

1975

# Restructuring a Staff Appraisal System

Larry Douglas Janes

*Eastern Illinois University*

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

---

## Recommended Citation

Janes, Larry Douglas, "Restructuring a Staff Appraisal System" (1975). *Masters Theses*. 3511.  
<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/3511>

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).

RESTRUCTURING A STAFF

APPRAISAL SYSTEM

(TITLE)

BY

Larry Douglas Janes

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF

Specialist in Education

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY  
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1975

YEAR

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

May 15, 1975  
DATE

May 15, 1975  
DATE

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.

May 15, 1975  
Date

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

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Author

pdm

329001

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. THE SETTING AND THE STUDY . . . . .	1
Purpose of Study . . . . .	1
Overview of Nokomis High School . . . . .	2
Design of the Study . . . . .	6
II. SOURCES OF CONSIDERATION IN EVALUATION . . . . .	7
Factors Which Govern Evaluation . . . . .	7
Existing Evaluation Systems. . . . .	10
III. DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCUMENT . . . . .	18
Teaching Staff In-put . . . . .	18
Administrative Team In-put . . . . .	21
Development of Process and Document . . . . .	23
IV. SUGGESTED PROCEDURE FOR EVALUATION OF STAFF . . . . .	27
Philosophy of the Evaluation Process. . . . .	27
Procedure for Evaluation of Staff . . . . .	27
V. DISPOSITION OF DOCUMENT . . . . .	32
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	33
APPENDIXES	
A . STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE AND RESULTS . . . . .	37
B . ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE AND RESULTS . . . . .	43
C . CURRENT EVALUATION DOCUMENT. . . . .	49
D . INSTRUCTIONS FOR USE OF DOCUMENT. . . . .	52
E . PROPOSED STAFF IMPROVEMENT PACKET . . . . .	55

## THE SETTING AND THE STUDY

### Purpose of Study

The improvement of the instructional processes by the professional staff has long been accepted as one of the primary responsibilities of building principals. One may question, however, the actualization of this responsibility in many cases as noted by the volume of literature criticizing the current status of teaching. Such literature ultimately demands that schools assume greater responsibility for the results of the educational process. As Hechinger has noted:

Consumerism, moreover, everywhere is flexing its muscles and demanding better service and the schools are not immune from such new demands and scrutiny.<sup>1</sup>

The premise of this paper is that the quality of instruction within a given building is in direct proportion to the specific attention given to the responsibility of instructional improvement. A corollary to this premise is that staff evaluation is a key element in instructional improvement and in achieving a position of accountability to the public. The processes and the document utilized to evaluate staff, consequently,

---

<sup>1</sup>Fred M. Hechinger, "Should Teachers Be Judged by Performance?" Saturday Review, 1 (May 9, 1974), pp. 71-72.

assume major importance.

Legislative statutes, court decisions, and board policy play important roles in defining the evaluative process; however, the type of document utilized for evaluation has not been so defined due to the nature of the focal points of the evaluation itself--a nature which places the evaluator's observations somewhere along a continuum moving from objective conclusions to subjective feelings. This study will define the processes of evaluation for the certified staff of Nokomis High School in such a way as to (1) protect the legal rights of all parties involved and (2) provide a climate conducive to instructional improvement. Secondly, this study will produce a document designed to define the scope of the evaluation with some degree of objectivity. This author acknowledges that in no way will he be so idealistic as to believe that the subjective nature of the evaluator will be eliminated by the document produced, but he does feel that the end product will limit the degree of such subjectivity.

#### Overview of Nokomis High School

Nokomis High School is a four-year traditionally-staffed high school of four hundred students and twenty-six certified staff members. Located in a rural agri-service community of south-central Illinois, it is fed by one public junior high and two parochial junior high schools. The community is conservative in its expectations of the schools. The predominantly German and Italian ethnic backgrounds serve as a

base for the strong Lutheran and Catholic influences that in part account for the conservative attitudes and beliefs.

The town has recently passed a referendum for an increase of \$126,000 in the educational fund. The favorable vote is indicative of the faith and support the citizenry has for the schools as well as indicative of a desire to keep the schools on a financially sound keel. The high school's original building was constructed in 1914 and extensively refurbished in 1974. A new addition consisting of a gymnasium, music area, administrative offices, two science classrooms, and three vocational classrooms was built in 1958. The rooms are traditionally structured and furnished.

The board of education is composed of seven men. One is in his third term; three are in their second terms; and three are in their first terms. Six of the seven earn the majority of their livelihoods in agriculturally-related occupations. The seventh member is a banker. While the author of this paper has resided in the community less than a year, his close relationship to the board as building principal of Nokomis High School allows for the following observations:

1. The board members expect staff members to teach the basic subjects and traditional content as the foundation of the curriculum.
2. The board members expect fair but strong discipline from staff.

3. The building principal is responsible for the fulfillment of items 1 and 2 through his instructional leadership.
4. In a time of teacher abundance, home town teachers when qualified and of desirable quality should be given consideration for employment.
5. No teacher should be retained, however, who cannot fulfill observations number 1 and 2 above.
6. Evaluation of staff in the past has considered employment status ahead of instructional improvement.

Although the author of this paper feels that instructional improvement through evaluation can account for the particular nature of employment status under consideration, he feels that a document can be created and a process utilized which will meet board-community expectations and provide instructional improvement. He further believes that staff members will be receptive to such an evaluative approach.

The certified staff consists of twenty-two tenured and four non-tenured personnel. The average teacher has taught nine years with seven of these years at Nokomis High School. Twelve of these teachers have resided in Nokomis or surrounding communities for the majority of their lives; in fact, five are graduates of Nokomis High School and eight others are graduates of schools within a fifty mile radius. Eighteen of the staff members are graduates of high



schools of 500 or fewer students.<sup>2</sup>

The above data serve to explain in part the traditional approach of Nokomis staff members; furthermore, it helps to explain complacency on the part of certain staff members--a complacency reflected in classroom techniques and course content. One should not assume at this point, however, that traditional educational content and procedures are always viewed negatively by this author. He has simply observed in his brief time at Nokomis High School various curricular areas that could be improved.

One can ask, however, a logical question. If there is such room for improvement so noticeable by the principal within a short time span, what were the factors which fostered the current situation? The answer is somewhat easier to ascertain than one might expect and can be dissected into five parts:

1. Time involvement of the principal for various other responsibilities minimized time for observations.
2. Minimal number of observations resulted as a consequence of item #1.
3. Those observations which did result were usually concerned with considering reemploying first-year staff or providing tenure for second-year staff.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>See Appendix A for the survey utilized to obtain the above data.

<sup>3</sup>See Appendix B, Tally Sheet, part B-3.

4. The evaluation document in use since 1969-70 did not lend itself to instructional improvement.<sup>4</sup>

5. No formal process existed for the evaluation of staff.

The status of evaluation, consequently, is low. The need for improvement of the situation is real and becomes the focus of this paper.

### Design of the Study

This paper shall consist of five primary divisions. Section 1 will be a delineation of the legal aspects that will help shape the processes as well as the evaluation technique to be utilized. Section 2 will deal with current research into staff evaluation as well as various methods now being utilized. Section 3 will consist of an analysis of responses to questionnaires used to allow teacher and administrative input into the new technique and process.

Sections 4 and 5 are output sections. Section 4 describes the development of the technique and process. Section 5 is the narrative concerning the disposition of the document by the superintendent and board.

