

1977

Constructing and Implementing an Evaluation Program for Certified Personnel in the Stonington School District

David E. Kuetemeyer
Eastern Illinois University

Recommended Citation

Kuetemeyer, David E., "Constructing and Implementing an Evaluation Program for Certified Personnel in the Stonington School District" (1977). *Masters Theses*. 3285.
<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/3285>

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.

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.

5/9/77

Date

Author

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

Date

Author

pdm

Constructing and Implementing an Evaluation
Program for Certified Personnel in the
Stonington School District

(TITLE)

BY

David E. Kuetemeyer

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

Specialist 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

May 9, 1977
DATE

ADVISER

May 9, 1977
DATE

ABSTRACT

CONSTRUCTING AND IMPLEMENTING
AN EVALUATION PROGRAM FOR CERTIFIED PERSONNEL
IN THE STONINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT

by

David E. Kuetemeyer

As the title indicates, this field study deals with the process of constructing and implementing a teacher evaluation program in the Stonington School District. The process is broken down chronologically and covers a three year period. The paper attempts to describe the Stonington School District and point out the need for formal evaluation of teachers everywhere, but more specifically in Stonington.

The construction of the instrument by the Stonington teachers is outlined in a step-by-step process. In a series of Inservice Workshops, the district teachers discuss the validity and purpose of evaluation, plus what they felt were evidences of good teaching and, therefore, evaluation criteria.

The implementation of evaluation is covered in procedures, problems, and the annual review of the instrument. The conclusion indicates that the author feels the program has had a positive effect on the school district and hopes the quality of education will continue to improve.

CONSTRUCTING AND IMPLEMENTING
AN EVALUATION PROGRAM FOR CERTIFIED PERSONNEL
IN THE STONINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT

by

David E. Kuetemeyer

Education 6910

Education 6920

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. THE SETTING AND THE STUDY	1
Purpose of the Study	1
The School District	2
II. OVERVIEW	6
III. THE PROCESS	9
Inservice Workshop - February 7, 1975	9
Inservice Workshop - February 21, 1975	14
Inservice Workshop - June 4, 1975	15
Inservice Workshop - December 9, 1975	17
Inservice Workshop - January 14, 1975	18
Inservice Workshop - March 9, 1976	19
Final Product	19
IV. PROCEDURES	20
V. PROBLEMS	22
VI. REVIEW OF THE INSTRUMENT	24
VII. CONCLUSION	25
APPENDIXES	26
APPENDIX A - LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE	26
APPENDIX B - NEOGA SCHOOL DISTRICT EVALUATION FORM	29
APPENDIX C - FINAL EVALUATION FORM	31
APPENDIX D - SELF-EVALUATION MEMORANDUM	40

THE SETTING AND THE STUDY

Purpose of the Study

This field study in constructing and implementing an evaluation program is being conducted for several reasons. Paramount among them is my personal philosophy that every school district should have an evaluation program.

Another reason is that just prior to my employment as K-12 Principal, a sixth-grade teacher was fired at the end of her second year of teaching. The School Board indicated later that more preparation should have gone into her dismissal. This resulted in the job description for the K-12 Principal to state that "the K-12 Principal will work with the Superintendent to develop an evaluation program for teachers". In addition, several teachers in the district felt that an evaluation program would help prevent a dismissal from occurring without warning.

There are many problems involved in developing an evaluation program in the Stonington School District. One is the difference in perspective between the Board of Education and the teachers. Also, the Superintendent is not interested in developing an evaluation program and several teachers are apprehensive because: 1) They have never been evaluated (formally)

before, and 2) they are not sure they want to be evaluated by a new principal. The problems are further complicated by having four new members on the School Board in the last two and one-half years.

The problems involved in constructing an evaluation program have caused this author to make haste slowly and take three years to implement. This timetable allowed all people involved to become accustomed to the idea of evaluation and also made sure that, as principal, I would be on tenure when the first teacher was evaluated.

My role in this study is the overall responsibility of developing and implementing the program. I intend to provide a guiding force and act as a catalyst when necessary.

There are several benefits to be gained from this Field Study. The Evaluation Program should help improve teacher quality, provide a vehicle for the rehiring or dismissal of non-tenure teachers, and help in the elimination of unqualified or incompetent tenured teachers. It might also be used as a tool in the reduction in staff caused by declining enrollments.

The School District

The Stonington School District is located in Christian County, 18 miles southwest of Decatur, 25 miles southeast of Springfield, and 10 miles northeast of Taylorville. The Unit District was organized on January 24, 1948, by an urban vote

of 101 to 8, and a rural vote of 84 to 29. The Stonington District covers 67 square miles, has an enrollment of 486 students and employs 27½ teachers.

