DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 200 514   SP 016 238

AUTHOR   Osmond, Patrick Kevin
TITLE   Teacher Assessment of Supervisory Evaluations.
PUB DATE   Jan 78
NOTE   51p.: Master's Thesis, Wayne State College.

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Attitude Change: Evaluation Criteria: *Evaluation
                Methods: Secondary Education: *Secondary School
                Teachers: *Teacher Attitudes: *Teacher Effectiveness:
                *Teacher Evaluation: Teacher Participation: Teaching
                Experience

ABSTRACT
                After a review of literature on teacher attitudes
about teacher evaluation, an assessment was made of secondary school
teacher attitudes toward their evaluations and the changes they would
like to have made in evaluation procedures. Results of a
questionnaire, responded to by 40 teachers, revealed: (1) The more
years of teaching experience a teacher had, the fewer evaluations
made per year: (2) There was a positive relationship between a
teacher's perception of the main purpose of evaluations and changes
made in teaching techniques after evaluation: (3) Teachers are apt to
make changes in their teaching if they accept their evaluations as
accurate: (4) A majority of teachers did not regard their evaluations
as accurate assessments of their teaching performance: and (5)
Teachers would like to have more input in evaluation procedures. A
bibliography and the attitude measurement instrument are appended.
(JD)

TEACHER ASSESSMENT OF SUPERVISORY EVALUATIONS

A File Paper

Presented to

Dr. Arnold Emry

Wayne State College

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science in Education

by

Patrick Kevin Osmond

January 1978

TABLE OF CONTENTS

iii

4

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

One of the most difficult tasks of any administrator, whether in education, business, or some other function, is to determine the effectiveness of personnel. In handling this problem, administrators generally use a system of formal evaluations. The problems in determining employee effectiveness in business have been documented by the Conference Board, a business research group. Two major problems cited by the Conference Board involved inaccurate appraisals of employee performance, and lack of time administrators spend in making evaluations.[1]

The problems involved in determining teacher effectiveness are also well-documented and are similar. Lack of time spent by evaluators, lack of communication between teachers and evaluators, and disagreement over forms and procedures used in evaluations are but a few of the problems that plague teacher evaluations. Biddle and Ellena summed it up well when they wrote:

> With all this research activity, results have been modest and often contradictory. Few if any facts are now deemed established about teacher effectiveness and many formal findings have been repudiated. It is not an

---

[1]Associated Press dispatch, _Chicago Tribune_, November 17, 1977, p. 10, cols. 1-2.

exaggeration to say that we do not today know how to
select, train for, encourage, or evaluate teacher effec-
tiveness.[2]

Perhaps evaluations can be improved and made more
accurate if evaluators know what teachers think of their
evaluations. If teachers disagree with all or part of their
evaluations, there is a good chance that very little benefit
will come of them.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The major objective of this study was to assess sec-
ondary-school teacher attitudes toward their evaluations. To
achieve this objective, teacher opinion was sought, by means
of a questionnaire dealing with areas such as the main pur-
pose of evaluations, the accuracy of evaluations, changes
made by teachers after their evaluations, and whether evalua-
tions were used to teachers' disadvantage. It was hypothe-
sized that the responses to these questions would reveal
teacher attitudes toward their evaluations.

A secondary objective of this study was to determine
the types of evaluation forms and procedures used in evalua-
tions throughout Northeast Nebraska. Another secondary
objective was to assess the changes teachers say they would
like to have made in evaluation procedures used in their
schools.

---

[2]Bruce J. Biddle and William J. Ellena (eds.), Con-
temporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness (New York: Holt,
Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964), p. vi.

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

The idea for this study originated when a teacher
told the author that her evaluation was being used to intim-
idate her. Because the purpose of evaluations is to stimu-
late the improvement of instruction, the study was designed
to discover if other teachers had a similar reaction. A
review of the related literature disclosed comparatively lit-
tle research dealing with teacher assessment of their evalu-
ations. As a result, a survey concerning teacher assessment
of their evaluations was made of sixty-three junior-senior
high-school teachers in Northeast Nebraska.[3]

---

[3]A complete explanation of the methodology is con-
tained in Chapter 3.

Chapter 2

SURVEY OF RELATED LITERATURE

The process of evaluation has probably been debated
by educators with more intensity and deeper concern than any
other aspect of education. The subject of this chapter
includes three phases of evaluation: (1) criticisms of past
evaluation procedures, (2) the relationship between evalua-
tion and supervision, and (3) teachers' reaction to super-
vision.

