = 67%
Oral - 3 = 38%	No - 4 = 33%
Both - 2 = 25%	

21. How long was it before you received feedback from the evaluator's observation(s)?

Feedback (N = 38)

Immediately	- 6 = 16%
Same day	- 5 = 13%
1 day	- 2 = 5%
2 days	- 2 = 5%
3-6 days	- 1 = 2%
7 days	- 3 = 8%
14 days	- 3 = 8%
21 days	- 2 = 5%
30 days	- 1 = 2%
60 days	- 2 = 5%
90 days	- 1 = 2%
End of year	- 5 = 13%
Never	- 3 = 8%
March	- 2 = 5%

The majority of evaluators did give feedback to teachers on observations made of their performance, and the majority of that feedback came within a reasonable length of time. However, the percentage of observations made in which no feedback was given, and the percentage of those giving feedback which was not within a reasonable length of time, is considered significant. The clear majority of evaluation instruments collected for this thesis which contained a statement of philosophy indicated that the primary purpose of evaluation was to "improve instruction." It can be reasonably assumed that instructional improvement as a result of observation/evaluation is improbable without some form of feedback within a reasonable length of time. When compared to questions #25, 26, 27, 28 and 32, a clear pattern of the effect of feedback emerges. When feedback is specific as to methods of improving teaching performance, and is made within a reasonable length of time following observation, the majority of teachers agree with the suggestions, try them, and feel that their performance is improved as a result. No significance is notable in the type of feedback--written, oral or both.

22. Did your evaluation(s) deal with specific strengths and weaknesses of your teaching performance?

(N = 43)

Yes - 32 = 74%

No - 11 = 25%

Cross-correlation of data from this question to data correlated to questions #20 and 21 reveal as highly significant the content of observation/ evaluation

feedback. Feedback which deals with specific strengths and weaknesses of teaching performance, as does the clear majority of feedback received by teachers observed in this survey, does not result in improved teaching performance unless specific ways of improving performance accompany the strengths and weaknesses feedback. This is highly significant.

23. Did the evaluator consider the various learning styles and cognitive levels of your students' in evaluating your teaching technique(s)?

(N = 40)

Yes - 21 = 52%

No - 19 = 47%

24. If not, would such consideration by the evaluator have resulted in more meaningful and accurate evaluation of your teaching performance?

(N = 22)

Yes - 19 = 86%

No - 3 = 14%

The clear majority do believe a more meaningful and accurate evaluation of their teaching performance would be rendered if the evaluator would consider the various student learning styles and cognitive levels in their particular classrooms. This is highly significant. In addition, those evaluators who did consider the various learning styles and cognitive levels of a particular teacher's students were much more likely to suggest specific ways of improving the instructional performance of that teacher. In turn, such suggestions resulted in improved instructional performance by that teacher. Therefore, it appears that a positive relationship exists between evaluators

who consider the cognitive levels and learning styles of a particular teacher's students, and the eventual improvement of that teacher's instructional performance. This is highly significant.

25. Did the evaluator suggest specific ways in which you could improve your teaching performance.

(N = 44)

Yes - 15 = 34%

No - 28 = 63%

Sometimes - 1 = 2%

26. If so, did you agree with these suggestions?

(N = 20)

Yes - 16 = 80%

No - 4 = 20%

27. If so, did you implement any of these suggestions in your teaching?

(N = 17)

Yes - 16 = 94%

No - 1 = 6%

28. If so, did this result in improved teaching performance by you?

(N = 16)

Yes - 14 = 88%

No - 1 = 6%

Sometimes - 1 = 6%

It is significant to note, as mentioned in questions #15-18, and #20-24, that:

1. The majority of evaluations do not deal with specific ways in which teaching performance might be improved.
2. The majority of those evaluations which did deal with such specifics were accepted by teachers, implemented, and resulted in improved instructional performance.

See questions #15-18, and #20-24, for more complete explanation of the significance of the data on these questions.

29. Was a standard instrument used to record the evaluation of your teaching performance?

(N = 42)

Yes - 28 = 66%

No - 14 = 33%

30. If so, did the instrument have a checklist or narrative format?

(N = 29)

Narrative - 4 = 14%

Checklist - 16 = 55%

Combination - 9 = 31%

31. Was any sort of checklist used by the evaluator during any observation of your teaching performance?

(N = 40)

Yes - 6 = 15%

No - 19 = 47%

Don't know - 15 = 38%

The comparison of data from these questions to data obtained from the evaluation instruments received from the various school districts in Illinois shows this survey to contain a representative sample of evaluation instruments, instrument formats, and observation instruments used throughout the state in observing/evaluating elementary teachers.

32. Did the majority of your evaluation(s) deal with in-classroom teaching performance or with personal characteristics?

(N = 41)

Teaching - 23 = 56%

Personal - 11 = 27%

Both - 7 = 17%

This question was intended for data collection to compare with the frequency distribution of evaluation criteria obtained from evaluation instruments throughout the state. The wide latitude of criteria application possibilities, together with the unspecific nature of the question and latitude for interpretation by respondents, rendered the comparative data highly subjective, very speculative, and, therefore, insignificant.

33. Did the evaluator have elementary classroom teaching experience?

(N = 44)

Yes - 30 = 68%

No - 5 = 11%

Don't know - 9 = 20%

34. If so, how many years?

(N = 29)

Don't know - 13 = 45%

2 yrs. - 1 = 3%

3-4 yrs. - 1 = 3%

5 yrs. - 1 = 3%

6 yrs. - 2 = 7%

7 yrs. - 1 = 3%

10 + yrs. - 2 = 7%

12 yrs. - 3 = 10%

15 + yrs. - 1 = 3%

20 yrs. - 1 = 3%

21-23 yrs. - 1 = 3%

24 yrs. - 2 = 7%

It is significant to note that the data from these two questions reveal that the majority of evaluators (i.e. principals, 94%) do have elementary classroom teaching experience. When compared to question #41, the significance of in-classroom elementary teaching experience to the perception of the value of an evaluator's suggestions for improvement via the observation/evaluation/feedback process appears significant. Correlation of data from questions #33, 34, and 41 to questions #25-28 were not significant due to the high percentage of in-classroom elementary teaching experienced evaluators. A substantial increase in sample size is needed to facilitate the correlation of data for establishing evaluator in-classroom elementary teaching experience to teacher perception of observation/evaluation feedback and resulting instructional improvement possibility.



35. Did the evaluator consider or mention your students' national standard achievement scores as a measure of your teaching performance?

(N = 43)

Yes - 1 = 2%

No - 42 = 97%

36. Would you consider use of your students' achievement scores--showing academic growth during the course of the school year--as legitimate criteria for evaluating your teaching performance?