The school, though small, has been able to provide quality education. The unit is all under one roof which allows for sharing of staff between elementary, junior high, and high school. The district participates in the Mid-State Special Education Cooperative, Christian County Joint Special Education Program, and the Decatur Area Vocational Cooperative. Our Guidance Director and Instructional Materials Center serve all students, K-12.

The community is committed to the school and is particularly proud of its band program and basketball team. The band consists of eighty members (out of 158 high school students) and recently raised \$12,400 for new band uniforms with very little effort. The Band performs in several capacities both locally and in the surrounding area. The basketball team has a long history of successful seasons, conference championships and a Regional Championship in 1976.

Most graduates of the Stonington School District either attend college (40% of the 1976 class is currently enrolled in a four-year or a two-year program), engage in agriculture or agro-business, or seek employment at Caterpillar, Firestone, Wagners, Borg-Warner, or other occupations in Decatur, Springfield, or Taylorville.

The assessed valuation of the district is \$16,915,119

and the tax rate is 3.015 (including 2.00 education). The cost per student for 1975-76 (based on audit) was \$1429.39.

Many residents attend one of the five churches in the community. Most, though living in a rural setting, hold more cosmopolitan ideas than most of Central-Southern Illinois and are part of the area surrounding Decatur that is extremely dedicated to quality education. The population is divided into affluent farmers, agro-businessmen, and people commuting to Decatur, Springfield, and Taylorville. Many residents are active in politics either at the village, township, county, or state levels. The population is relatively stable, but the school enrollment is declining.

The community usually takes great care in selecting Board members. The Board has traditionally featured long tenured service but for a variety of personal reasons has changed more rapidly in recent years (four new members in two and one-half years). The new members and old members have always stood behind the administration and the school, but a process of change and becoming accustomed to one another has taken place. The Board of Education is composed of six men and one woman. The Board members can be broken down by occupation as follows:

Business Manager of Wabash Railroad Hospital
Association - Decatur

Secretary to the Secretary of State - Springfield

Manager of Golden Harvest Seed Company - Stonington
Division

Lead Man in Catepillar Production Plant - Decatur

Farmer - landowner - member of Elevator Coop Board

Farmer - landowner

Farmer - landowner

The Board of Education expects the teaching staff to:

1. Exert strong but fair discipline.
2. Prepare the student for a world of work and achievement through a broad background of studies.
3. Fit into the community mores.
4. Present a model for their children to follow.

The Board of Education also expects the administration to recommend to rehire or not rehire non-tenured teachers.

OVERVIEW

The 1960's brought the coining of the word "accountability" which filtered into even the smallest school system. As an out-growth of accountability many small school districts (and some larger ones) either started formal evaluation programs or searched for ways to improve the existing program.

There are few jobs in private industry or enterprise in which an employee is not evaluated. Many times, this evaluation is directly related to a person's salary. Often, the product involved is finite: visible and measurable. The measurement may involve a quota and/or quality control.

In a school district, it is difficult to measure the product of a teacher's efforts. It is not easy to establish a quota and/or quality control. It is difficult to pinpoint who is responsible for problems or successes taking place in the classroom. The following factors all exert influences which affect accountability to varying degrees:

- Students
- Parents
- School policies
- Administrators
- Materials
- Curriculum
- School boards
- Communities

There are many indicators which some people may use to evaluate teachers. However, they cannot be used by themselves. Teaching methods are only as good as the person applying them,

and what works for one teacher does not always work for another teacher. Grades issued to students can be manipulated one way or another. It is difficult to use standardized testing to evaluate teacher success because it usually leads to teaching towards the test. Using class averages on standardized tests to evaluate teachers does not take into account students' varied abilities. The affective domain cannot be measured adequately and no one knows what will remain with a student through his/her adult years.

In every district, however, evaluation takes place. It takes place in the classroom; on the restroom walls; at the dinner table; the bowling alley; the teachers' lounge; and before, during, and after school board Meetings. Although all these evaluations take place, they do not fulfill the role of a formal evaluation conducted by a school administrator. Formal evaluation is the tool which can be used for accountability. Thus we have a dicotomy: a task which is almost impossible to perform, yet must be performed. It is the principal's job to accomplish this monumental task.

I feel that I am qualified to discuss teacher evaluation. I have perused much of the available literature and have had the experience of starting a teacher evaluation program while principal of the Buckley-Loda Jr.-Sr. High School in 1973-74. (The primary purpose of that program was the elimination of incompetant teachers. By the end of the school year, one teacher had retired, two resigned, and one was fired.)

I sometimes feel that I have been exposed to almost every type of evaluation instrument and/or evaluation philosophy in existence today. The advertisements for different types of commercial evaluation packages that flow through a school administrator's office in one year could fill a small library. The periodicals and professional journals run a constant supply of current and more current articles on evaluation.