The various questionnaires and responses will be included in the appendix of this study. The final document will also be provided in the appendix.

---

<sup>4</sup>Farrell Flatt and Charles Wood, "In Practical Fulfillment of the Requirements of EDA4970," (Charleston, Illinois: Educational Administration Department, Eastern Illinois University, 1974). (Mimeographed.)

## SOURCES OF CONSIDERATION IN EVALUATION

### Factors Which Govern Evaluation

The authority for the recommendations concerning employment of staff is delegated by the state of Illinois to school superintendents; however, to aid the superintendent, Section 10-21.4a of the Illinois School Code provides the following:

The principal shall submit recommendations to the superintendent concerning the appointment, retention, promotion, and assignment of all personnel assigned to the attendance center.<sup>5</sup>

From the above statement one can deduce that the building principal has been given the major responsibility for the evaluation of staff. This responsibility may be delegated as one's superintendent or board directs; nevertheless, the principal must make the final recommendation. To fulfill such a major responsibility, it is well that the principal be cognizant of the extra-legal as well as legal ramifications of his task.

As contents of evaluation documents are often utilized to aid in the determination of tenure or job retention, one should be aware

---

<sup>5</sup>School Code of Illinois (St. Paul: West Publishing Co., 1974), p. 78.

of the aspects of due process which relate to evaluation. Hollister has noted the following:

1. Evaluation criteria for the teacher should be printed and be comprehensible to all concerned.
2. Review procedures should be available to establish beyond a reasonable doubt that the decisions on employment are predicated on criteria related to professional competence.
3. A teacher must be afforded the opportunity to ascertain whether or not those findings are defensible or undefensible. A procedure which has been reduced to writing must be available to all parties.
4. Serious thought must be given to the matter of releasing a tenured teacher. A decision should reflect that the reasons for the dismissal are bonafide and the action does not violate either constitutional safeguards or the accepted principles of academic freedom.
5. In cases involving non-retention of non-tenured faculty members the following principles shall govern:
  - a. Non-tenured teachers shall have the right, if they so request, to obtain in writing the reasons for the decisions....
  - b. They shall also have a right to any documentary evidence which may have contributed to the decision of non-retention....<sup>6</sup>

Based upon the above legalities as well as professional courtesies, one could conclude that a document should be utilized based upon a process delineated for the benefit of both staff and evaluators. As this author noted in an earlier paper, the evaluation process should define the minimum number of visits, whether or not visits are to be announced, who is to evaluate, and who receives the results of the evaluation.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup>Charles Hollister, "Due Process of Law and the School Community," Eastern Educational Journal, VI (Fall, 1972), pp. 7-13.

<sup>7</sup>Larry Janes, "Evaluation Is \_\_\_\_\_," (Charleston, Illinois: Educational Administration Department, Eastern Illinois University, 1973). (Mimeographed.)

The form should provide basic areas which include the date and time of the evaluation as well as the reason for the evaluation. A space for a brief resume of the class evaluated should be provided. A place for findings of the evaluation is an obvious necessity; furthermore, a place for teachers to register dissenting opinions is a must. A clear analysis of strengths and weaknesses should be followed by statements of corrective help provided to teachers as well as objectives to improve their instruction. Room for comment to note follow-up observations of these areas is essential.

A signature blank that acknowledges receipt of a copy of the document as well as having the content thoroughly explained should be located at the end of the document.<sup>8</sup> If one feels documentation of a situation related to the teacher's competency is necessary, this author believes a supplemental narrative should be placed in the personnel folder.<sup>9</sup> Subsequent recommendations, statements by witnesses or concerned parties, and the like should be included. Also, the various aspects of due process as delineated above should be observed.

Such an approach can also be employed for noninstructional areas as long as there are no restrictions placed upon the civil rights of the individual.<sup>10</sup> A positive approach utilizing due process criteria

<sup>8</sup>Ibid.

<sup>9</sup>The Illinois Office of Education requires personnel folders to be maintained on all employees.

<sup>10</sup>Janes, op. cit., p. 13.

is always a plus in such situations.

As noted in the above delineation of legalities, not only is it essential to note one's observations but also when dealing with negative observations one must provide viable means for the staff member to attempt to overcome such deficiencies. Instructional improvement, thus, can be the focus of evaluation until such a point when observation evidences that no improvement is occurring.

### Existing Evaluation Systems

As the author of this paper believes in the eclectic approach, a review of current literature on both traditional as well as innovative approaches toward evaluation is appropriate. A wealth of evaluation literature currently exists from which to choose; consequently, considerable editing has been used.<sup>11</sup>

One important tangential aspect of evaluation receiving considerable attention is staff morale. Newton has noted that staff morale is higher when a supervisor is seen as one who is interested in staff development and not in evaluating staff.<sup>12</sup> More than a semantic differentiation, this perception can be especially important to young teachers who see evaluation as the sole determinant of job status.

---

<sup>11</sup>See Janes' "Evaluation Is \_\_\_\_\_," pp. 14-21, for other innovative approaches.

<sup>12</sup>Robert R. Newton, "Three Dilemmas of Supervision," NASSP Bulletin, LVI (December, 1972), pp. 54-55.

The openness and honesty of the supervisor can key his effort toward helping the staff member improve as a teacher.

To insure the openness and honesty of his efforts, the administrator will keep open all lines of communication. During the evaluative process this openness requires that the principal treat the teacher as both an individual as well as a professional worthy of respect.<sup>13</sup> The evaluator, consequently, works with the teacher in staff improvement. He does not stand above the situation as an outside observer; rather, he becomes a participant in a joint experience.

Such a morale climate cannot be turned off and on only during evaluation. The climate comes from the totality of the evaluator's relationship to the staff. As Wayson has written, "... he (the principal) uses highly personalized techniques to stimulate other people to contribute to the school whatever it needs."<sup>14</sup> One can thus conclude that the personality of the evaluator as perceived by the teacher does affect their relationship; consequently, during such a dynamic situation as staff evaluation, the morale of the staff member as related to his perceptions of the purpose of the evaluation and his view of the evaluator does affect the results of the evaluation.

Current literature still focuses considerable attention on a

---

<sup>13</sup>F. C. Ellenburg, "Factors Affecting Teacher Morale," NASSP Bulletin, LVI (December, 1972), pp. 44-45.

<sup>14</sup>William W. Wayson, "A New Kind of Principal," The National Elementary Principal, L (February, 1971), p. 18.

variety of approaches that had their origin in the early stages of the accountability movement. An example is Niedermeyer and Klein's Staff Performance Improvement and Appraisal Plan (SPI&A). Utilizing an appraisal cycle and an improvement cycle, this plan defines pupil performance as the primary criterion in evaluation.<sup>15</sup> Objectives that focus on aspects of instructional improvement are submitted to the principal by the teacher. At the end of the appraisal period data documenting the degree to which objectives were obtained is submitted. The improvement cycle functions within the appraisal cycle and consists of observations by a team of peers and their recommendations from the observation. Of important note, however, is that only the appraisal cycle data are used as a part of the teacher's formal evaluation.

A second spin-off from the accountability movement is evaluation of a teacher's transactions with pupils within the classroom; consequently, teachers are held accountable for the transactions occurring and are evaluated as to the nature and number of transactions. This approach has one major flaw: no one has demonstrated which transactions can be correlated with student learning.<sup>16</sup> In addition,

---

<sup>15</sup>Fred Niedermeyer and Stephen Klein, "An Empirical Evaluation of a District's Teachers' Accountability Programs," Phi Delta Kappan, LIV (October, 1972), pp. 100-103.

