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CONSTRUCTING AND IMPLEMENTING
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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.
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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 Caterpillar Production Plant - Decatur
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 outgrowth 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. Kuatemeyer (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
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.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>faculty only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty and administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
### I. PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. VOICE</th>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>NEEDS IMPROVEMENT</th>
<th>UNSATISFACTORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally pleasant vocal quality and articulation High</td>
<td>Generally pleasant vocal quality and articulation Low</td>
<td>Not noticeable in English expression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. USE OF ENGLISH</th>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>NEEDS IMPROVEMENT</th>
<th>UNSATISFACTORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally good expression; converses clearly and efficiently</td>
<td>Noticeable deficiency in English expression</td>
<td>Frequent errors in pronunciation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. PHYSICAL HEALTH AND VIGOR</th>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>NEEDS IMPROVEMENT</th>
<th>UNSATISFACTORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Able to meet any normal demands upon energies</td>
<td>Able to handle minimal demands upon energies</td>
<td>Low physical vitality; has to conserve strength</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. RELATIONS—STAFF</th>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>NEEDS IMPROVEMENT</th>
<th>UNSATISFACTORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative and friendly; mutual liking and respect</td>
<td>Reserved; not particularly liked or disliked</td>
<td>Tends to antagonize others over appearance or task</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. RELATIONS—PARENTS</th>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>NEEDS IMPROVEMENT</th>
<th>UNSATISFACTORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally favorable comments and reactions from parents; pleasant and cooperative</td>
<td>Comments from parents indicate negativity; lack of mutual respect; somewhat resentful of parent</td>
<td>Few evidence really want to help</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F. RELATIONS—PUPILS</th>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>NEEDS IMPROVEMENT</th>
<th>UNSATISFACTORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mutual respect and cooperation evident</td>
<td>Some mutual respect and cooperation</td>
<td>Mutually unagreement; frequent conflict; hostility evident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G. INVOLVEMENT IN EXTRA CURRICULAR</th>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>NEEDS IMPROVEMENT</th>
<th>UNSATISFACTORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Involved in extra-curricular functions; shows interest through involvement</td>
<td>Involved in few extra-curricular functions outside his field; limited interest shown</td>
<td>Involved in no extra-curricular functions that are not obligatory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H. ENTHUSIASM AND INITIATIVE</th>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>NEEDS IMPROVEMENT</th>
<th>UNSATISFACTORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quick reaction to obvious and generally quick in new situations dependable</td>
<td>Little initiative: requires prodding</td>
<td>Lifeless; &quot;way below&quot; at share’s responsibility; does not follow suggestions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. EMOTIONAL BALANCE</th>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>NEEDS IMPROVEMENT</th>
<th>UNSATISFACTORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passed seldom loses self-control</td>
<td>Easily agitated</td>
<td>Lacks self-control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J. INTEREST IN TEACHING AND GROWTH</th>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>NEEDS IMPROVEMENT</th>
<th>UNSATISFACTORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participates beyond bare job requirements; actively improving self and profession</td>
<td>Moderate interest; limited vision for service and growth</td>
<td>No new interest evident; job satisfied &quot;adequately&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K. SENSE OF HUMOR</th>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>NEEDS IMPROVEMENT</th>
<th>UNSATISFACTORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Able to laugh at self and others. Humor generally appropriate to situation or event</td>
<td>Able to see humor in situations but rarely able to enjoy or react appropriately</td>
<td>Unable to perceive or appreciate humor or comic situations and events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II. INSTRUCTIONAL AND MANAGEMENT COMPETENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. ACCOMPLISHMENT OF OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>NEEDS IMPROVEMENT</th>
<th>UNSATISFACTORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diagnoses, plans, motivates, and evaluates in terms of individual differences based on unit philosophy</td>
<td>Some planning evident but inadequate diagnosis and evaluation</td>
<td>Fails to recognize individual differences with little or no planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. INSTRUCTIONAL PRESENTATION</th>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>NEEDS IMPROVEMENT</th>
<th>UNSATISFACTORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructions logical, clear, and convincing</td>
<td>Instructions involved, imprecise; no clear direction</td>
<td>Instructions confusing, ill-organized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. DISCIPLINE</th>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>NEEDS IMPROVEMENT</th>
<th>UNSATISFACTORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control of situation without constant reprimand or domination of teacher-inspired student self-control evident; mutual respect</td>
<td>Control by sarcasm; fear; ridicule; threats</td>
<td>Little or no respect or a few students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. PUPIL RESPONSE</th>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>NEEDS IMPROVEMENT</th>
<th>UNSATISFACTORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alert, interested, actively constructive involved</td>