My experience has been that the most important thing about a teacher evaluation program is not how much information the administrator has about evaluation, or what is his favorite evaluation form. Rather, I think that the most important aspects of an evaluation program are what the teachers know and think about evaluation, and what instrument with which they choose to be evaluated. Therefore, the process of starting an evaluation program becomes all important.

The process of developing the evaluation program will determine how much the teachers know about evaluation, whether the teachers are comfortable with being evaluated, and if they will accept the evaluation instrument. It would be extremely difficult to implement an evaluation program with any degree of success if the teachers were suspicious of evaluation and the evaluation form and did not understand the purpose for which it was to be used. There will also be problems if the teachers as a group feel that the administrator will not be fair and impartial.

THE PROCESS

My first move in developing an evaluation program was to gain permission from the Stonington Board of Education to hold several inservice workshops on teacher evaluation. The Superintendent was not overly enthusiastic, but he did not object or stand in the way. The Board was sold on the idea because I pointed out that I wanted to have the 1:42 early dismissal of students on Fridays. This would lengthen the weekend for the students having the winter doldrums between Christmas and Easter. The first inservice date was scheduled for Friday, February 7, 1975, and the second for Friday, February 21, 1975.

Inservice Workshop - February 7, 1975

The first inservice workshop was started by a general discussion on teacher evaluation. I got the ball rolling by stating: "I think evaluation is very important, but many problems could develop in starting a program. I would like to hear your views on evaluation."

A lively discussion ensued and was engaged in by all, sometimes singly, sometimes collectively. I tried to make sure that everyone got a chance to speak and was not interrupted too often.

The questions that were raised were similar to much of the literature available. They included:

1. Who was going to do the evaluation?
2. What criteria would be used?
3. Was evaluation fair?
4. How could someone come into a classroom and make an evaluation in a short time?
5. What if the evaluator did not know anything about the subject area?
6. Would the students react differently when the evaluator was there?
7. What if the teacher was having a bad day?
8. What if the students were having a bad day?
9. What about non-tenured teachers?
10. What is the purpose of evaluation?
11. Who would look at the evaluation?
12. Would the teacher get to see the evaluation?
13. What about different teaching methods?
14. What about specialized personnel?

There was a certain amount of hostility by some teachers toward evaluation and a great deal of interest in the topic. I tried to allow the discussion to ebb and flow, enabling teachers to provide answers and opposing viewpoints to other teachers' questions and statements.

When asked, I provided the best short answers I could.

Question: What kind of evaluation form would you use?

Answer: I could live with any form but the question is with what form would the group be the happiest.

Question: Would you let the teacher see the evaluation?
Answer: Certainly, I would want them to see and sign it.

Question: What training have you had in evaluating?
Answer: I have a Masters Degree in Educational Administration, have studied the topic in much of my course work, and also developed and instituted an evaluation program in Buckley-Loda.

Question: Why should we be evaluated?
Answer: Why not?

Most of these questions and answers were interspersed with statements and comments from other various teachers. I acted as a moderator but remained low keyed. I was able to relax or perhaps alleviate many fears by maintaining a low profile.

After forty-five minutes of discussion I divided the group into groups of five. I asked that they discuss evaluation and select a secretary for each group. The secretaries were to write down any ideas that were brought up and later act as a committee to represent the teachers and do any necessary work between inservice workshops. At the end of the meeting the secretaries were to turn the ideas into Mr. Charles Peabody. I selected Mr. Peabody to act as chairman of the teachers' committee because he expressed an interest in evaluation at an earlier date. He was to consolidate the ideas for the next inservice meeting of February 21, 1975.

The following is a summary of the group discussions on teacher evaluation at the end of the Feb. 7, 1975, inservice workshop:

Group 1

Administration evaluation - not have teachers evaluate others.

Prefer long term evaluation.

Frequent casual visits by administrators.

Evaluator should go over the evaluation with the teacher.

Allow teachers to share in the making up of the criteria for judgement.

Positive attitude by both administration and staff toward evaluation - that it is to be used to help teachers improve.

Evaluation not limited strictly to classroom visitation.

Group 2

No teachers on evaluation team.

Definite conferences with teacher after each evaluation day.

Pre-printed list of points to be evaluated on.

Evaluation should be an on-going process as well as conferences.

We recommend an administrative team should be the evaluators.
i.e. One day Mr. Buchanan (Supt.) and another day Mr. Kuetemeyer (Prin.) thereby giving two views.

There should be different criterion for evaluation by grade level and subject level.

Use an adapted version of "The Teacher Evaluation Record."

Group 3

Frequent, informal visits summarized every semester formally.

Rebuttal privileges.

Types of things to be evaluated:

Appearance, grooming

Attitude

General way you teach, methodology

Student rapport

Student participation

Cooperation among teacher peers

School-related extra-curricular activities

Progressiveness

Group 4

The evaluation should be used to enable the teacher to grow and improve, not to scare him.