<sup>16</sup>Barak Rosenshine and Barry McGaw, "Issues in Assessing Teacher Accountability in Public Education," Phi Delta Kappan, LIII (June, 1972), p. 641.



the training necessary to analyze classroom transactions would be extensive. Even then, Cronk has found such training to be ineffective.<sup>17</sup>

In his study, Cronk found that six principals who had taken a course in the Flanders' Interaction Analysis System (FIAS) did not improve in their evaluations of the verbal transactions between pupils and teachers. Three principals did increase their comments on verbal behavior, but after three years even this area was back to its original range.<sup>18</sup> This author feels that transactions between pupil and teacher do merit consideration during an evaluation; however, the shortcomings noted by Cronk coupled with some personal doubts lead to the conclusion that transactional analysis cannot stand alone as a viable evaluation instrument.

Although not a recent innovation, the use of video-taping for evaluation of staff still receives attention. An article by Krult, however, does suggest a somewhat unique approach. He feels that to reduce the initial threat of the taping that staff must realize the tape will be used to assess strengths and weaknesses for instructional growth and that the assessment should be done by an anonymous evaluator from outside the district.<sup>19</sup> Wilson emphasizes a similar approach,

---

<sup>17</sup>David R. Cronk, "Analyses of Principals' References to Verbal Behavior in Annual Written Evaluations of Teachers," Dissertation Abstracts, 33 (1972), p. 99-A.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid.

<sup>19</sup>Lawrence E. Krult, "Alternatives in Teacher Evaluation," The Clearing House, XLVII (January, 1973), p. 278.

except he recommends a team headed by a consultant who first visits the classroom so as to be more familiar with the situation.<sup>20</sup>

A finding by Stone should be considered, however, before one utilizes the video-tapes of the teacher in the classroom as opposed to live observation. Stone found that live observation had a greater effect upon selection decisions.<sup>21</sup> This author believes that Stone's findings have a parallel in evaluation. The evaluator is somewhat similar to the individual selecting a teacher in that live observation produces an internal feeling of confidence and reliability as opposed to the video-taped observation which produces a feeling of artificiality.

An approach utilized by Kalamazoo, Michigan's school system has received considerable emphasis of late. This approach equates the results of one's evaluation with the pay one receives or, in more modern terminology, merit pay. The teachers in Kalamazoo are evaluated by a variety of techniques, each component receiving a different weighting. One component is a student opinion questionnaire, which increases in comprehensiveness in proportion to the student's grade level. A second component is the teacher evaluation form used by the instructor's principal. Thirdly, teachers are rated on a peer image question-

---

<sup>20</sup>Laval S. Wilson, "Assessing Teacher Skills: Necessary Component of Individualization," Phi Delta Kappan, LVI (November, 1974), p. 208.

<sup>21</sup>Bert Stone, "The Effect of Classroom Observations on Teacher Selection Decisions," Dissertation Abstracts, 33 (1972), p. 939-A.

naire by staff members. Fourthly, the teacher evaluates himself on the same questionnaires used for components one, two, and three.<sup>22</sup>

A fifth and more controversial component is also utilized. A teacher is evaluated in terms of students' achievement gains as measured by various achievement and criterion referenced tests.<sup>23</sup> All five components are fed into a computer and a Teacher Performance Profile is developed. From this profile pay is computed and job status is considered.

One component cited above, self-ratings by individual staff members, has received attention by Pierce. He has developed a General Model of Instruction (GMI) which goes beyond the rating of one-self to the ascertaining of specific areas requiring improvement and the formulating of a procedure in the development of performance objectives for the improvement of a specified area of instruction. Working with a supervisor, the teacher assesses his needs and develops his objectives. A proficiency level is mutually agreed upon as a minimum level of acceptability. The teacher is then evaluated as to the degree to which this proficiency level is accomplished.<sup>24</sup> One should

---

<sup>22</sup>"Ready? Let's Open That Can of Worms and Rate Teachers on How They Perform," The American School Board Journal, CLXI (April, 1974), p. 43.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid.

<sup>24</sup>Walter D. Pierce, "Helping Teachers Improve Teachers," Illinois Principal, V (May, 1974), pp. 13-14.

note that such an approach is aimed toward instructional improvement and can help remove the negative connotations often ascribed to evaluation.

The GMI in itself can be viewed as one form of Management by Objectives (MBO). This method of evaluation is founded in the assumption that teachers grow toward points of evaluation. A study by Jones indicates that to express these points in measurable terms would be the logical approach.<sup>25</sup> Conclusions from a study by the General Electric Company adds substance to Jones' work. The conclusions are as follows:

1. Criticism has a negative effect on the achievement of goals.
2. Praise has little effect one way or another.
3. Performance improves most when specific goals are established.
4. Mutual goal setting improves performance.
5. Defensiveness resulting from critical appraisal reduces performance.<sup>26</sup>

In view of the above, a second point made by Jones should be emphasized. He noted that one should not assume that a teacher will try to alleviate noted deficiencies; consequently, if a deficiency is listed, a solution should be provided.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup>Anthony S. Jones, "Realistic Approach to Teacher Evaluation," The Clearing House, XLVI (April, 1972), p. 406.

<sup>26</sup>Scott D. Thomson, "From Crisis to Progress," North Central Association Quarterly, XLVIII (Winter, 1973), pp. 265-268.

<sup>27</sup>Jones, op. cit., pp. 406-407.

As stated earlier, there is ample literature available on evaluation. The above articles were selected by this author as being those which are most applicable to the development of his evaluation document and procedure. There exists one other area, however, which was analyzed and necessitates comment prior to development of the document and procedure. This area concerns whether or not a teacher's mental health should be considered during evaluation. Brodbelt contends there should be a program to diagnose teachers with mental problems.<sup>28</sup> Noting that only psychiatrists should be given the responsibility for diagnosis upon referral by school authorities, he stresses the need not to overlook or avoid confronting situations involving mental health problems. This author personally agrees with Brodbelt, but he further believes that staff evaluation is not the proper instrument for identifying or solving the problem; thus, prior to developing this document, one should note that no direct reference to mental stability will be built into the document.

---

<sup>28</sup>Samuel Brodbelt, "Teachers' Mental Health: Whose Responsibility?" Phi Delta Kappan, LV (December, 1973), p. 268.

## DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCUMENT

### Teaching Staff In-put

Two questionnaires (Appendixes A and B) were utilized to gather data from teaching staff and administrative personnel and to allow for staff in-put into the development of the new technique and process. The staff questionnaire was keyed to determine the following information:

1. Educational background
2. Teaching background
3. Experiences with evaluation
4. Opinions on evaluation practices

The questionnaires were created by the author following discussion with several principals and teachers. During telephone conversations with the principals, they were asked to pinpoint factors which they felt influence the various ways teachers react to evaluation situations. In discussions with staff members, the author asked them to name factors which they felt important in respect to their attitudes toward evaluation. Lastly, the author proceeded to list what he felt were relevant areas of importance which required the acquisition of

data prior to the development of the staff questionnaires. The data was then organized into the form in which the staff questionnaire appears.

Although, the total staff averages nine-years' experience, twelve staff members have five or fewer years of experience. Most staff members have taught for most of their careers in Nokomis; consequently, their experiences with evaluation techniques are primarily limited to those utilized within Nokomis. Policy in Nokomis requires two evaluations per year of tenured teachers and four per year of non-tenured personnel; however, the survey indicated the average teacher had been evaluated less than twice a year.