(N = 41)

Yes - 7 = 17%

No - 32 = 78%

Maybe - 2 = 5%

Correlation of the data from these two questions to the frequency distribution of criteria used on evaluation instruments clearly reveals that none of the parties to evaluation of elementary teachers, including the teachers themselves, have any use for students' national standard achievement scores for evaluation purposes. The proliferation of criticism leveled at the validity of the tests which produce such scores may be partially responsible for the data indications produced by these questions. This is speculative, however.

37. How many hours of direct observation would you consider to be a minimum for accurate and meaningful evaluation of your teaching performance?

(N = 38)

<u>Time</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
Less than 1 hr.	2	5%
1 hr.	2	5%
2 hrs.	10	25%
3 hrs.	4	10%
4 hrs.	3	8%
5 hrs.	6	16%
6 hrs.	2	5%
8 hrs.	1	2%
10 hrs.	2	5%
30 hrs.	1	2%
40 hrs.	3	8%
41 + hrs.	2	5%

38. Have you ever been observed that long (even collectively) by an evaluator for the purpose of a single evaluation?

(N = 39)

Yes - 4 = 10%

No - 35 = 89%

Evaluation of this data for purposes of comparison to the cross-correlated data from questions #4-8 required some interpretation. This interpretation may have resulted in reduced validity. It is also notable that the use of the abbreviation "hrs." at the end of question #37 may have reduced validity by reflecting surveyor bias. The average observation time per evaluation

suggested by those teachers responding to question #37 is six hours. This is substantially more observation time than is actually done (i.e., 34.23 min. being the average observation time per evaluation.) The significance of the specific time difference between the average amount of time spent observing per evaluation and the average amount of time teachers consider to be a minimum for observation to effect meaningful and accurate evaluation is considerably reduced because of the wide range of response to questions #4-8 and #37. However, taking the difference generally, and comparing it to the data from question #38, there appears to be much significance in the fact that teachers do not feel they are adequately observed for the purpose of evaluation.

39. Is the same pattern--observation time, evaluation feedback, instrument used, etc.--being continued this year?

(N = 43)

Yes - 37 = 86%

No - 6 = 14%

40. If not, what changes have been made?

Changes (N = 6)

Head teacher observations - 1 = 17%

Observations done by someone  
from another district - 1 = 17%

Standard Forms - 1 = 17%

Interviews & Sign Eval. - 1 = 17%

Fewer Observations - 1 = 17 %

Evaluators check  
lesson plans - 1 = 17%

Data produced by these questions indicate very little change was appearing in the observation/evaluation process, or the materials in use for such, from the 1975-76 school year to that of 1976-77. It may be inferred that the improvement of instruction, so often repeated as the purpose of evaluation, does not apparently include the improvement of the evaluation process or materials used in such. This inference is, possibly, revealing of why the improvement of instruction is not resulting to a greater degree from the evaluation process. This is speculative, however, and would have to include analysis over a period of years, including the specific changes which did occur, in order to even marginally determine the effort and effect of changes.

41. Evaluation of elementary teachers should be conducted only by evaluators with a minimum of three years of in-classroom elementary teaching experience.

(N = 43)

Agree - 37 = 86%

Disagree - 6 = 14%

In addition to the comparative and correlated significance of the data produced by this question, it is notable that the same percentage of respondents answered question #42 "agree" as those who answered this question "agree". The "agree" response to one question did not necessarily produce an "agree" response to the other.

42. In order for evaluations to be meaningful, they must be based on direct observation.

(N = 44)

Agree - 38 = 86%

Disagree - 6 = 14%

The significance of the data produced by this question has been evident throughout the analysis of data produced in this survey.

### Summary of Data Analysis Significance

1. The overall survey is considered valid.
2. The majority of elementary principals are male, have in-classroom elementary teaching experience, and perform the evaluations of the teachers at their attendance centers.
3. There is a close relationship between the number of evaluations required and those actually performed. A majority of evaluations are done without prior notification.
4. Informing teachers of the specifics going to be looked for in observations may be useful in reducing teacher resistance. However, this would have to be determined on an individual basis.
5. Informing teachers of the intended duration of observations may be useful in reducing teacher anxiety. However, this would have to be determined on an individual basis.
6. Teachers generally feel that evaluators are at least somewhat familiar with the children in their classrooms. It remains indeterminate if the extent of familiarity is sufficient to render accurate judgment in cases where evaluation criteria required such.
7. Correlation of specific questions to frequency distribution of criteria for evaluation mentioned in those questions strongly indicates that evaluators are superficial in their rating of teaching performance.
8. No apparent violation of professional ethics (to any significant degree) exists in relation to evaluators speaking to teachers concerning performance during the course of observation.

9. A majority of evaluators give teachers feedback of some kind regarding the observation of their teaching performance. However, a majority of that feedback does not deal with specific ways in which performance can be improved in spite of a majority of evaluators giving feedback on strengths and weaknesses of teaching performance. In those cases in which feedback is specific as to ways of improving instructional performance, teachers agree with the suggestions, try them, and feel that their performance improves as a result. This is highly significant.
10. A positive relationship exists between evaluators who consider the various learning styles and cognitive levels of a particular teacher's students and evaluators who suggest specific ways in which a particular teacher can improve instructional performance. This is highly significant.
11. Teachers do not believe they are adequately observed for the purposes of evaluation. This is highly significant.
12. Elementary teacher perception of the value of an evaluator's suggestions for instructional improvement are apparently significantly tied to the variable of that evaluator's in-classroom elementary teaching experience. The teacher's perception of such value is positively correlated to an evaluator's having such experience. No significance is apparent in the amount of that experience.



### Suggestions For Improving the Survey Instrument

1. Include the word "formal" to precede the words "observation(s)" and "evaluation(s)" in appropriate places.
2. Define the words "formal evaluation(s)" and "formal observation(s)" in the instructions for completing the survey. Include a minimum time in the definition of "formal observation(s)".
3. Inclusion of questions to determine if the teacher was or was not aware of the specifics a particular observer would be looking for prior to being notified, or regardless of being notified, of the intention to observe.
4. Inclusion of a question to determine if teachers feel that the extent to which evaluators are familiar with the children in their classrooms is sufficient to render an accurate judgment in cases where criteria requires such familiarity.
5. Questions #15, 16, 17, 18, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27 should have qualifying questions to facilitate their individual, correlated, and cross-correlated significance.
6. Eliminate the word abbreviation "hrs." from question #37 and add the note "Be as specific as possible."
7. Qualify question #32 with specific criteria and how it's used.
8. A significant increase in the sample size is needed to increase the validity of the data. Such would also facilitate the correlation of data from questions #25-28 to questions #33, 34 and 41, making it possible to further determine the effect of evaluator in-classroom teaching experience to the improvement of teaching performance by teachers observed/evaluated.