The evaluation should be in writing. This could serve as a protection for the teacher and would help to eliminate personal judgements.

No fellow teachers should evaluate. Don't destroy the congeniality of our faculty.

There should be two visits made with the teacher having an option to request another.

The evaluations should be discussed with the teacher and suggestions made which would be helpful.

The teachers should help set up the criteria to be used in the evaluation.

Group 5

Get a copy of "Teacher Evaluation Record" and "Teachers Evaluation for Teachers Professional Growth" to each teacher.

We won't have to hunt for it.

We can really study it.

Peabody thinks teachers, students, and administrators should make the evaluation. The rest of the group thought that it should be done by the administrators.

If the board says we are to be evaluated, then it is time we had a P.N. Agreement with the board.

Allows for individual to have a chance for rebuttal directly to the board.

Allows welfare committee, etc., to speak.

After an evaluation there should be a personal conference and discussion of the evaluation with the evaluator.

Who will evaluate the board and administration - If evaluation is to take place everyone should be evaluated.

Criteria

General appearance

Tie, pant suits, shined shoes, coat, etc.

Student progress

Are we to teach to reach certain percentiles on standardized tests?

Classroom physical conditions?

Neatness, posters, bulletin boards, etc.

Education

Will those who have taken classes recently be judged better than those who haven't?

Attendance at activities

Will people who attend basketball games, dances, etc. be judged above those who don't?

Cooperation with committees

Will those that work with A 160, etc. be judged above those that don't?

Course content

Will a text-limited course be judged lower than those that have a wider adaptation?

Organization participation

Will community, church, state, etc. participation be used as an evaluation?

Inservice Workshop - February 21, 1975

The summary of the group discussions were prepared and typed just in time for the February 21st inservice program. I started the second meeting off by passing out a copy of all of the groups' discussions at the previous meetings. Each secretary was given an opportunity to explain the group's feelings or reasoning behind their views. General discussion followed but the group input gradually wound down as everyone was presented with plenty of opportunity to speak.

The teachers then met in small groups with a secretary in each group. Each group was instructed to write down what they felt should be in the final guidelines for evaluation in the Stonington School District. The groups' notes would be turned over to Mr. Peabody for consolidation and typing.

I announced that we would have one more meeting on evaluation

before the end of the year. At that time we would discuss the final draft of the guidelines for evaluation.

Inservice Workshop - June 4, 1975

Because of the busy calendar in a small school, the last meeting on evaluation was not held until June 4, 1975. The Superintendent had built an extra snow day into the calendar to be used as a records day for the teachers and secretaries to take care of grade cards. This did not provide a very opportune time to carry on a discussion because most of the teachers were more interested in getting their grade cards finished. I did not feel, however, that much time would be needed since a great deal of discussion had already taken place.

The following guidelines were presented:

Improvement should be the goal of every one.

A quality school is the goal of our community and members of our faculty.

The purpose of evaluation is to be a guide for diagnosing the strengths and weaknesses of our staff, for the purpose of improving instruction, and to provide an objective record for use in evaluation and rating.

Guidelines for self and administrator evaluation shall include preparational competencies, instructional skills, classroom management, professional responsibilities, and personal competencies.

Evaluations should be the result of several periodic, short, unannounced visits made over a long interval of time.

Evaluations when possible, should be done by part self-evaluation and by two administrators.

Evaluations should be based on actual personal contact only.

Following the evaluation visits there will be a conference between the evaluated and the evaluator(s) during which time the findings will be discussed.

An option for more evaluations is available upon request.

Results of the evaluations are to be kept in a file folder which will be open to inspection.

I had already read the guidelines and could certainly not see anything that conflicted with my philosophy of evaluation. All of the teachers agreed that they would be able to live with them also.

With a little gentle guidance, the group then felt that the next step was to find an evaluation instrument that would fulfill our needs. I suggested that it was not so important that we invent our own. A couple of teachers had already brought in evaluation forms which they had or had acquired. I suggested that we adopt or adapt an instrument or parts of several instruments from other school districts. This would save time and energy which might just as well be spent on other things. I explained that I thought there was no sense in "re-inventing the wheel."

I asked Mr. Peabody if he would write to various school districts the next school year and ask for copies of their evaluation instruments. After the start of the 1975-76 school year Mr. Peabody sent a letter and questionnaire (see Appendix A) to the Superintendents of the following districts:

Taylorville
Shelbyville
Sullivan
Cerro Gordo

Argenta
Rochester
Pawnee
Morrisonville
Nokomis
Clinton
Macomb
Streator
Woodstock
Olney
Greenville

Being a staunch member of the Illinois Education Association, he also sent the same letter and questionnaire to the Presidents of the local Education Associations.