Of evaluations remembered by staff, forty-four per cent were noted as being concerned with the ascertainment of tenure status. Twenty-eight per cent were considered to have been given only to fulfill an administrative responsibility. Disappointingly, only twenty-four per cent of the evaluations were noted as being provided to improve instruction.

The most typical form of evaluation according to the survey was the traditional paper-pencil checklist type. All current staff members noted this. Only eleven noted the narrative style of the paper-pencil technique although the current Nokomis form does allow for narrative comment. Two had been video-taped, and two others noted being evaluated informally with no means of recording data being utilized.

When asked to list their preferences as to technique, sixteen indicated the use of narrative comments and eight opted for the checklist style.

In analyzing the strengths and weaknesses of evaluation techniques with which they were familiar, the staff noted determination of strengths and weaknesses in their teaching methods on fourteen responses as a strength; however, no one listed as a strength the formulation of goals coming from the ascertainment of strengths or weaknesses. Eight staff members felt that the type of evaluation or the technique utilized was a major strength and seven noted the content of the document as being a strength.

Quite interestingly, the weakness most frequently noted was the lack of direction for improvement, which was found on eleven responses. Eight teachers indicated as a weakness their lack of faith in the evaluator and eight also felt that there were too few evaluations to help. Other weaknesses worthy of mention were the lack of any follow-up, the lack of objectivity, the document itself, and the need to clarify the goals of the evaluation. One comparison that speaks for itself is that in responding to strengths thirty comments were marked; whereas, in responding to weaknesses forty-nine were marked.

In classifying the current document being utilized at Nokomis High School, fourteen staff members commented that it was poorly structured and seven felt the content was too narrow as opposed to five who felt the document was acceptable and four who felt the content



was adequate. Three indicated they would not be in favor of any document at all no matter what the content.

From the teachers' responses a variety of assumptions to aid in the formulation of the desired procedure and document were developed. They included these:

1. The majority of staff members are stabilized in their positions within the community and school and reflect the conservative attitudes of the community.
2. The majority of staff members lack diverse educational backgrounds.
3. Evaluation of staff at Nokomis has been traditional as to purpose and technique.
4. Teachers feel the current procedure and technique does ascertain strengths and weaknesses; however, they desire a more thorough analysis of their abilities as well as more direction and follow-up.
5. Teachers are not happy with the current procedures and document, but they do prefer the use of a document to more innovative techniques.

#### Administrative Team In-put

The administrative questionnaire was developed in a fashion similar to that employed for developing the staff questionnaire. Administrators within the unit were asked to analyze their attitudes toward

various evaluation techniques and to note their feelings toward current evaluation procedures utilized by Nokomis personnel. The data gathered was coupled with other points of inquiry this author felt would aid in the development of a sound evaluative instrument.

The administrative questionnaire revealed that the five Nokomis administrators have all served in administrative capacities for a minimum of three years. Four have administrated in districts other than Nokomis prior to coming to the Nokomis district. All have worked for other school districts. Total experience in education ranges from eight to seventeen years.

All of the administrators are responsible for the evaluation of personnel; however, the superintendent does so only for unit principals or when a situation involving job status arises. In their rankings as to the purposes of evaluation as it should be, they named instructional improvement first and tenure second. Ranking the purpose of evaluation as it now exists, the participants felt, in contrast to the ideal, that tenure was the first consideration with instructional improvement a close second.

Noting the techniques used within Nokomis, all referred to the pencil-paper narrative. One notes the difference in their interpretation of the document as contrasted with the teachers' view of it as a checklist. Three also felt the major strength of the current document was its content; however, two of these noted that the content could be

supplemented and changed for improvement. As to the major weakness, three noted follow-up: two were referring to staff follow-up and one to administrative follow-up.

In reviewing the findings of the administrative questionnaire, certain factors must be noted. They included these:

1. Nokomis administrators are all at least moderately experienced.
2. Administrators agree with teachers that tenure consideration motivates many evaluations.
3. Administrators have a different concept than staff of the evaluation document now in use.
4. Administrators held a higher value for the document in use than did staff; however, they agreed with the teaching staff on the need for more follow-up.

#### Development of the Process and Document

In developing the evaluation process and document, the author used the data presented in the earlier sections of this study as the primary sources for the guidelines which regulate the evaluation procedure. Of particular importance was the section that considered the legalities the evaluator must observe. One will note in the procedure which follows that such items as the number of evaluations, the method for discussing data gathered during the evaluation, the means for staff rebuttal to evaluation findings, and the disposition of evaluation results are all delineated.

One will also note that the section on current evaluation procedures helped in shaping the procedure. Staff members will have specific objectives developed for them from the evaluation. These objectives will become targets of inquiry in subsequent observations.

The staff and administrative questionnaires helped to substantiate the need for follow-up of recommendations as the procedure necessitates. Further, the questionnaires helped to emphasize the need for specifying the number of evaluations for each staff member. One recalls that questionnaire results indicated that most staff members were seldom observed once on tenure.

The various legal aspects discussed were also utilized in developing the document. One will note that instructions for use appear on the document to aid both the evaluator and the staff member being evaluated. One will also note an area for staff response and the section which explains the ramifications of one's signature appearing on the document.

The research into current evaluative systems was primarily responsible for the section in which objectives are to be formulated. This research also served as the basis for requiring criteria to be established so as to aid in ascertaining if the objectives are subsequently fulfilled.

The staff and administrative questionnaires made it clear that the vast majority of personnel preferred the traditional paper-

pencil evaluation format. The questionnaires further emphasized that staff definitely preferred narrative comments over the marking of a checklist.

In deciding what areas were to be covered by the evaluation, this author utilized his previous evaluations of the Nokomis staff. Each evaluation was considered as to those areas included in the document which were most frequently used and required the greatest elaboration for staff. Secondly, each evaluation was reviewed for comments made by the evaluator for which the current document lacked a specific section.

All such items were then listed in random order. The author then analyzed the list and found that he could group them into two sections: (1) total school program areas and (2) classroom evaluation areas. The total program areas were subsequently split in sections on personal characteristics, rapport, professional concerns, and non-classroom responsibilities. A fifth area, citations, was added by the author. The section on classroom observation was divided into organization, classroom management, methods, and content. From the original random list, the items were placed under the appropriate major topic section.

To help the evaluator, the author then chose to define the type of transaction or characteristic which was being evaluated. He utilized data from a collection of evaluation documents he maintains as well as

standard dictionary definitions. Hopefully, these definitions will serve to define the limits of each area under consideration.

With such items in mind, the author recommends to the Board of Education, Nokomis Community Unit District #22 the evaluative process and document which follows be placed in the Nokomis High School Official Staff Guidelines. One will note that as this document is in the proposal stage and has yet to be utilized procedures for validating the content of the document will subsequently need to be developed.

## SUGGESTED PROCEDURE FOR EVALUATION OF STAFF

### Philosophy of the Evaluation Process

Evaluations are designed (1) to improve instruction and (2) to insure that the total school program operates at a peak level of efficiency in the best interests of the learner and instructional staff.

### Procedure for Evaluation of Staff

1. The building principal of Nokomis High School is responsible for the evaluation of certified staff within his building and such responsibility cannot be delegated.
2. The building principal shall utilize the Staff Evaluation Document as approved by the Board of Education.
3. The evaluation of staff shall follow those procedures as outlined herein. Failure to adhere to such procedures invalidates the findings of the evaluation.
4. During the in-service workshop prior to the opening of the school term each teacher will receive a copy of the Staff Evaluation Document and the Procedure for Evaluation. At this time a thorough explanation of evaluation as it concerns Nokomis High School staff will be provided.