EVALUATION  
INSTRUMENTS AND CRITERIA  
DATA AND ANALYSIS

SECTION II

INSTRUMENTS AND CRITERIA  
USED FOR EVALUATION OF  
ELEMENTARY TEACHERS IN ILLINOIS

## Guide - Table I

Questions correspond to the vertically listed numbers on the following data Table I. Individual column figures are based on 50 requests; the totals column figure is based on 300 requests.

1. The number of responses received.
2. The percentage of responses received.
3. The total number of instruments received.
4. The percentage of instruments represented in the total number of responses received.
5. The number of responses from districts not using evaluation instruments.
6. The percentage of districts not using evaluation instruments represented in the total number of responses.
7. The total number of different criteria represented in the instruments collectively.
8. The total count of criteria occurrence.
9. The average number of criteria per instrument.
10. The highest number of criteria occurring on any single instrument.
11. The lowest number of criteria occurring on any single instrument.
12. The number of checklist formats represented in the total number of responses received.
14. The number of narrative formats represented in the total number of responses received.
15. The percentage of narrative formats represented in the total number of responses received.

16. The number of mixed formats represented in the total number of responses received.
17. The percentage of mixed formats represented in the total number of responses received.

TABLE I

	K(N)-(6) 8			K(N)-12			Total Survey
	0-500	500-1,000	1,000 +	0-750	750-1,500	1,500 +	
1.	21	21	38	19	28	25	152
2.	42	42	76	38	56	50	51
3.	18	18	37	17	26	24	140
4.	86	86	97	89	93	96	92
5.	3	3	1	2	2	1	12
6.	14	14	3	11	7	4	8
7.	183	188	285	177	202	206	383
8.	523	603	1,525	540	865	758	4,814
9.	29.05	33.50	41.21	31.76	33.26	31.58	34.38
10.	55	63	98	79	84	107	107
11.	4	9	3	10	0	4	0
12.	3	0	5	0	1	0	9
13.	14	0	13	0	4	0	6
14.	4	3	14	3	7	10	41
15.	19	14	37	16	25	40	27
16.	11	15	18	14	11	14	83
17.	52	71	45	74	39	56	55

## Guide - Tables II and III

- Rank - The most frequently occurring criteria from 1 to 10 (11).
- N - The number which identifies the criteria corresponding to the rank order of the criteria for the total sample.
- F.D. - Frequency distribution--based on the "N" number listed for that particular district size/type subsample which can be found in row #1 of Table I.
- W.F.D.-Weighted frequency distribution--based on the "N" number, row #1 of Table I.
- O.P. - Occurrence percentage--based on the "N" number, row #1 of Table I.

An eleventh criteria is mentioned where the frequency of occurrence is the same as the tenth ordered criterion.

TABLE 2

K(N)-(6)8

Rank	0-500				500-1,000				1,000 +			
	N	FD	WFD	OP	N	FD	WFD	OP	N	FD	WFD	OP
1.	2	21	15.66	116	5	17	15.5	94	1	39	38.5	105
2.	6	16	16	89	10	15	15	83	3	33	32.5	89
3.	7	14	14	78	1	13	10.3	72	9	30	29.5	81
4.	37	12	9.33	67	9	12	11.33	67	4	29	27.5	78
5.	34	11	10.5	61	59	12	10.83	67	22	25	24.5	67
6.	10	11	10.25	61	6	12	10.5	67	2	24	22.25	64
7.	68	11	8.66	61	4	11	10	61	9	23	23.0	62
8.	8	10	10	56	15	11	9.20	61	6	23	19	62
9.	13	10	9.5	56	2	10	9.5	56	5	22	22	59
10.	1	9	7.82	50	14	10	5.33	56	7	22	22	59
11.	17	9	7.0	50					8	22	22	59



TABLE 3

Rank	K(N)-12											
	0-750				750-1,500				1,500 +			
	N	FD	WFD	OP	N	FD	WFD	OP	N	FD	WFD	OP
1.	5	16	14.5	94	1	25	23.6	96	5	19	18.5	79
2.	3	14	14	82	4	18	16.6	69	1	18	15.91	75
3.	4	14	11.33	82	2	18	16.35	69	4	17	16.5	71
4.	1	13	11.16	76	5	18	16.1	69	11	17	16.5	71
5.	2	13	10.83	76	3	17	17	65	3	16	16	67
6.	7	12	11.5	71	18	17	15.08	65	18	16	15.33	67
7.	6	11	10.5	65	6	16	15.25	62	2	16	15	67
8.	13	10	9.0	59	8	16	14.7	62	6	16	15	67
9.	14	9	9.0	53	20	16	13.75	62	7	13	12.5	54
10.	12	9	8.5	53	14	15	12.25	58	13	13	11.75	54

## Evaluation Criteria

As noted in the analysis statement of the Research Flow Chart, the following three hundred and eighty-three evaluation criteria are those used in codifying the criteria appearing on the one hundred and forty evaluation instruments analyzed for purposes of this research. Each criterion is listed in order of frequency of occurrence from most frequent to least. The number preceding the criterion statement indicates its order rank. Each criterion is followed by the frequency distribution number, (F.D.), the weighted frequency distribution number (W.F.D.), and the occurred percentage (O.P.). The frequency distribution number, the weighted frequency distribution number, and the occurrence percentage are based on 140. In some cases, the evaluations of teachers in a particular district are recorded on more than one instrument. Each combination, whether two evaluation instruments, or one evaluation instrument and one observation instrument, was counted as one instrument. All criteria from the instruments, regardless of combination, were analyzed and reported in this research.

Where applicable, each criterion reported contains the various descriptors which occurred in the different wordings encountered. "No descriptor" represents all occurring wordings of that criterion except those used for differentiation elsewhere. This includes instances where a single word criterion with no descriptor occurred. "All descriptors" appears where a criterion represents all descriptors, including those instances where a single word occurs. The word "various" is used to indicate frequent occurrence of words surrounding the criterion in question which did not change its falling within the parameters of the wording used there. A maximum effort was made to insure that each criterion statement was a true representation of the various criteria it stood for. As many original

wordings were used, no responsibility is assumed for grammatical correctness or the statement making sense.