It took approximately three months to receive answers from the school districts. Some districts required another letter, and some never replied. In addition, our teachers brought in several unsolicited evaluation forms from friends and relatives in other school districts. It was obvious that the teachers were thinking and discussing evaluation with a great many people.

Inservice Workshop - December 9, 1975

A fourth inservice program was planned for December 9, 1975. We supplied five groups with copies of each sample evaluation form. Each group inspected the samples and then wrote out what they wished to make part of our evaluation instrument. We ran out of time at this meeting and agreed to continue the work at the next workshop.

Inservice Workshop - January 14, 1976

The fifth inservice day was scheduled for January 14, 1976. At this meeting the teachers finished their small group discussions. We then gathered for a general discussion with plans to come to some consensus on what form or parts of forms to use. We discussed the following:

1. There are some teacher competencies which can be evaluated in a short period of time (such as a classroom visit) but others that can only be judged over a longer period of time. Most forms do not differentiate between the two.
2. The teacher should be provided with the opportunity to read and discuss the evaluation with the administration.
3. No one seemed to like the checklist type evaluation form. However, since we only have two administrators in the building, the form should allow the administrator to go through it fairly speedily.
4. The administrator doing the evaluating should be comfortable with the form.

Most of the teachers were in favor of adopting the form from the Neoga School District (see Appendix B). They asked me how I felt about this particular form. Oddly enough the form was the same form the teachers at Buckley-Loda had chosen for adaptation/adoption. (I also wondered if I had somehow unconsciously directed them to this form.) I explained to the Stonington teachers that after having used the form with one set of teachers there were only a few things I did not particularly like - although I would use any form they chose. The part I disliked the most about it was that there was not enough space for a narrative statement. Also,

I was not sure that all of the categories were relevant.

The teachers as a group decided that time would need to be spent adapting the form so these deficiencies would be remedied. I suggested that this work would not lend itself to an inservice workshop but rather should be assigned to the committee. The work would then be distributed to the teachers for their perusal and comments. Everyone agreed.

Inservice Workshop - March 9, 1976

The committee was able to complete its work by March 9, 1976. The evaluation instrument (see Appendix C) was distributed to the teachers at that time. The teachers were asked to return the forms with any final suggestions written on them.

Final Product

All the evaluation forms and responses were returned within one week. The majority of the teachers felt that the instrument was satisfactory. The few negative comments received were on specific items and not with the form generally. All responses were kept on file for future reference. I decided to use this evaluation instrument for one year, then re-evaluate.

PROCEDURES

Since the new evaluation form was not completed until the middle of March, I waited until the start of the 1976-77 school year to begin evaluating. This seemed to work well since one of the major questions at our first-day workshop was "when do we start".

The following guidelines that were finished at the June 4, 1975 inservice workshop are adhered to:

Improvement should be the goal of every one.

A quality school is the goal of our community and members of the faculty.

The purpose of evaluation is to be a guide for diagnosing the strengths and weaknesses of our staff, for the purpose of improving instruction, and to provide an objective record for use in evaluation and rating.

Guidelines for self and administrator evaluation shall include preparational competencies, instructional skills, classroom management, professional responsibilities, and personal competencies.

Evaluations should be the result of several periodic short unannounced visits made over a long interval of time.

Evaluations, when possible, should be done by part self-evaluation and by two administrators.

Evaluations should be based on actual personal contact only.

Following the evaluation visits there will be a conference between the evaluated and the evaluator(s) during which time the findings will be discussed.

An option for more evaluations is available upon request.

Results of the evaluations are to be kept in a file folder which will be open to inspection.

Specifically, the evaluation takes the form of a formal un-announced visit to the classroom. I fill out the items to be evaluated over a long period of time in Part I before going into the classroom. I then ask the teacher to fill out Part III and return it to me. I also make arrangements for a conference as soon as possible following the evaluation (usually the next day).

At the conference the teacher is given the opportunity to present any comments or ask questions or give rebuttal. If he/she desires he can make a written comment at the end of the form. If the teacher wishes an additional evaluation there is a place for this request. The teacher is asked to sign the statement that he has read the evaluation and is aware of the contents. The evaluation is then placed in the teacher's personnel file for future use and reference.

Non-tenured teachers are evaluated at least twice a year - more if there are problems or questions. Tenured teachers are evaluated once a year.

PROBLEMS

I originally planned to formalize the procedure to be used in evaluation. In 1975, however, the Illinois Association of School Boards began warning administrators and School Boards that a collective bargaining bill would probably be passed by the State Legislature in the near future. If this happened there would be a possibility that all formal policies would become part of the current agreement between the Teachers Associations and the School Boards. Therefore, I scrapped the idea of formalizing the procedures by adding them to the teachers' handbook.