CRITICISM OF PAST EVALUATION PROCEDURES

One major criticism of past evaluation procedures has
been that teachers and supervisors do not always agree as to
what constitutes effective teaching. In addition, these
groups do not always agree as to what instrument should be
used to measure teacher effectiveness. A study of selected
teachers at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illi-
nois, concluded that possibly neither the teacher nor the
supervisor is capable of correctly evaluating teacher effec-
tiveness.[1]

As a result of this controversy between supervisors

---

[1]David T. McAfee, "Evaluation of the Teacher: Do
Teachers and Supervisors Agree?" High School Journal, 58:339,
May, 1975.

and teachers, many different types of evaluation forms and procedures have been devised. The following is a summary of evaluation practices used in the last fifty years.

According to James Buck and James Parsely, prior to and during the 1930s most educators agreed the best way to evaluate the effectiveness of teachers was to observe them teaching in the classroom. In order to assist evaluators measuring the proficiency of teachers, education specialists created rating scales to determine the teachers' social relations, instructional skills, personal characteristics, and professional qualifications.[2] However, in studying evaluations based on a rating scale as a major determinant of teaching effectiveness, researchers found the criteria used were often arbitrary and vague. In 1945, Reavis and Cooper analyzed specific items in rating forms. In their subsequent report they noted certain weaknesses in rating scales commonly used in school systems: a lack of definition of items, ambiguous terms, and "items that linked two independent elements for a single judgement." On this basis the authors concluded, "Ratings appear to be invalid, then, as comprehensive measures of either general or specific teaching ability."[3]

[2]James J. Buck and James F. Parsely, Jr., The Way We See It: A Survey of Teacher Evaluation Policies and Practices Operant in the State of Washington; U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 084-223, March, 1973.

[3]W. C. Reavis and D. H. Cooper, Evaluation of Teacher Merit in City School Systems. Supplementary Educational Monographs, No. 59 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945), cited by Hazel Davis, "Evolution of Current Practices in

In the same vein, A. G. Hellfritzsch concluded: "Teacher rating scales . . . have little in common with any of the teacher abilities measured, including the ability of the teacher to promote pupil growth.[4] In 1954, Harold M. Anderson seemed to concur with the findings of Reavis and Cooper and of Hellfritzsch:

> In general no adequate basis for validation of teachers exists at present. There is apparently no general agreement as to what is good teaching, and even if there were, present day measures lack the reliability necessary for valid criteria.[5]

With the revival of interest in merit pay proposals in the 1940s, it became increasingly important to measure the "effective teacher." In a number of states, programs were initiated in which supervisors would evaluate teachers on factors other than degree and experience. The programs for the most part failed. As of 1967, in only four of the eight states surveyed--Georgia, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Utah --were programs still in existence.[6]

Evaluating Teacher Competence," Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness, ed. Bruce J. Biddle and William J. Ellena (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964), pp. 53-54.

[4]A. G. Hellfritzsch, "A Factor Analysis of Teacher Abilities," Journal of Experimental Education, 14:184, December, 1945.

[5]Harold Milton Anderson, "A Study of Certain Criteria of Teaching Effectiveness," Journal of Experimental Education, 23:69, September, 1954.

[6]James H. McPhail, Teacher Evaluation--A State-by-State Analysis, U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document, ED 014-449, October, 1967. States where supervisors attempted to evaluate teachers by ways other than

Another method used to evaluate teacher effective-
ness has been to compare a teacher characteristic or person-
ality trait with a specific outcome variable. Some traits
that were considered in evaluating teacher effectiveness
were sex, age, socio-economic background, academic achieve-
ment, marital status, intelligence, and voice quality. In
an exhaustive study conducted in 1957 involving over 6,000
teachers in 1,700 schools and 450 school systems, David Ryans
was unable to find any variable that had a significant corre-
lation with teacher effectiveness.[7] Ryans further explained
that effective teaching must be correlated with three sets of
conditions:

degree and/or experience include:

(1) Delaware: salary increases for teachers with
certain ratings.

(2) Florida: Career Increment Competency Awards and
National Teacher Examination scores.

(3) Georgia: National Teacher Examination scores for
sixth- and seventh-year certificates.

(4) New York: Merit Promotional Increments.

(5) North Carolina: a series of experimental programs.

(6) South Carolina: National Teacher Examination.

(7) Tennessee: a salary differential supplement to
superior teachers.

(8) Utah: Twenty dollars for each Distribution Unit
to be applied for salary differentials.

[7]David G. Ryans, Characteristics of Teachers: Their
Description, Comparison and Appraisal. A Research Study
(Menasha, Wis.: George Banta Company, inc., 1960), p. 370.

(1) The social or cultural group in which the teacher operates, involving social values which frequently differ from person to person, community to community, culture to culture, and time to time.

(2) The grade level and subject matter being taught.