<u>Rank</u>	<u>F.D.</u>	<u>W.F.D.</u>	<u>O.P.</u>
1. Individualization of instruction--by recognition of pupil needs--psychological, social.	117	107.29	84
2. A variety of materials--equipment--used effectively, wisely--for enrichment.	102	89.59	73
3. Classroom conditions--physical, various.	100	99.5	71
4. Instructional skills--variety of techniques.	97	88.26	69
5. Planning--no descriptor--complete, thorough, well written, indication of, smooth transition.	95	89.6	68
6. Teacher's enthusiasm--interest, effort.	94	89.5	67
7. Knowledge of subject matter--use of.	87	85.5	62
8. Appearance--clean, appropriate dress, hair.	78	75.86	56
9. An education atmosphere is maintained--wholesome atmosphere.	77	73.66	55
10. Works cooperatively with others--effective, helpful, harmonious, no descriptor. Is cooperative.	72	67.59	51
11. Relationship with parents--contacts, rapport, professional.	70	65.16	50
12. All class members are encouraged to participate.	66	62.23	47
13. Supports policies and decisions of Board of Education--follows, conforms with, aware of--also building policy, decisions, philosophy.	66	61.33	47
14. Teacher self-control--poise.	65	54.11	46
15. Takes personal responsibility for individual professional growth--takes steps toward self-improvement.	61	56.7	44
16. Classroom control--supervision, organization, interest.	58	57.5	41
17. Punctual, no descriptor.	58	49.24	41
18. Teacher is fair, firm, friendly, just--consistently.	55	53	39

19. Oral expression--speech, clarity, English.	55	36.49	39
20. Discipline--no descriptor.	54	48.08	39
21. Rapport with class, pupils--positive.	52	49	37
22. Activities (learning experiences)--appropriate variety, purposeful, time for, individualize, constructive.	52	47.1	37
23. Participation--in school activities, extra curricular, extra assignments.	50	48.16	36
24. Reaction to constructive criticism--accepts, willingness to try suggestions.	47	45.5	34
25. Teacher is flexible--adaptable to change--new ideas.	47	41.49	34
26. Responsibilities--assumes share, accepts.	45	42.43	32
27. Voice--quality, control.	45	36.66	32
28. Aids--variety of, use, multi-media, supplies.	43	40.41	31
29. Professional meetings--committees, activities, conferences, workshops, in-service.	43	40.2	31
30. Teacher interested in students as individuals--available for individual help, guidance, concerned, low achievers and failures.	43	39.99	31
31. Classroom management--class time.	42	40.1	30
32. Dependable--reliable--no descriptor.	42	33.74	30
33. Teacher's vitality--physical condition, good health, energetic, stamina.	40	38.5	29
34. Atmosphere/environment of open interaction.	38	34.36	27
35. Written expression--English.	38	24.41	27
36. Teacher sense of humor--all descriptors.	37	34.20	26
37. Teacher is able to work as one member of a team--constructive, contributing, effective, partner in the learning process.	37	33.33	26
38. Keeps accurate records.	37	31.25	26

39.	Tactful--all descriptors.	37	29.99	26
40.	Understanding, empathy, sympathy, sensitivity.	35	27.90	25
41.	High moral and ethical standards.	34	33.5	24
42.	Judgment--common sense.	34	30.5	24
43.	Evaluation techniques--variety, effective, appropriate.	32	29.29	23
44.	Teacher's creativity, imagination, resourcefulness.	32	29	23
45.	Understanding of child growth and development.	31	28.66	22
46.	Has observable, clearly defined, goals/aims--for students.	31	27.75	22
47.	Teacher leadership--all descriptors.	30	28.33	21
48.	Involvement in professional organizations.	29	25.9	21
49.	Materials fit varying levels of student ability.	29	25.75	21
50.	Prompt with reports and administrative requests.	29	23	21
51.	Assignments made are clear, concise, definite.	29	21.57	21
52.	Teacher is able to motivate student learning.	28	24.62	20
53.	Adjust to adapt/adjust to unexpected, difficult, situations--ability to handle.	27	24.33	19
54.	Student motivation is shown by interest.	27	23.91	19
55.	Teacher is willing to share.	26	24.08	19
56.	Teacher's care of equipment and materials--accountable, responsible for.	26	22.95	19
57.	Effective use of supportive services--specialists	25	24.33	18
58.	Uses motivation as a technique--stimulation, factors.	25	23.16	18
59.	Teacher utilizes--provides for--individualization.	24	22.83	17
60.	Student learning of self-discipline, self-control, self-direction.	24	22.33	17

61.	Variety of resources used.	24	18.24	17
62.	Teacher--emotionally stable, good mental health.	24	17.36	17
63.	Skill in presentation--conducts challenging discussion/recitation.	23	21.1	16
64.	Cooperation/participation/support--community.	23	20.16	16
65.	Assignments--meaningful, purposeful, appropriate.	23	17.78	16
66.	Effectively communicates with students, staff, parents.	22	22	15
67.	Teacher shows initiative.	22	19	15
68.	Planning--careful, thoughtful, geared for needs of class.	22	16.49	15
69.	Records and reports--no descriptor.	21	20.5	15
70.	Skillful questioning.	20	19.5	14
71.	Student creativity--ample opportunity, encourages.	20	18.83	14
72.	Is cooperative with administration, school.	20	18.16	14
73.	Confidence--teacher is confident.	20	18.08	14
74.	Planning--long and short range.	20	16.5	14
75.	Planning--efficient, organized, effective.	20	15.49	14
76.	Direction/method/organization of student learning.	19	17	14
77.	Seeks to improve work habits of students.	19	16.83	14
78.	Professional--no descriptor.	19	16.75	14
79.	Attendance--not absent from room unnecessarily or tardy--good attendance record.	19	16.2	14
80.	Stimulates original thinking in students--creative thinking--thinking, ideas, problem solving.	18	15.24	13
81.	Relates well with colleagues.	17	15	12
82.	Students respect teacher.	16	15	11



83. Teacher is genuinely concerned/interested in others--students.	16	14.66	11
84. Teacher is loyal--all descriptors.	15	15	11
85. Student growth is evident--all descriptors.	15	15	11
86. Teacher is unbiased--objective, impartial.	15	14	11
87. Respects the opinions, viewpoints, beliefs, suggestions, of others.	15	13.83	11
88. Teacher's attitude toward students and school--positive--administration, teachers.	14	14	10
89. Teaching strategy is appropriate for lessons and goals.	14	14	10
90. Carries out routine effeciently, effectively, wisely.	14	14	10
91. Criticism/suggestions--teacher uses constructive suggestions rather than adverse criticism.	14	13.5	10
92. Teacher is courteous.	14	11.91	10
93. Encourages independent study habits.	14	11.83	10
94. Current reading in field.	14	11.7	10
95. Promptness--no descriptor.	14	10.75	10
96. Personal characteristics--personal competencies, personality, personal qualities, traits.	13	13	9
97. Professional status maintained between teacher and pupils--harmonious, rapport.	13	12.5	9
98. Teacher provides for students' health/safety--knows, characteristics of.	13	12.5	9
99. Student use of materials, resources, aids.	13	12	9
100. Student enthusiasm--motivation shown by.	13	8.33	9
101. Teacher shows respect for each student.	12	12	9
102. Diagnostic results applied to planning.	12	11.33	9
103. Teacher is prepared for lessons to be presented.	12	11	9