<td>Response at low level; little enthusiasm evident</td>
<td>Little or no interest in a student, interesting activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. ROOM AND EQUIPMENT CARE</th>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>NEEDS IMPROVEMENT</th>
<th>UNSATISFACTORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keen equipment and room in good order; uses them properly</td>
<td>Inconsistent care and use of equipment and room</td>
<td>Neglects, abuses, misuses, and material, no discipline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F. ROUTINE DETAIL</th>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>NEEDS IMPROVEMENT</th>
<th>UNSATISFACTORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prompt, accurate, dependable; uses acceptable written form</td>
<td>Often late; irregular or little attention to routine details</td>
<td>Usually late; takes too long; disregards routine procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G. KNOWLEDGE IN TEACHING AREA</th>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>NEEDS IMPROVEMENT</th>
<th>UNSATISFACTORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well prepared; continuing growth in comprehensive background</td>
<td>Generally inadequate; little preparation; gaps and needs evident</td>
<td>Poorly prepared; little knowledge or inaccurate knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. VOICE</td>
<td>Generally pleasant vocal quality and articulation</td>
<td>Some difficulties with vocal quality</td>
<td>Noticeable deficiency in English expression</td>
<td>Frequent errors in grammar; poor expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. USE OF ENGLISH</td>
<td>Generally good expression; conveys ideas clearly and effectively</td>
<td>Noticeable deficiency in English expression</td>
<td>Frequent errors in grammar; poor expression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. PHYSICAL HEALTH AND VIGOR</td>
<td>Able to meet any normal demands upon energies</td>
<td>Able to handle minimal demands upon energies</td>
<td>Low physical vitality; has to conserve strength</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL APPEARANCE</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Neat and appropriately dressed</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Usually well groomed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF-RELATIONSHIP</td>
<td>Cooperative and friendly; mutual liking and respect</td>
<td>Reserved-not particularly liked or disliked</td>
<td>Tends to antagonize associates; overly aggressive or timid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARENT-RELATIONSHIP</td>
<td>Generally favorable comments and reactions from parents; pleasant and cooperative</td>
<td>Comment from parents indicate negativism; lack of muruality; somewhat resentful of parents</td>
<td>Much evidence (calls; comments) of parents antagonism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUPIL-RELATIONSHIP</td>
<td>Mutual respect and cooperation evicent</td>
<td>Some mutual respect and cooperation</td>
<td>Mutually unpleasant; frequent conflicts; hostility evident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVOLVEMENT IN EXTRA-CURRICULAR</td>
<td>Involved; shows interest through involvement</td>
<td>Involved in few extra functions outside of field</td>
<td>Involved in no extra functions that are not obligatory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTHUSIASM AND INITIATIVE</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quick reaction to obvious: generally quick in new situations: dependable</td>
<td>Little initiative; requires prodding</td>
<td>Lifeless attitude; shirks responsibility and does not follow suggestions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DECISIONS</th>
<th>Self reliant; makes careful and thoughtful decisions</th>
<th>Makes decisions too late</th>
<th>Cannot make worthwhile decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPOSURE, PATIENCE, AND TACT</th>
<th>Evident and adequate for the situations</th>
<th>Easily agitated</th>
<th>Lacks self-control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTEREST IN TEACHING AND GROWTH</th>
<th>Participates beyond bare job requisites; actively improves self and profession</th>
<th>Moderate interest; limited vision for service and growth</th>
<th>No real job interest: satisfied &quot;as is&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SENSE OF HUMOR</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Able to laugh at self and others; humor generally appropriate</td>
<td>Able to see humor in situations but rarely able to react or enjoy</td>
<td>Unable to perceive or enjoy humorous or comic situations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSIBLE TO ASSIGNED DUTIES</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is effective in complying with assigned duties</td>
<td>Is ineffective in complying with assigned duties</td>
<td>Cannot be relied upon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOMPLISHMENT OF OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnoses, plans, motivates, and evaluates in terms of unit philosophy</td>
<td>Some planning evident but inadequate diagnosis and individual differences in evaluation</td>
<td>Fails to recognize individual differences with little or no planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUCTIONAL PRESENTATION</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical, clear, and convincing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructions involved; imprecise; no clear direction</td>
<td>Instructions confusing; illogical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFFECTIVENESS OF TEACHING MATERIAL</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively uses materials to clarify the lesson</td>
<td>Uses very few aides for instructions</td>
<td>Teaching is ineffective; no use of aides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 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 |

<p>| EVALUATION OF SKILLS AND KNOWLEDGE | Achieves his objectives in light of pupil abilities; uses appropriate appraisal techniques | Makes some use of appraisal techniques; shows no concern in pupil achievement | Makes no use of appraisal techniques; shows no concern in pupil achievement |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROOM AND EQUIPMENT</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keeps room and equipment in useful condition and uses them properly</td>
<td>Inconsistent care and use of room and equipment</td>
<td>Neglects, abuses, and misuses equipment and materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 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

Please 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 Z. 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.