Another problem was making time to spend on evaluation. It requires careful planning and a listing of priorities. In order to help solve the problem of finding time, I paid a visit to the Elementary Principal in Assumption, Mr. Wayne Brownback, who has had a strong evaluation program for many years. He informed me that he uses a teacher self-evaluation instrument in conjunction with the administrative evaluation for his tenure teachers. He alternates with the other and only has to evaluate half of his tenured staff during a particular year.

The self evaluation is placed in the teachers file. He often changes the self-evaluation instrument when he wants to emphasize different areas or competencies. He explained that it could be switched frequently without being threatening to the teachers because the teachers filled it out themselves.

I decided to incorporate this feature into Stonington's Evaluation Program (see Appendix D for memo to staff). The teachers have accepted this without a ripple.

A third problem that developed quite unexpectedly was the resignation of our Superintendent in March, 1977. As a result, I am now the Superintendent and the Guidance Counselor is the Acting Principal. The evaluations planned for March and April have virtually ground to halt. As soon as the decks clear a bit (we have an IOE State Visitation on April 22, teachers' salaries to be settled, and a Principal to be hired) I will have to play catch up with the evaluations.

The last problem involved has to do with the items on the evaluation form. I feel that some items listed in Part II (to be evaluated during the visitation) should be included in Part I (items to be evaluated over a long period of time) of the form. This problem can be worked on when we re-evaluate the instrument.

REVIEW OF THE INSTRUMENT

In order to maintain the evaluation instrument as a viable and meaningful form, it needs to be reviewed and updated by the teachers every year. Thus it will remain relative and an ongoing process to the teachers being evaluated.

I originally planned to have this review at the end of the year. However, a new teacher who joined our staff this year questioned the relevancy of a particular item. The questioning has caused me to realize that the review should be at the beginning of the new school year rather than at the end of the old school year. This will give the new teachers input into the program and perhaps provide more understanding of the program.

CONCLUSION

I feel that the evaluation program has had a positive effect on the staff at Stonington. I have noticed a tightening up of some teachers in areas which were loose in the past. As the evaluation program became more of a reality, certain teachers showed more awareness of suggestions, requests, and directives. I do not think that it has caused a feeling of tyranny, but rather an awareness that sometime, the day-to-day evaluations that an administrator makes of the teachers in his building will be formalized, will be written down, will be expressed. I think that this helps good teachers to continue to do a good job and to feel that their efforts are recognized, and encourages other teachers to seek improvement.

The program has also been useful to the School Board in rehiring two non-tenured teachers. One was placed on tenure and the other was rehired for the second year.

Thus the evaluation program has benefitted the teaching staff, administration, and the School Board. In turn, I should hope that the quality of education in our district will continue to improve.

APPENDIX A

LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE

Stonington Community Unit School

District 7

501 EAST NORTH STREET
STONINGTON, ILLINOIS 62567

September 18, 1975

Dear Sir,

We, here in the Stonington Unit #7, are in the process of working on and setting up some criteria for evaluation of faculty and administration personnel. We are sending out a questionnaire in hopes of finding some other districts who will also be interested in the same thing. Would you please take a couple of minutes and answer some of the questions and return them to us in the envelope provided. Any other information you could send would be helpful. We will be glad to give you the results of our study when it is completed.

Thank you for helping us.
Sincerely,

Charles Peabody
Committee for Evaluation Criteria

CP:sam

District replying _____

Town _____

1. Our district has done a study on evaluation criteria for the following:

faculty only
administration
faculty and administration

Yes	No

2. Our district has implemented some criteria since _____.(date)

3. Some of the criteria for evaluation in our district are:

4. Some good points in our evaluation criteria are:

5. Some weak points in our evaluation criteria are:

6. Please send us a copy of your criteria if they are in print.

APPENDIX B

NEOGA SCHOOL DISTRICT EVALUATION FORM

EVALUATION GUIDE
NEOGA COMMUNITY DISTRICT NO. 3 SCHOOLS
NEOGA, ILLINOIS

FOR THE
 To Com...
 Policy 356

NAME _____ DATE _____

SUBJECT GRADE _____ BUILDING _____

This evaluation guide is designed to describe the general behavior of teachers in areas important to students. It is meant to make public many of the standards for teacher activity which the Neoga schools hold to be desirable. It is written so that the teacher see not only the goal but the principal's evaluation of progress toward those goals. Its purpose is that of describing the actual current status of a teacher's individual growth toward desirable instructional, professional and personal objectives.

I. PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

	STANDARD	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT	UNSATISFACTORY
A. VOICE	Generally pleasant vocal quality and articulation High	Some difficulties with vocal quality	Distinct problem with vocal quality and volume Low
B. USE OF ENGLISH	Generally good expression; conveys ideas clearly and effectively.	Noticeable deficiency in English expression	Frequent errors in grammar poor expression
C. PHYSICAL HEALTH AND VIGOR	Able to meet any normal demands upon energies	Able to handle minimal demands upon energies	Low physical vitality; has to conserve strength
D. RELATIONS—STAFF	Cooperative and friendly; mutual liking and respect	Reserved; not particularly liked or disliked	Tends to antagonize people over aggressive or timid
E. RELATIONS—PARENTS	Generally favorable comments and reactions from parents; pleasant and cooperative	Comments from parents indicate negativism; lack of mutuality, somewhat resentful of parents	Minor evidence recalls; some of parent antagonism
F. RELATIONS—PUPILS	Mutual respect and cooperation evident	Some mutual respect and cooperation	Mutually unpleasant; frequent conflicts; hostility evident
G. INVOLVEMENT IN EXTRA CURRICULAR	Involved in extra-curricular functions; shows interest through involvement	Involved in few extra-curricular functions outside his field; limited interest shown	Involved in no extra-curricular functions that are not obligatory
H. ENTHUSIASM AND INITIATIVE	Quick reaction to obvious and generally quick in new situations dependable	Little initiative; requires prodding	Lifeless; "way bother" at shift's responsibility; does follow suggestions
I. EMOTIONAL BALANCE	Posed seldom loses self-control	Easily agitated	Lacks self-control
J. INTEREST IN TEACHING AND GROWTH	Participates beyond bare job requisites; actively improving self and profession	Moderate interest; limited vision for service and growth	No real interest evident; a job satisfied "as is"
K. SENSE OF HUMOR	Able to laugh at self and others; humor generally appropriate to situation or event	Able to see humor in situations but rarely able to enjoy or react appropriately	Unable to perceive or enjoy humorous or comic situations and events.

II. INSTRUCTIONAL AND MANAGEMENT COMPETENCE

A. ACCOMPLISHMENT OF OBJECTIVES	Diagnoses, plans, motivates, and evaluates in terms of individual differences based on unit philosophy	Some planning evident but inadequate diagnosis and evaluation	Fails to recognize individual differences with little or no planning
B. INSTRUCTIONAL PRESENTATION	Instructions logical, clear, and convincing	Instructions involved, imprecise; no clear direction	Instructions confusing ill
C. DISCIPLINE	Control of situation without constant repression or domination; teacher inspired student self control evident; mutual respect	Control by sarcasm, fear, ridicule threats	Little or no respect or control from students
D. PUPIL RESPONSE	Eager, alert, interested; actively constructively involved	Response at low level; little enthusiasm evident	Little or no interest in or shown; negative attitude
E. ROOM AND EQUIPMENT CARE	Keeps equipment and room in good order; uses them properly	Inconsistent care and use of equipment and room	Neglects, abuses, misuses equipment and materials; room disorderly
F. ROUTINE DETAIL	Prompt, accurate, dependable; uses acceptable written form	Often late; irregular or little attention to routine detail(s)	Usually late, inaccurate or less; disregards routine procedures
G. KNOWLEDGE IN TEACHING AREA	Well prepared; continuing growth in comprehensive background	Generally inadequate; little preparation, gaps and needs evident	Poorly prepared; inadequate or inaccurate knowledge

DATE _____ TEACHER _____ DATE _____

The signature of the teacher indicates teacher has received copy of evaluation form and conference has been held.

APPENDIX C

FINAL EVALUATION FORM

EVALUATION GUIDE
STONINGTON COMMUNITY DISTRICT NO. 7 SCHOOLS
Stonington, Illinois

NAME _____ DATE _____

SUBJECT/GRADE _____ BUILDING _____

This evaluation guide is designed to describe the general behavior of teachers in areas important to teachers. It is meant to make public many of the standards for teacher activity which the Stonington schools hold to be desirable. It is written to help the teacher see not only the goal but the principal's evaluation of progress toward those goals. Its purpose is that of describing the actual current status of a teacher's individual growth toward desirable instructional, professional, and personal fulfillment.

I. PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS
 (Items to be evaluated over long period of time.)

	<u>HIGH</u>			<u>LOW</u>
	<u>Standard</u>		<u>Needs Improvement</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>
A. VOICE	Generally pleasant vocal quality and articulation		Some difficulties with vocal quality	Definite problems: articulation, quality, and volume
B. USE OF ENGLISH	Generally good expression; conveys ideas clearly and effectively		Noticeable deficiency in English expression	Frequent errors in grammar; poor expression
C. PHYSICAL HEALTH AND VIGOR	Able to meet any normal demands upon energies		Able to handle minimal demands upon energies	Low physical vitality; has to conserve strength