5. Evaluation of Non-tenured Staff.

a. Non-tenured staff will be evaluated a minimum of four times during the year. Three of those evaluations shall come prior to the week of the third Tuesday in February, at which time recommendations are made concerning the job status of non-tenured personnel.

- (1) Prior to the first two evaluations, a pre-evaluation conference will be held at which time the principal shall review the evaluation process and document. A date and time will be established for the evaluation, and the teacher will present a duplicate copy of the lesson plans to the principal. Attached to the lesson plans will be a statement of objectives the lesson is designed to attain. For the second evaluation, objectives related to the lesson at hand as well as to items noted in the first visitation will be attached.

The conference preceding the second visit shall include a review of the first evaluation and a delineation of any objectives formulated for the improvement of the staff member. The same class shall be visited at a date mutually agreed upon.

- (2) The third evaluation will be multiple in nature as it will consist of at least two class observations of a minimum



of twenty minutes duration. These visits will not be prearranged.

(3) The fourth visit will also be multiple in nature, meeting the same criteria as visit three.

b. At any point in the school term the principal deems an additional evaluation necessary, he will file an addendum with the teacher and superintendent receiving a copy stating specifically the reasons for the additional evaluation.

#### 6. Evaluation of Tenure Staff

a. Tenure staff will be evaluated a minimum of two times during the year. Both evaluations shall come prior to the week of the third Tuesday in February, at which time recommendations concerning the status of tenured personnel are made.

(1) Prior to the first evaluation, a pre-evaluation conference will be held at which time the principal shall review the evaluation process and document. A date and time will also be established for the evaluation and the teacher will present a duplicate set of lesson plans to the principal. Attached to the lesson plans will be a statement of objectives the lesson is designed to attain.

As a supplement to this evaluation, the principal and teacher at the post-evaluation conference will develop any objectives related to the evaluation and a

supplemental visit will be arranged for the purpose of noting accomplishment of said objectives. Should the principal feel this supplemental step is unnecessary, he will note this in the document.

- (2) The second evaluation will be multiple in nature and consist of two classroom observations of a minimum of twenty minutes duration. These visits will not be prearranged.

- b. If at any point in the school term the principal deems an additional evaluation necessary, he will file an addendum with the teacher and superintendent receiving a copy stating specifically the reasons for the additional evaluation.

7. On the day of the evaluation or on the second day of the multiple-visit evaluation, the principal shall hold a summary conference with the staff member at which time the document is reviewed point-by-point. The teacher may respond in writing to comments in the space allotted for that purpose.

Three copies of the document will be provided. The principal and staff member shall sign all three and initial any supplemental comments. One copy is provided for the teacher; one copy is retained by the principal; and one copy is sent to the office of the unit superintendent for review and placement in the staff member's personnel folder.

8. Any objectives formulated during the evaluative session must be reviewed following the second visit of non-tenured staff and the supplemental visit of tenured staff.
9. In all matters involving the evaluation of staff, the administration and Board of Education shall act in the best interest of all parties and observe the due process of the law.

## DISPOSITION OF THE DOCUMENT

At the current time this document is in a state of limbo.

Charles Wood, unit superintendent, has reviewed its content and given it his conditional approval, pursuant to board action; however, as the unit's board policies are being rewritten and will not be finalized until July or August of this current year, no action will be taken upon the proposed document. Board action is necessary to provide the legal base for the document and procedures as defined within the Teacher's Handbook. This author is hopeful of board approval so that the proposed evaluative system can be implemented in September of 1975.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brodbelt, Samuel. "Teachers' Mental Health: Whose Responsibility?" Phi Delta Kappan, LV (December, 1973), 268-69.
- Cronk, David R. "Analyses of Principals' References to Verbal Behavior in Annual Written Evaluations of Teachers." Dissertation Abstracts, 33 (1972), 99-A.
- Ellenburg, F. C. "Factors Affecting Teacher Morale." NASSP Bulletin, LVI (December, 1972), 37-45.
- Flatt, Farrell and Charles Wood. "In Practical Fulfillment of the Requirements of EDA4970." Charleston, Illinois: Educational Administration Department, Eastern Illinois University, 1974. (Mimeographed.)
- Hechinger, Fred M. "Should Teachers Be Judged by Performance?" Saturday Review, I (May 4, 1974), 71-72.
- Hollister, Charles. "Due Process of Law and the School Community." Eastern Educational Journal, VI (Fall 1972), 4-15.
- Janes, Larry D. "Evaluation Is \_\_\_\_." Charleston, Illinois: Educational Administration Department, Eastern Illinois University, 1973. (Mimeographed.)
- Jones, Anthony S. "Realistic Approach to Teacher Evaluation." The Clearing House, XLVI (April, 1972), 607-11.
- Krult, Lawrence E. "Alternatives in Teacher Evaluation." The Clearing House, XLVII (January, 1973), 277-79.
- Newton, Robert R. "Three Dilemmas of Supervision." NASSP Bulletin, LVI (December, 1972), 52-56.
- Niedermeyer, Fred and Stephen Klein. "An Emperical Evaluation of a District's Teachers' Accountability Programs." Phi Delta Kappan, LIV (October, 1972), 100-03.

Pierce, Walter D. "Helping Teachers Improve Teachers." Illinois Principal, V (May, 1974), 13-15.

"Ready? Let's Open That Can of Worms and Rate Teachers on How They Perform." The American School Board Journal, CLXI (April, 1974), 40-43.

Rosenshine, Barak and Barry McGaw. "Issues in Assessing Teacher Accountability in Public Education." Phi Delta Kappan, LIII (June, 1972), 640-43.

School Code of Illinois. St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Co., 1974.

Stone, Bert. "The Effect of Classroom Observations on Teacher Selection Decisions." Dissertation Abstracts, 33 (1972), 939-A.

Thomson, Scott D. "From Crisis to Progress." North Central Association Quarterly, XLVIII (Winter, 1973), 265-69.

Wayson, William W. "A New Kind of Principal." The National Elementary Principal, L (February, 1971), 8-19.

Wilson, Laval S. "Assessing Teacher Skills: Necessary Component of Individualization." Phi Delta Kappan, LVI (November, 1974), 207-09.

**APPENDIX A**  
**STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE AND RESULTS**



To: Staff

From: Larry Janes, Principal

Subject: Questionnaire

Directions:

The survey below is being conducted to aid in (1) the development of an evaluation document and process and (2) the completion of a paper to be presented as a field study to Eastern Illinois University.

Please do not sign.