104.	Teacher takes approval/beneficial courses.	12	11	9
105.	Teacher recognition of student efforts and contributions.	12	10.83	9
106.	Positive public relations.	12	10.5	9
107.	Planning--flexible, grouping, purposes.	12	10.5	9
108.	Willingness to propose constructive methods of improving policies and procedures.	12	9.83	9
109.	Teacher integrity--honesty, trustworthy.	12	9.83	9
110.	Knowledge of current education theories and research.	12	9.33	9
111.	Teacher is patient--all descriptors.	12	8.91	9
112.	Teacher shows attention to individual needs as shown by differentiation of assignments.	12	6.03	9
113.	Teacher is free of annoying/distracting personal habits.	11	11	8
114.	Teacher use of audio-visual/multi-sensory materials, technology.	11	10.25	8
115.	Supervision--of learning activities, thorough.	11	10.2	8
116.	Analyzes and makes use of the results of tests --both teacher made and standardized.	11	10.2	8
117.	Understanding--no descriptor--endeavors to create an atmosphere of.	11	9.75	8
118.	Attention to clerical details/duties--proper, accurate.	11	9.33	8
119.	Relating how something learned or studied could be applied to other situations--correlates, interrelates learning experiences. Teacher's attitude--constructive.	10	10	7
120.	Teacher work habits--efficient, accurate.	10	10	7
121.	Teacher sets standards--realistic.	10	10	7
122.	Teacher helps students learn to assume responsibilities.	10	9.5	7

123.	Teacher channels suggestions/requests to proper staff members--observes channels.	10	9.5	7
124.	Develops in each student a sense of personal growth and worth.	10	8.83	7
125.	Teacher discusses pupil problems and personalities only with those concerned.	10	8.7	7
126.	Teacher is consistent.	10	8.53	7
127.	Self-evaluation--teacher.	10	8.1	7
128.	Children accept responsibility.	10	8	7
129.	Teacher is open-minded.	10	7.36	7
130.	Teacher uses the inquiry/discovery technique.	9	9	6
131.	Teacher uses democratic classroom procedures.	9	9	6
132.	Discipline procedure is clearly defined.	9	9	6
133.	Teacher adapts vocabulary to grade level.	9	9	6
134.	Seating arrangement contributes to learning.	9	9	6
135.	Teacher evaluates and returns student work promptly.	9	8.5	6
136.	Helps students evaluate their own achievement and skills.	9	8.5	6
137.	Performs assigned duties efficiently and effectively.	9	8.33	6
138.	Teacher is willing to ask for help/council/advice.	9	8.25	6
139.	Praise is used as a motivational technique.	9	8	6
140.	Teacher is able to work with individuals and various sized groups.	9	7.41	6
141.	Teacher researches and evaluates new educational trends.	9	7.03	6
142.	Pupil cooperation.	9	7	6
143.	Teacher is considerate.	9	7	6
144.	Teacher recognizes the relationship of his/her individual teaching assignment to the total school program.	8	8	6

145.	Systematic and orderly progression--continuity, sequential.	8	8	6
146.	Teacher finds and emphasizes the positive attributes of each child.	8	8	6
147.	Teacher handling of classroom procedure--organized.	8	7.5	6
148.	Teacher provides reinforcement--reinforces, positive.	8	7.5	6
149.	Teacher has/displays a high regard for the teaching profession.	8	7.33	6
150.	Teacher accepts the will of the majority.	8	7.33	6
151.	Teacher involvement in curriculum studies.	8	7.2	6
152.	Teacher is discreet.	8	6.66	6
153.	Teacher is tolerant.	8	4.52	6
154.	Teacher employs an adequate balance between lecture, demonstration, recitation, discussion; various.	7	7	5
155.	Planning includes all pupils.	7	7	5
156.	Teacher uses curriculum guide--adheres to.	7	6.75	5
157.	Teacher works to improve instruction--performance.	7.	6.5	5
158.	Specific class goals are formulated.	7	6	5
159.	Teacher understands the background, needs, and problems of the community.	7	6	5
160.	Teacher is alert for ways to help others.	7	5.75	5
161.	Teacher encourages independent thinking.	7	5.25	5
162.	Teacher is calm.	7	5.03	5
163.	Teacher is sincere.	7	4.16	5
164.	Key concepts are emphasized.	6	6	4
165.	Teacher has a good self-concept, self-image; various.	6	6	4

166.	Teacher engages in professional study.	6	6	4
167.	There is pupil participation in setting behavioral standards.	6	6	4
168.	Students consistently appraise their own work.	6	6	4
169.	The teacher evaluates continuously in terms of objectives set by the teacher and pupils.	6	6	4
170.	Organization of records and reports.	6	5.5	4
171.	Appropriate course content is evident.	6	5.5	4
172.	Teacher makes use of community resources.	6	5.16	4
173.	Teacher has a pleasant disposition.	6	4.75	4
174.	Teacher is familiar with student background, home.	6	4.5	4
175.	Interesting educational climate.	6	4.5	4
176.	Teacher makes adjustments in classroom environment appropriate to lesson and external conditions.	6	4.49	4
177.	Clearly defined instructional procedure.	6	4.	4
178.	Teacher's professional dignity, pride.	6	3.91	4
179.	There is communication between everyone in the class.	5	5	4
180.	Students are aware of the goals for each lesson.	5	5	4
181.	Teacher's method of homework/class assignment.	5	5	4
182.	Teacher handles problems by "working through" rather than denial, avoidance or suppression.	5	5	4
183.	Teacher's active interest in P.T.A.	5	5	4
184.	Teacher provides experiences beyond mastery of skills--and understandings which synthesize them.	5	5	4
185.	Teacher utilizes teaching situation to stimulate social interaction, fair play--various.	5	5	4
186.	Lessons are kept to a central purpose.	5	5	4
187.	Teacher allows sufficient time for each subject.	5	4.83	4

188.	Teacher avoids use fear/threats--motivates positively.	5	4.5	4
189.	Participation--no descriptor.	5	4.5	4
190.	Plans are made in advance.	5	4.5	4
191.	Plans for substitutes--various.	5	4.5	4
192.	Teacher cares for routine matters.	5	4.5	4
193.	Thoroughness of presentation.	5	4.5	4
194.	Teacher respects morals of the community in general conduct.	5	4.5	4
195.	Class attitude and response--teacher helps students gain the right attitude.	5	4.5	4
196.	Teacher works positively with class.	5	4.16	4
197.	Student participation, where appropriate, in goal setting.	5	4	4
198.	Teacher is able to draw upon student interest.	5	4	4
199.	Teacher is diplomatic.	5	3.75	4
200.	Pupil reactions accepted and used in the learning situation.	4	4	3
201.	Teacher accepts responsibility for the quality of the instructional programs.	4	4	3
202.	Teacher is able to disagree without being disagreeable.	4	4	3
203.	Teacher accepts all children.	4	4	3
204.	Decisiveness--no descriptor.	4	4	3
205.	Teacher skill at interpreting student progress.	4	4	3
206.	Teacher goals reflect realistic expectations.	4	4	3
207.	Teacher has sufficient course credit to work in assigned area.	4	4	3
208.	Teacher has the ability to grade students accurately	4	4	3