	<u>Standard</u>	2. <u>Needs Improvement</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>
PERSONAL APPEARANCE	Neat and appropriately dressed	Usually well groomed	Careless in dress or appearance
STAFF-RELATIONSHIP	Cooperative and friendly; mutual liking and respect	Reserved-not particularly liked or disliked	Tends to antagonize associates; overly aggressive or timid
PARENT-RELATIONSHIP	Generally favorable comments and reactions from parents; pleasant and cooperative	Comment from parents indicate negativism; lack of mutuality; somewhat resentful of parents	Much evidence (calls; comments) of parents antagonism
PUPIL-RELATIONSHIP	Mutual respect and cooperation evident	Some mutual respect and cooperation	Mutually unpleasant; frequent conflicts; hostility evident
INVOLVEMENT IN EXTRA-CURRICULAR	Involved; shows interest through involvement	Involved in few extra functions outside of field	Involved in no extra functions that are not obligatory

	<u>Standard</u>	<u>3 Needs Improvement</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>
ENTHUSIASM AND INITI- ATIVE	Quick reaction to obvious: generally quick in new situa- tions: dependable	Little initiative; requires prodding	Lifeless attitude; shirks responsibility and does not follow suggestions
DECISIONS	Self reliant; makes careful and thought- ful decisions	Makes decisions too late	Cannot make worth- while decisions
COMPOSURE, PATIENCE, AND TACT.	Evident and adequate for the situations	Easily agitated	Lacks self-control
INTEREST IN TEACHING AND GROWTH	Participates beyond bare job requisites; actively improves self and profession	Moderate interest; limited vision for service and growth	No real job interest: satisfied "as is"

		4	
	<u>Standard</u>	<u>Needs Improvement</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>
SENSE OF HUMOR	Able to laugh at self and others; humor generally appropriate	Able to see humor in situations but rarely able to react or enjoy	Unable to perceive or enjoy humorous or comic situations

II. CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION AND MANAGEMENT COMPETENCE
(Items to be evaluated during classroom visit.)

	<u>HIGH</u>		<u>LOW</u>
	<u>Standard</u>	<u>Needs Improvement</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>
RESPONSIBLE TO ASSIGNED DUTIES	Is effective in complying with assigned duties	Is ineffective in complying with assigned duties	Cannot be relied upon

ACCOMPLISHMENT OF OBJECTIVES	Diagnoses, plans, motivates, and evaluates individual differences in terms of unit philosophy	Some planning evident but inadequate diagnosis and evaluation	Fails to recognize individual differences with little or no planning
------------------------------	---	---	--

INSTRUCTIONAL PRESENTATION	Instructions logical, clear, and convincing	Instructions involved; imprecise; no clear direction	Instructions confusing; illogical
----------------------------	---	--	-----------------------------------

	<u>Standard</u>	5 <u>Needs Improvement</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>
EFFECTIVENESS OF TEACHING MATERIAL	Actively uses materials to clarify the lesson	Uses very few aides for instructions	Teaching is ineffective; no use of aides
DISCIPLINE	Controls situation without constant repression or domination; fosters student self control; mutual respect	Controls by sarcasm, fear, ridicule, threats	Little or no respect or obedience from students
PUPIL RESPONSE	Eager, alert, interested and actively involved	Response low level; little enthusiasm evident	Little interest shown; negative attitude
EVALUATION OF SKILLS AND KNOWLEDGE	Achieves his objectives in light of pupil abilities; uses appropriate appraisal techniques	Makes some use of evaluation	Makes no use of appraisal techniques; shows no concern in pupil achievement

	<u>Standard</u>	6 <u>Needs Improvement</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>
ROOM AND EQUIPMENT	Keeps room and equipment in useful condition and uses them properly	Inconsistent care and use of room and equipment	Neglects, abuses, and misuses equipment and materials
ROUTINE DETAIL	Prompt, accurate, dependable; uses acceptable written form	Often late, irregular or little attention to routine details	Usually late; inaccurate, careless and disregards procedures
TEACHER AREA KNOWLEDGE	Well prepared; continuing growth in background	Little preparation; gaps and needs evident	Poorly prepared; inadequate or inaccurate
TEACHER GROWTH	Takes advantage of opportunities to improve himself	Content to be a routine teacher; little enthusiasm	Little or no growth

III. IN THE FOLLOWING SPACES GIVE A BRIEF ANSWER TO THESE QUESTIONS.

A. What were the highlights in your position during the past year?

B. In what ways could your classroom techniques be improved?

C. What changes have you made for the coming year?

Do you wish an additional evaluation _____yes _____no

I have read this evaluation and am aware of its contents.

Signature of teacher

Use this space for any written comments that you wish to add to this evaluation.

APPENDIX D

SELF-EVALUATION MEMORANDUM

TO: K-12 Teachers

FROM: David E. Kuetemeyer

DATE: October 14, 1976

SUBJECT: Teacher Evaluation

I do not anticipate being able to evaluate every tenure teacher every year. Instead, I will aim for every other year with some type of self-evaluation in the off years. The self-evaluation will be simpler than the administrative evaluation form.

Non-tenure teachers will continue to be evaluated every year.