A. Background Data:

- |  |                  |
|--|------------------|
| 1. Did you graduate from Nokomis High School?  | <u>Yes -- No</u> |
| 2. If answer to number 1 is <u>no</u> , did you graduate from a school within a fifty mile radius? | <u>Yes -- No</u> |
| 3. Approximately how many students attended the high school from which you graduated?              | _____            |
| 4. From which college did you receive your B.S. or B.A. degree?                                    | _____            |
| 5. Do you have an advanced degree?   | <u>Yes -- No</u> |
| 6. If <u>yes</u> , from which school? If <u>no</u> , list any advanced hours you have.             | _____            |

B. Teaching Data:

- |  |       |
|--|-------|
| 1. Total years taught.   | _____ |
| 2. Years taught in Nokomis.  | _____ |
| 3. If you have taught elsewhere, what was (were) the approximate size (sizes) of the school (schools)? | _____ |

C. Evaluation Data:

- |  |       |
|--|-------|
| 1. How many times would you estimate you have been evaluated since you have began teaching (average/year)? | _____ |
|--|-------|

2. How many times have you been evaluated while teaching in Nokomis (average/year)? \_\_\_\_\_
3. How many evaluations do you feel have benefitted you as a teacher - 100%; 75%; 50%; 0%? \_\_\_\_\_
4. How many of these have been beneficial since teaching in Nokomis? \_\_\_\_\_
5. Concerning evaluations in general:
  - a. What do you feel has been the primary purpose of evaluations you have undergone? You may mark more than one.
    - (1) Tenure \_\_\_\_\_
    - (2) Promotion or demotion \_\_\_\_\_
    - (3) Instructional improvement \_\_\_\_\_
    - (4) Administrative fulfillment of an assigned task \_\_\_\_\_
    - (5) Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. What types of evaluation techniques have been utilized in your evaluation? You may mark more than one.
    - (1) Paper-pencil (check list or scale) \_\_\_\_\_
    - (2) Paper-pencil (narrative) \_\_\_\_\_
    - (3) Video-tape \_\_\_\_\_
    - (4) Interaction analysis \_\_\_\_\_
    - (5) Management by objectives \_\_\_\_\_
    - (6) Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. What type of evaluation technique do you prefer? (Number   ?   above) \_\_\_\_\_
  - d. What has been the major strengths of evaluations you have undergone? You may mark more than one.
    - (1) The technique utilized \_\_\_\_\_
    - (2) The content of the evaluative tool \_\_\_\_\_
    - (3) The ascertainment of one's strengths and weaknesses \_\_\_\_\_
    - (4) Goals or objectives derived from the evaluation \_\_\_\_\_
    - (5) Confidence in the evaluator \_\_\_\_\_
    - (6) Improved teacher-evaluator communication and understanding \_\_\_\_\_
    - (7) Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
  - e. What has been the major weaknesses of evaluations you have undergone? You may mark more than one.
    - (1) Too few in number \_\_\_\_\_

- (2) Failure of evaluator to clarify goals of the evaluation \_\_\_\_\_
- (3) Lack of objectivity; too subjective in feedback information \_\_\_\_\_
- (4) Insufficient direction as to techniques or methods for improving a deficiency \_\_\_\_\_
- (5) Lack of follow-up concerning previous recommendations by evaluator \_\_\_\_\_
- (6) Poor document or technique used for evaluation \_\_\_\_\_
- (7) Lack of confidence in the evaluator \_\_\_\_\_
- (8) Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

---

6. The current procedures and document used for evaluation at Nokomis High School could be characterized as follows (you may mark more than one):

- a. Acceptable \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Poorly structured as to procedure \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Poorly structured document \_\_\_\_\_
- d. Adequate content \_\_\_\_\_
- e. Too broad in range of areas evaluated \_\_\_\_\_
- f. Too narrow in range of areas evaluated \_\_\_\_\_
- g. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

---

7. To improve evaluation at Nokomis High School, I would like to suggest the following:

(1)

(2)

(3)

TALLY SHEET  
STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE

A. Background Data:

1. Graduates of Nokomis High School	5
Other High Schools	21
2. Graduates of other High Schools from a fifty mile radius	9
3. Average size of High School from which staff graduated	424
4. Colleges from which received B.S. or B.A.:	
a. Eastern Illinois University	9
b. Illinois State University	5
c. Southern Illinois University	5
d. Others	7
5. Number of certified staff with advanced degrees	9
6. Colleges from which one received advanced degree:	
a. Eastern Illinois University	4
b. Southern Illinois University	2
c. Others	3

B. Teaching Data:

1. Number of years taught:	
a. 0-2	3
b. 3-5	7
c. 6-10	10
d. 10 or more	6
2. Number of years taught in Nokomis:	
a. 0-2	5
b. 3-5	7
c. 6-10	11
d. 10 or more	3
3. Number of staff who have taught only in Nokomis	13
4. Average size of other schools in which taught:	
a. 0-500	9
b. 501-1000	4
c. 1000 or larger	0

## C. Evaluation Data:

1. Average number of times evaluated per year	<u>1.67</u>
2. Number of times evaluated per year while teaching in Nokomis	<u>1.88</u>
3. Average number of evaluations one feels has benefitted him	<u>32.7%</u>
4. Primary purpose of evaluations one has undergone (in his opinion)	
a. Tenure	<u>58</u>
b. Promotion or demotion	<u>7</u>
c. Instructional improvement	<u>31</u>
d. Administrative fulfillment of an assigned task	<u>38</u>
e. Other	<u>6</u>
5. Types of evaluation techniques by which one has been evaluated. You may list more than one.	
a. Paper-Pencil (checklist or scale)	<u>26</u>
b. Paper-pencil (narrative)	<u>11</u>
c. Video-tape	<u>2</u>
d. Interaction analysis	<u>0</u>
e. Management by Objectives	<u>0</u>
f. Other	<u>11</u>
6. Type of evaluation technique preferred	
a. Paper-pencil (checklist-scale)	<u>8</u>
b. Paper-pencil (narrative)	<u>16</u>
c. Video-tape	<u>1</u>
d. Interaction analysis	<u>0</u>
e. Management by Objectives	<u>0</u>
f. Other	<u>1</u>
7. Major strengths of evaluations one has undergone	
a. Techniques utilized	<u>8</u>
b. Content of evaluative tool	<u>7</u>
c. Determination of strengths and weaknesses	<u>14</u>
d. Goals or objectives coming from evaluation	<u>0</u>
e. Expertise of evaluator	<u>1</u>
f. Other	<u>0</u>
8. Major weaknesses of evaluations one has undergone	
a. Too few to aid in improving skills	<u>8</u>
b. Failure of evaluator to clarify goals of evaluation	<u>4</u>
c. Lack of objectivity	<u>5</u>
d. Lack of direction for improvement	<u>11</u>
e. Lack of follow-up	<u>6</u>
f. Poor document or technique	<u>5</u>
g. Lack of confidence in evaluator	<u>8</u>
h. Other	<u>2</u>
9. Current document and procedure used at Nokomis High School could be classified as follows:	

a. Acceptable	<u>5</u>
b. Poorly structured as to procedure	<u>3</u>
c. Poorly structured document	<u>14</u>
d. Adequate content within document	<u>4</u>
e. Too broad in range of areas evaluated	<u>2</u>
f. Too narrow in range of areas evaluated	<u>7</u>
g. Other	<u>3</u>
10. Suggestions for improvement:	
a. "Don't allow one-word explanations. "	
b. "Eliminate section on mental and physical health. "	
c. "State the way it is to work in writing. "	
d. "Rewrite it. " (Mentioned in many ways several times. )	
e. "Do something with results. " (Person clarified as meaning recommendations should be followed up. )	

**APPENDIX B**

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE AND RESULTS**

To: Nokomis Administration Personnel

From: Larry Janes, Principal

Subject: Questionnaire

Directions:

The survey below is being conducted to aid in (1) the development of an evaluation document and process and (2) the completion of a paper to be presented as a field study to Eastern Illinois University.

Please do not sign.