209.	Teacher is willing to work longer hours--more than minimum--additional responsibilities	4	4	3
210.	Teacher's mental/emotional maturity.	4	3.5	3
211.	Teacher's disposition toward pupils--positive.	4	3.5	3
212.	Teacher gains respect of associates.	4	3.5	3
213.	Teacher use of supplementary materials.	4	3.5	3
214.	Teacher eliminates use of sarcastic remarks.	4	3.16	3
215.	Pupil interest/enthusiasm.	4	3	3
216.	Teacher individualizes by circulating in the room--physical movement.	4	2.66	3
217.	Teacher's personality is warm/appealing.	4	2.5	3
218.	Teacher refrains from gossip.	4	2.49	3
219.	Teacher familiarity with students' problems.	4	2	3
220.	General personal characteristics that may hinder doing the best job or contribute to success.	3	3	2
221.	Teacher follows through without external pressure.	3	3	2
222.	Classroom is child-centered or subject centered?	3	3	2
223.	Plans are challenging.	3	3	2
224.	Teacher finds and emphasizes the positive attributes of each child.	3	3	2
225.	Teacher implements suggestions of the principal.	3	3	2
226.	Teacher expresses own professional convictions.	3	3	2
227.	Teacher endeavors to find and eliminate causes of undesirable behavior.	3	3	2
228.	Teacher's records and reports of evaluation.	3	3	2
229.	Teacher recognizes strengths and weaknesses.	3	3	2
230.	Teacher handles behavior problems without emotional upsets or emotional extremes.	3	3	2



231.	Teacher is cognizant of individual students' capacity to learn.	3	3	2
232.	Pupils express pride in and contribute to the attractiveness of the classroom.	3	3	2
233.	Teacher demands best efforts--challenging.	3	3	2
234.	Opportunities provided to foster leadership and cooperation among pupils in and out of the classroom.	3	3	2
235.	Teacher provides opportunities for student decision making.	3	3	2
236.	Teacher is able to justify grades.	3	3	2
237.	Behavioral rules and procedures are reinforced.	3	2.5	2
238.	Teacher encourages critical thinking.	3	2.5	2
239.	Students are cheerful at work and play.	3	2.5	2
240.	Cooperation to the total school program.	3	2.5	2
241.	Teacher takes positive steps in developing and maintaining faculty and student morale.	3	2.5	2
242.	Teacher uses student committee report method.	3	2.5	2
243.	Teacher avoids scolding, nagging, shouting, or loud talking.	3	2.5	2
244.	Teacher shows social and emotional adjustment.	3	2.33	2
245.	Teacher adheres to approved programs.	3	2.25	2
246.	Teacher completes goals--objectives.	3	1.83	2
247.	Student research--research activities--exploration.	3	1.53	2
248.	Classroom atmosphere is happy/enjoyable.	3	1.5	2
249.	Teacher coordinates all available resources.	2	2	1
250.	Teacher provides feedback on professional meetings.	2	2	1
251.	Teacher considers professional growth secondary to responsibility.	2	2	1
252.	Teacher uses cumulative records when appropriate.	2	2	1

253.	Continuing education--no descriptor.	2	2	1
254.	Teacher seeks principal's advice on school policy/procedure/philosophy.	2	2	1
255.	Teacher's mental alertness.	2	2	1
256.	Students follow teacher's rules and procedures.	2	2	1
257.	Knows and uses stimulating assignment techniques.	2	2	1
258.	Teacher's promise for professional growth.	2	2	1
259.	Materials/resources/aids--well organized.	2	2	1
260.	Teacher watches students for cues of understanding.	2	2	1
261.	Teacher generates enthusiasm and motivation within an academic atmosphere.	2	2	1
262.	Teacher is dedicated.	2	2	1
263.	Teacher fosters social and emotional growth in children.	2	2	1
264.	Teacher uses planning time to best advantage.	2	2	1
265.	Teacher has knowledge of skills appropriate to grade level.	2	2	1
266.	Teacher knowledge of current events.	2	2	1
267.	Teacher teaches for transfer of learning.	2	2	1
268.	Materials are readily available.	2	2	1
269.	Teacher uses drill and review.	2	2	1
270.	Teacher uses texts.	2	2	1
271.	Teacher interprets policy and procedures for parents.	2	2	1
272.	Teacher defines objectives in terms of trends, concepts, and skills.	2	2	1
273.	Teacher leads pupils to interpret facts and make generalizations.	2	2	1

274.	Teacher uses group evaluation through class discussion, projects presentation by pupil, group, and other means.	2	2	1
275.	Teacher is task oriented.	2	2	1
276.	Teacher is willing to explain.	2	2	1
277.	Teacher can effect and accept compromise solution.	2	2	1
278.	Teacher's morale--school spirit.	2	2	1
279.	Teacher is a good listener.	2	2	1
280.	Teacher encourages children to work to capacity without undue tension.	2	2	1
281.	Teacher accepts transfer.	2	2	1
282.	Teacher character--no descriptor.	2	2	1
283.	Teacher's cultural refinement.	2	2	1
284.	Classroom noise equals "work noise."	2	2	1
285.	Teacher seeks to understand situations before making judgment decisions	2	2	1
286.	Teacher non-verbal communication.	2	2	1
287.	Teacher has recent training and experience.	2	2	1
288.	Teacher maintains confidence of students.	2	2	1
289.	Teacher provides for utilization of volunteer students as peer tutors.	2	2	1
290.	Teacher minimizes time spent on clerical tasks in order to work with the students.	2	2	1
291.	Teacher encourages a continued desire to learn.	2	2	1
292.	Develops instruction from an understanding of what is to be taught and why.	2	2	1
293.	Teacher is diligent.	2	1.83	1
294.	Teacher is alert to ways of improving conditions.	2	1.5	1

295.	Teacher contribution to the total staff program.	2	1.5	1
296.	Teacher provides experiences in all areas of the curriculum to aid character development.	2	1.5	1
297.	Teacher is at ease.	2	1.5	1
298.	Teacher is kind.	2	1.5	1
299.	Teacher is familiar with curriculum guides.	2	1.25	1
300.	Teacher is familiar with approved programs.	2	1.25	1
301.	Teacher has buoyant personality.	2	1.25	1
302.	Teacher handbooks--no descriptor.	2	1.25	1
303.	Students helped to recognize the need for rules and regulations.	2	1.2	1
304.	Teacher is predictable.	2	1.2	1
305.	Teacher teaches in accordance with the principles of learning.	2	1.16	1
306.	Teacher role-playing--no descriptor.	2	1.16	1
307.	There is evidence that educational needs have been met.	2	1.16	1
308.	Teacher's ability to communicate in all media.	1	1	1
309.	Teacher exhibits knowledge of individual learning within the classroom.	1	1	1
310.	Teacher is capable of giving and carrying out instructions.	1	1	1
311.	Teacher is thorough in attacking a task.	1	1	1
312.	Teacher evaluation of goals completion.	1	1	1
313.	Teacher lecture--no descriptor.	1	1	1
314.	Teacher--administrative records and reports--no descriptor.	1	1	1
315.	Teacher is progressing through materials.	1	1	1
316.	Students demonstrate mastery on tests.	1	1	1
317.	Students are aware of evaluation methods.	1	1	1

318.	Students understand teacher's behavioral expectations.	1	1	1
319.	Teacher does not leave work early.	1	1	1
320.	Teacher is punctual at school activities.	1	1	1
321.	Teacher promotes effective growth in oral and written communication.	1	1	1
322.	Tests and quizzes are a true representation of the work that precedes them.	1	1	1
323.	Immediacy and smoothness with which work begins.	1	1	1
324.	Teacher endeavors to be humanitarian.	1	1	1
325.	Teacher enjoys working with children.	1	1	1
326.	Teacher willingness to engage in dialogue with principal concerning performance.	1	1	1
327.	Teacher constructs, administers, and interprets diagnostic tests and procedures.	1	1	1
328.	Evidence of effective transmission of subject matter.	1	1	1
329.	Teacher performs all required school regulations on time.	1	1	1
330.	Teacher uses workbooks.	1	1	1
331.	Culmination of activities.	1	1	1
332.	Teacher led discussion.	1	1	1
333.	Teacher led demonstration.	1	1	1
334.	Teacher uses individual report technique.	1	1	1
335.	Teacher uses experiment.	1	1	1
336.	Teacher skill at writing student progress reports.	1	1	1
337.	Utilization of the unit method of instruction.	1	1	1
338.	Individualization for each student.	1	1	1
339.	Individualizes teaching methods and aids.	1	1	1
340.	Teacher is committed.	1	1	1

341.	Teacher perceives and assumes share of responsibility beyond minimum.	1	1	1
342.	Teacher is appreciative.	1	1	1
343.	Teacher is innovative.	1	1	1
344.	Teacher is businesslike.	1	1	1
345.	Teacher provides pupils opportunity to practice (criterion tasks.)	1	1	1
346.	Teacher has rapport with immediate supervisor.	1	1	1
347.	Teacher travels to be a better teacher.	1	1	1
348.	Teacher is better than last year.	1	1	1
349.	Teacher is willing to admit error.	1	1	1
350.	Teacher is persevering.	1	1	1
351.	Teacher secures voluntary cooperation.	1	1	1
352.	Teacher has a good sense of the relative value of various learning outcomes.	1	1	1
353.	Economy of materials.	1	1	1
354.	Teacher amenability toward administration and supervision.	1	1	1
355.	Teacher serves as new teacher consultant upon request.	1	1	1
356.	Student evaluation of teacher is solicited.	1	1	1
357.	Teacher establishes a line between the new lesson and the past lesson.	1	1	1
358.	Students work together.	1	1	1
359.	Teacher possesses a positive image to the community.	1	1	1
360.	Teacher sets a good example.	1	1	1
361.	Teacher's reading skills and habits.	1	1	1
362.	Teacher is active in room--does not just sit at desk.	1	1	1

363.	Teacher led demonstration.	1	1	1
364.	Teacher spontaneity.	1	1	1
365.	Good listening habits--no descriptor.	1	1	1
366.	Minimum teacher talk.	1	1	1
367.	Teacher recognizes improvements to encourage each child.	1	1	1
368.	Teacher enjoys children.	1	1	1
369.	Teacher is organized--no descriptor.	1	1	1
370.	Effectiveness of class activity.	1	1	1
371.	Teacher accurateness--no descriptor.	1	1	1
372.	Teacher personalizes teaching.	1	1	1
373.	Teacher has had special training in his/her field.	1	1	1
374.	Teacher is genuine, believable, real.	1	1	1
375.	Teacher is available when something needs to be done.	1	1	1
376.	Teacher respects the worth of each child.	1	.5	1
377.	Teacher displays awareness of motivation.	1	.33	1
378.	Attention span--no descriptor.	1	.33	1
379.	Teacher repeats when necessary.	1	.33	1
380.	Teacher is unruffled.	1	.25	1
381.	Extra class projects--no descriptor.	1	.2	1
382.	Provisions for inductive and deductive reasoning.	1	.16	1
383.	Teacher encourages divergent thinking.	1	.1	1



### Research to Follow

Any good basic research, as contrasted with applied research, should result in practical application. In an effort to further facilitate such practical application, the following supplemental data analysis and post research is being undertaken.

1. Codification of the various evaluation instrument formats.
2. Identification of research which is comparable to this.
3. Identification of the most frequently occurring problems in evaluation of elementary teachers cited in research, articles, and books on the subject.
4. Designing a model for evaluation instrument development and procedural definition.
5. Planning the expansion of the sample universe.
6. Development of an instrument to survey elementary evaluators.
7. Repeating the study with a vastly increased target number for instrument collection, survey(s) completion, and informational base.
8. Analysis of word descriptors used in evaluation criteria.

## Appendix A

### Information and Opinion Survey

#### The Observation and Evaluation of Elementary Teachers in Illinois

This survey is limited to those currently employed as full-time elementary classroom teachers who were likewise employed throughout the 1975-1976 school year and who are currently enrolled in one or more graduate-level education courses.

Information and opinions are solicited through this survey solely for purposes of obtaining statistical data. No individual respondent, nor any information about a particular respondent, will be mentioned.

For further information, contact:

Paul Charles Burton  
c/o Eastern Illinois University  
Department of Educational Administration  
and Supervision  
Charleston, Illinois 61920

NOTE: Throughout this survey two types of answers are called for.  
Please FILL IN THE BLANK or CIRCLE answer as appropriate.

What is your sex?     M   F

What is your age? \_\_\_\_\_

What was your undergraduate major? \_\_\_\_\_

What is your graduate major, if any? \_\_\_\_\_

From what institution(s) did you receive your degree(s)?  
\_\_\_\_\_

Do you hold a standard elementary teaching certificate in Illinois?

Yes    No

Do you hold any other type of teaching certificate?

Yes    No

If yes, what type? \_\_\_\_\_

At what level did you teach during the 1975-1976 school year?