A. Background Data:

1. Number of years in education \_\_\_\_\_
2. Number of years in Nokomis school \_\_\_\_\_
3. Number of years in administration \_\_\_\_\_
4. Number of years in administration in Nokomis school \_\_\_\_\_
5. Highest degree held \_\_\_\_\_

B. Evaluation Data:

1. In your present position are you responsible for the evaluation of certified staff? \_\_\_\_\_
2. If Yes to item 1, how many certified staff members do you evaluate? \_\_\_\_\_
3. If No to item 1, have you previously been in an administrative position in Nokomis in which you evaluated staff? \_\_\_\_\_

(If your answers to both items 2 and 3 are No, your phase of the questionnaire has been completed.)

4. In your capacity as an evaluator, what do you feel the primary purpose of evaluation should be?



Please rank.

- a. Tenure \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Promotion or demotion \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Instructional improvement \_\_\_\_\_
- d. Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

---

5. In your capacity as an evaluator, what do you feel has been the primary purpose of evaluations within Nokomis schools? Rank in order of primary importance.

- a. Tenure \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Promotion or demotion \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Instructional improvement \_\_\_\_\_
- d. Fulfillment of job description or assigned role \_\_\_\_\_
- e. Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

---

6. What type of evaluation techniques have you utilized within Nokomis? You may list more than one.

- a. Paper-pencil (check list or scale) \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Paper-pencil (narrative) \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Video-tape \_\_\_\_\_
- d. Interaction analysis \_\_\_\_\_
- e. Management by Objectives \_\_\_\_\_
- f. Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

---

7. What type of evaluation technique do you prefer?  
(Number   ?   above) \_\_\_\_\_

8. What has been the major strengths of the document now being utilized?

- a. The technique utilized \_\_\_\_\_
- b. The content of the evaluation tool \_\_\_\_\_
- c. The objective delineation of strengths and weaknesses to provide direction for the individual evaluated \_\_\_\_\_
- d. Goals or objectives coming from the evaluation \_\_\_\_\_
- e. Improved staff relationships \_\_\_\_\_
- f. Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

---

9. What has been the major weaknesses of evaluations you have conducted? You may list more than one.

- a. Too few in number \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Technique utilized \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Poor understanding on part of staff member of the goals of the evaluation \_\_\_\_\_
- d. Insufficient direction on part of evaluator \_\_\_\_\_
- e. Failure of staff member to follow-up \_\_\_\_\_

f. Attitude of person evaluated

g. Other (please specify)

---

- 
10. To improve evaluation at Nokomis High School, I  
would like to suggest the following:

(1)

(2)

(3)

**TALLY SHEET  
ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE**

**A. Background Data:**

**1. Number of years in education**

a. 0-5

0

b. 6-10

2

c. 11 or more

3

**2. Number of years in Nokomis schools**

a. 0-2

1

b. 3-5

2

c. 6-10

1

d. 10 or more

1

**3. Number of years in administration**

a. 0-2

0

b. 3-5

2

c. 6-10

2

d. 11 or more

1

**4. Number of years in administration in Nokomis schools**

a. 0-2

1

b. 3-5

2

c. 6-10

1

d. 11 or more

1

**B. Evaluative Data:**

**1. Responsible for evaluation or certified staff:**

Yes

5

No

0

**2. Primary purpose of evaluation as should be (rank average)**

a. Tenure

2

b. Promotion or demotion

3

c. Instructional improvement

1

d. Other

0

**3. Primary purpose as exists in Nokomis (rank average)**

a. Tenure

1

b. Promotion or demotion

3

c. Instructional improvement	1.2
d. Fulfillment of assigned task	4
e. Other	0
4. Techniques utilized within Nokomis	
a. Paper-pencil (checklist or scale)	0
b. Paper-pencil (narrative)	5
c. Video-tape	0
d. Interaction analysis	0
e. Management by Objectives	1
f. Other	0
5. Of those listed in item <u>4</u> above, which do you prefer?	
a. Paper-pencil (checklist or scale)	1
b. Paper-pencil (narrative)	3
c. Video-tape	0
d. Interaction analysis	0
e. Management by Objectives	1
f. Other	0
6. Major strength of document now utilized	
a. Technique utilized	1
b. Content of evaluation	3
c. Objective delineation of strengths and weaknesses to provide direction	0
d. Objectives forthcoming	1
e. Improved staff relationships	0
f. Other	0
7. Major weaknesses of evaluation now being conducted	
a. Too few in number	0
b. Technique utilized	1
c. Poor understanding of goals of evaluation	0
d. Poor follow-up by evaluator	1
e. Poor follow-up by staff member	2
f. Attitude of person evaluated	1
g. Other	0
8. Suggestions for improvement	
a. Rearrange content and be more specific in areas being evaluated	
b. Develop a system for following through on recommendations	

**APPENDIX C**  
**CURRENT EVALUATION DOCUMENT**

UNIT DISTRICT #22  
Nokomis, Illinois

Criteria for Teacher Evaluation

Teacher \_\_\_\_\_ Date of Visit \_\_\_\_\_

School \_\_\_\_\_ Date of Conference \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator \_\_\_\_\_

OBSERVED

\_\_\_\_\_ I. Teacher-Pupil Rapport

- a. Has positive attitude toward students \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Displays evidence of adequate discipline for learning \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Provides for physical welfare of pupils \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ II. Teaching Methods

- a. Meets the objectives of the given level or subject taught \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Uses enthusiasm, adaptability, initiative, and inventiveness in the teaching approach \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Plans for the use of instructional materials \_\_\_\_\_

- d. Provides for individual differences

---

\_\_\_\_ III. Personal Qualities

- a. Promptness
- b. Dependability
- c. Degree of pleasantness in personality and appearance
- d. Judgment
- e. Mental and Physical Health

---

---

---

---

---

\_\_\_\_ IV. Professional Qualities

- a. Promotes good public relations
- b. Has good relationships with fellow colleagues
- c. Has loyalty to fellow staff members

---

---

---

\_\_\_\_ V. Professional Growth

- a. Meets board requirement
- b. Acquires additional training beyond board requirements
- c. Displays other evidence of professional growth

---

---

---

Comments or Recommendations:

---

---

---

## **APPENDIX D**

### **INSTRUCTIONS FOR USE OF DOCUMENT**



The following items are to serve as guidelines for the utilization of the evaluative document by the evaluator:

1. The document is to be written, not typed.
2. Due to the time involved in completing the document, the evaluator should complete as many areas as possible prior to the post-evaluative conference.
3. The comment section of each evaluation area requires brief, narrative statements. The definitions appearing on the document are provided as leads for the evaluator; consequently, the evaluator should not be limited by those leads.
4. The objectives formulated from the evaluation should be written in the presence of the staff member. They should be specific and directive.
5. The criteria to be considered should provide an accurate description of how the evaluator is to judge if the objectives are subsequently fulfilled.
6. When the follow-up evaluation is completed and the objectives formulated from the original visit are assessed, the evaluator should state specifically in the space provided his

conclusions as to whether or not the objectives have been fulfilled. Be certain to have this section initialled or signed by the staff member.

7. There is no relationship between the numerical arrangement of the objectives and the broad areas evaluated; thus, one is free to develop more than one objective for any specific concern should one choose to do so.
8. The staff response should be completed at the post-evaluative conference. Should the staff member desire to file an addendum, this fact should be noted in the staff response section.
9. Read the acknowledgement section to the staff member at the conclusion of the post-evaluative conference and then sign all copies.
10. Distribute and file the document as the unit policy directs immediately upon completion of the post-evaluative conference.

**APPENDIX E**

**PROPOSED STAFF IMPROVEMENT PACKET**

STAFF IMPROVEMENT PACKET NOKOMIS HIGH SCHOOL

General Data

Staff Member: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator \_\_\_\_\_

Date or Dates of Evaluation: \_\_\_\_\_

Class or Classes Evaluated: \_\_\_\_\_

Reason for Evaluation: \_\_\_\_\_

Announced \_\_\_\_\_ Unannounced \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Pre-Evaluation Conference: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

The purpose of this evaluation is to promote the instructional growth of the staff member and to insure the total school program operates at maximum efficiency in the best interests of the learner and instructional staff. Staff members are urged to review the procedures for evaluation as outlined in their Teacher Handbooks for clarification of the evaluative process. Instructions for use of this particular document follow.

### Instructions for Use

1. Each document shall be completed in its entirety.
2. Following the evaluation, the principal shall review the entire document with the staff member.
3. Objectives formulated from the evaluation will be written during the post-evaluative conference.
4. Conclusions from follow-up visits are noted on the documents of the teacher and principal and shall be initialed and dated. These conclusions are filed as an addendum to the superintendent's copy.
5. Descriptive terminology following the area being evaluated serves only to define the scope of that area and should not be considered as evaluative limits for that particular area. These terms are only leads and the evaluator is to supply his own narrative comments.
6. Observations of a negative nature should be stated in as specific a context as possible.
7. Each teacher has a right to a rebuttal as an addendum. Such a rebuttal should be signed and dated by both the teacher and principal.
8. Hand written evaluations are preferred to reduce proliferation of information.

### Areas of Evaluation

- I. Total School Program - Areas of concern which relate to those responsibilities not solely resulting from teaching assigned classroom subjects.
  - A. Personal Characteristics
    1. Appearance: Neat and appropriate. Offers self as a positive model for students.  
COMMENT: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
    2. Dependability: Punctual. Follows through on commitments. Acknowledges responsibilities.  
COMMENT: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

3. **Enthusiasm and Initiative:** Self-starter. Innovative. Positive attitude. Enjoys work.

COMMENT: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

4. **Judgment:** Confident and judicious. Impartial. Nonprejudiced.

COMMENT: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

5. **Leadership:** Contributes ideas. Accepts leadership roles when asked.

COMMENT: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**B. Rapport**

**1. Pupil**

- a. **Respect:** Has respect of pupils and in return respects them. Shows trust.

COMMENT: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- b. **Empathy:** Acknowledges pupils' feeling. Can listen as well as counsel or advise.

COMMENT: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**2. Co-Workers**

- a. **Congeniality:** Friendly and polite. Sense of humor. Maintains good relations with non-certified staff.

COMMENT: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- b. **Cooperativeness:** Shares facilities or materials as needed. Harmonious to others' ideas. Shares committee responsibilities.

COMMENT: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**3. Administrative**

- a. **Cooperativeness:** Aids intra-school relations. Acknowledges mutuality of interests in goals of district.

COMMENT: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- b. **Line-Staff Relationships:** Uses appropriate channels. Can subordinate feelings if necessary. Accepts constructive criticism.

COMMENT: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

4. **Community**

- a. **Activities:** Supports clubs and organizations of community service nature. Donates time to groups or worthy causes.

COMMENT: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

- b. **Parental Response:** Has out-of-school contact with parents. Presents positive image of school and profession when dealing with parents.

COMMENT: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

C. **Professional Concerns**

1. **Education:** Meets board requirements for growth. Attends workshops. Stays abreast of field.

COMMENT: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

2. **Organizations:** Belongs to professional organizations. Member of groups related to teaching field.

COMMENT: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

3. **Ethics:** Carries out board policies and school staff guidelines. Observes chain of command.

COMMENT: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

D. **Non-Classroom Responsibilities**

1. **Clubs and organizations:** Serves as sponsor. Groups reflect his leadership and organization.

COMMENT: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

2. **Volunteer Duties:** Accepts responsibilities. Prompt.

COMMENT: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

- E. Citations: Awards, honors, publications, and the like which reflect quality of individual within his community or profession.

COMMENT: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

## II. Classroom Observation

- A. Narrative Description of Class Visited: \_\_\_\_\_

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

- B. Specific Areas Observed

### 1. Organization

- a. Planning: Lesson plans organized. Goals and objectives known by students. Units sequenced. Instructional materials and methods built into plans.

COMMENT: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

- b. Grading: Grade book maintained. Students know grading system. Papers promptly returned.

COMMENT: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

- c. Testing: Tests reflect class content. Questions and directions clear. Demands not only recall but also application of knowledge.

COMMENT: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

- d. Assignments: Clear and directive. Stimulates interest.

COMMENT: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

### 2. Classroom Management

- a. Use of Time: Class starts promptly. Study time when provided is organized and utilized as such. Contingencies exist for shortened class periods.

COMMENT: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_



- b. **Physical Condition of Room:** Properly respected. Bulletin board is appropriate. Lighting, heat, ventilation given consideration. Seating conducive to class.  
COMMENT: \_\_\_\_\_

- c. **Discipline:** Teacher exercises self-control. Consistent. Work habits promote discipline. Classroom conduct in line with total school rules and expectations. Tact and good judgment shown. Positive atmosphere.  
COMMENT: \_\_\_\_\_

### 3. Methods

- a. **Personal Qualities:** Voice is appropriate. Eye contact evident. Maintains clearness of expression. Avoids annoying habits. Displays a sense of humor. Courteous toward student.  
COMMENT: \_\_\_\_\_

- b. **Use of Instructional Materials:** Materials integrated into class content. Materials used properly and effectively. Community resources acknowledged.  
COMMENT: \_\_\_\_\_

- c. **Individualization and Grouping:** Individual differences accounted for through questioning, special help, grouping, and materials. Recommendations from counselor solicited.  
COMMENT: \_\_\_\_\_

- d. **Questioning Techniques:** Questioning promotes critical thinking and goes beyond recall and recognition. Questioning promotes attentiveness and discussion. Responses sought from a variety of students.  
COMMENT: \_\_\_\_\_

- e. **Method of Delivery:** Method of presentation appropriate to content. Lesson plans reflect variety. Students responsive. Innovative and creative.  
COMMENT: \_\_\_\_\_

## 4. Content

- a. Knowledge of Subject Matter: Conversable. Capable of handling related questions. Current.

COMMENT: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

- b. Organization: Material sequenced. Assignments and testing occur at appropriate intervals and promote learning.

COMMENT: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

- c. Supplemental Content: Allows students to supplement. Avoids going off-the-topic except when doing such fosters a learning experience.

COMMENT: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

## III. Objectives Resulting from Evaluation

- A. Objective #1: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Criteria to be considered: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Conclusions from follow-up evaluation: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Initials: \_\_\_\_\_

- B. Objective #2: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Criteria to be considered: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Conclusions from follow-up evaluations: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Initials: \_\_\_\_\_

C. Objective #3: \_\_\_\_\_

Criteria to be considered: \_\_\_\_\_

Conclusions from follow-up evaluation: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Initials: \_\_\_\_\_

IV. Staff Response:

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

V. Acknowledgement

This document has been completed in triplicate with copies being provided the teacher, the building principal, and the unit superintendent. The signature (below) of the teacher does not indicate acceptance or rejection of the evaluation; however, it does acknowledge that the content of the document has been reviewed and the stated unit policy for evaluation has been followed.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Principal

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Teacher