K 1 2 3 4 5 6

At what level are you teaching during this 1976-1977 school year?

K 1 2 3 4 5 6

Were you on tenure during the 1975-1976 school year?

Yes    No

Are you on tenure during this 1976-1977 school year?

Yes    No

How many years of teaching experience at the elementary level do you have? (Do not include this current school year)

\_\_\_\_\_ yrs.

In what school district were you employed during the 1975-1976 school year?  
\_\_\_\_\_

In what school district are you currently employed?  
\_\_\_\_\_

What was the minimum number of evaluations required per teacher, per year, by the district in which you were employed during the 1975-1976 school year?

For tenured \_\_\_\_\_ For non-tenured \_\_\_\_\_ No requirement \_\_\_\_\_

What is the minimum number of evaluations required per teacher, per year, by the district in which you are employed during this 1976-1977 school year?

For tenured \_\_\_\_\_ For non-tenured \_\_\_\_\_ No requirement \_\_\_\_\_

Please answer the following questions for the 1975-1976 school year.

1. Who conducted your evaluation(s)? Principal \_\_\_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_

2. If someone other than the principal conducted your evaluations, please identify by title.

\_\_\_\_\_

3. Was the evaluator male or female?

M      F

4. How many times were you evaluated during the school year?

\_\_\_\_\_

5. How many times were you observed during the school year?

\_\_\_\_\_

6. What was the average duration of each observation?

\_\_\_\_\_

7. What was the duration of the longest observation?

\_\_\_\_\_

8. What was the duration of the shortest observation?

\_\_\_\_\_

9. Were you notified of the evaluator's intent to observe your teaching performance prior to the actual observation?

Observation #1    Yes    No    How much time prior? \_\_\_\_\_

Observation #2    Yes    No    How much time prior? \_\_\_\_\_

Observation #3    Yes    No    How much time prior? \_\_\_\_\_

(If more than three observations were made during the year, please complete on back of this page.)

(For any of the following questions, if more than three observations were made during the school year, please complete on back of page]

10. Do you prefer notice prior to being observed for the purpose of evaluation?

Yes No

11. Were you notified of what specifics the evaluator would be looking for during the observation?

Observation #1	Yes	No
Observation #2	Yes	No
Observation #3	Yes	No

12. Would you prefer such notification?

Yes No

13. Were you notified of the intended duration prior to each observation?

Observation #1	Yes	No
Observation #2	Yes	No
Observation #3	Yes	No

14. Would you prefer such notification?

Yes No

15. Was the evaluator at least somewhat familiar with the children in your classroom prior to observation(s)?

Yes No

16. Did the evaluator check your lesson plans?

Observation #1	Yes	No
Observation #2	Yes	No
Observation #3	Yes	No

17. Did the evaluator check any student work?

Observation #1	Yes	No
Observation #2	Yes	No
Observation #3	Yes	No

18. Did the evaluator make any efforts to determine progress or improvement of students under your supervision during observation (s)?

Observation #1	Yes	No
Observation #2	Yes	No
Observation #3	Yes	No

19. Did the evaluator speak to you regarding your teaching performance during the course of any observation?

Yes No

20. Were observations followed by written or oral communication regarding your performance?
- Observation #1    Yes    No    Kind \_\_\_\_\_
- Observation #2    Yes    No    Kind \_\_\_\_\_
- Observation #3    Yes    No    Kind \_\_\_\_\_
21. How long was it before you received feedback from the evaluator's observation(s)?
- Observation #1    Yes    No    Kind \_\_\_\_\_
- Observation #2    Yes    No    Kind \_\_\_\_\_
- Observation #3    Yes    No    Kind \_\_\_\_\_
22. Did your evaluation(s) deal with specific strengths and weaknesses of your teaching performance?
- Yes    No
23. Did the evaluator consider the various learning styles and cognitive levels of your students in evaluating your teaching technique(s)?
- Yes    No
24. If not, would such consideration by the evaluator have resulted in more meaningful and accurate evaluation of your teaching performance?
- Yes    No
25. Did the evaluator suggest specific ways in which you could improve your teaching performance?
- Yes    No
26. If so, did you agree with these suggestions?
- Yes    No
27. If so, did you implement any of these suggestions in your teaching?
- Yes    No
28. If so, did this result in improved teaching performance by you?
- Yes    No
29. Was a standard instrument used to record the evaluation of your teaching performance?
- Yes    No
30. If so, did the instrument have a checklist or narrative format?
- Narrative \_\_\_\_\_ Checklist \_\_\_\_\_ Combination \_\_\_\_\_
31. Was any sort of checklist used by the evaluator during any observation of your teaching performance?
- Yes    No    Don't Know
32. Did the majority of your evaluation(s) deal with in-classroom teaching performance or with personal characteristics?
- Teaching \_\_\_\_\_ Personal \_\_\_\_\_
33. Did the evaluator have elementary classroom teaching experience?
- Yes    No    Don't Know
34. If so, how many years?
- \_\_\_\_\_ yrs.

35. Did the evaluator consider or mention your students' national standard achievement scores as a measure of your teaching performance?

Yes No

36. Would you consider use of your students' achievement scores--showing academic growth during the course of the school year--as legitimate criteria for evaluating your teaching performance?

Yes No

37. How many hours of direct observation would you consider to be a minimum for accurate and meaningful evaluation of your teaching performance?

\_\_\_\_\_ hrs.

38. Have you ever been observed that long (even collectively) by an evaluator for the purpose of a single evaluation?

Yes No

Please answer the following questions for the 1976-1977 school year.

39. Is the same pattern--observation time, evaluation feedback, instrument used, etc.--being continued this year?

Yes No .

40. If not, what changes have been made?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

41. Evaluation of elementary teachers should be conducted only by evaluators with a minimum of three years of in-classroom elementary teaching experience.

Agree Disagree

42. In order for evaluations to be meaningful, they must be based on direct observation.

Agree Disagree



## Appendix B

Paul C. Burton  
1531 North Oak  
Danville, IL 61832

Date

Superintendent of Schools  
District # \_\_\_\_\_

Dear Superintendent:

I am conducting preliminary research for my Master's thesis at Eastern Illinois University. As part of this research I am requesting 300 districts in Illinois to furnish me with the elementary teacher evaluation instruments they currently use. These instruments will be used to identify the most frequently occurring items used as criteria for evaluating elementary teachers throughout the state. No mention of individual districts will be made in this study. Your cooperation in furnishing your district's evaluation instrument will be most appreciated. If no instrument is used to evaluate elementary teachers in your district, that information would be equally helpful.

Any questions may be referred to my academic and thesis advisor, Dr. Robert V. Shuff, Eastern Illinois University, Department of Educational Administration and Supervision.

Thank you,

Paul C. Burton