(3) Intellectual and personal characteristics of the pupils taught.[8]

In the 1960s a new method of estimating teacher effectiveness became popular. This method involved observing interaction between the teacher and students in a classroom. In order to measure this interaction accurately, a number of indices were created: Flanders' Interaction Analysis Procedure, Mark's Verbal Reaction Behavior, and Log and Ober's Reciprocal Category System. There are differing opinions in the literature concerning how much interaction analysis improved instruction. Campbell and Barnes reported that interaction analysis provided an approach for objective evaluation instead of the subjective evaluations used throughout the country. They wrote:

> We can now give the teacher something definite, both in the form of diagnosis and subsequent prognosis to utilize in improving his teaching, and perhaps we can move away from the hopelessly vague folklore which has come to be known as education.[9]

A less enthusiastic view than that of Campbell and Barnes was that of Borah Rosenshine:

> It is possible that the major usefulness of IA [Interaction Analysis] will be in identifying extremes

---

[8]Ibid., p. 371.

[9]James Reed Campbell and Cyrus W. Barnes, "Interaction Analysis--A Breakthrough," Phi Delta Kappan, 50:589, June, 1969.

--those teachers who are most or least effective--and that the scatter in the middle will be too large to fit any type of curve.[10]

Questioning older methods of evaluation, educational researchers have advocated giving the teacher a more active role in the evaluation process. The rationale behind this approach is that if a teacher has an active role in the evaluation process, he will be more apt to consider using suggested changes in his instruction. One system based on the teacher self-evaluation concept was launched by E. Wayne Robeson. Using his own Teacher Self Appraisal Observation System in California and Arizona schools, Dr. Robeson saw:

(1) an increased awareness of different instructional patterns.

(2) an improvement of teacher morale and attitude.

(3) improved instruction.

(4) increased student achievement.[11]

A recent innovation in the evaluation of teacher effectiveness is micro-teaching. In this system a conventional lesson is scaled down in three ways: it lasts only five or ten minutes; it is presented to a "class" of five volunteers in place of the regular pupils; and it is designed for the teacher to exhibit just one specific skill, which is the subject of the evaluation. The lesson is recorded on

---

[10]Borah Rosenshine, "Interaction Analysis: A Tardy Comment," Phi Delta Kappan, 51:446, April, 1970.

[11]E. Wayne Robeson, "Teacher Self Appraisal: A Way to Improve Instruction," Journal of Teacher Education, 22: 471, Winter, 1971.

video-tape, and while the teacher listens to himself, he receives criticism from specially-trained supervisors. Then he repeats the lesson to a new group of volunteers, in an attempt to improve on his first presentation. From the video-tape of the second presentation the teacher can determine whether he has improved.[12]

Opponents of the micro-teaching method of evaluation have asserted that a teacher does not use the same techniques with a class of volunteer "pupils" as he does with a regular class. Also, because the teaching is conducted in an artificial milieu, the results may be invalid.[13]

Another method used to evaluate teachers involves accountability techniques. The concern over accountability became so widespread that by 1974 forty state legislatures had enacted or attempted to enact evaluation programs based on accountability techniques. Have teachers accepted accountability in evaluation? In assessing the Michigan accountability system, E. R. Hause, Wendell Rivers, and D. L. Stufflebeam submitted that one of the most censurable aspects of the Michigan system was the use of test scores as the major criteria for determining teacher effectiveness.[14]

---

[12]N. L. Gage, "An Analytical Approach to Research on Instructional Methods," Phi Delta Kappan, 49:602, June, 1968.

[13]Buck and Parsely, loc. cit.

[14]Ernest Hause, Wendell Rivers, and Daniel L. Stufflebeam, "An Assessment of the Michigan Accountability System," Phi Delta Kappan, 55:667, June, 1974.

In discussing the total Michigan accountability effort, the authors described it as "a giant snowball rolling down a hill." While admitting the accountability model had a number of good features, they found it "unfortunately was not thoroughly thought through, and it has gathered a momentum somewhat lacking in thoughtful control."[15]

In discussing the accountability procedures used at the Mt. Diablo school district in California, Christopher Cory reported that the results had been "somewhat less than baffo" [sic].[16] Cory's major criticisms of the accountability program were: (1) there was too much paperwork involved, (2) it encouraged narrow teaching, and (3) the measuring devices were not adapted to all the different problems the teachers confront. Cory concluded that the "dead hand" of accountability "can only increase both paperwork and paranoia."[17]

Using accountability in determining teacher effectiveness seems to fall in the same category as merit pay--although it looks appealing in theory it is extremely difficult to put into practice. In a recent survey of 300 teachers and student teachers in a four-state area, 79 percent of the teachers generally supported the idea of accountability;

---

[15]Ibid., p. 669.

[16]Christopher Cory, "The Heavy Hand of Accountability," Learning: The Magazine for Creative Teaching, 2:24, March, 1974.

[17]Ibid., pp. 24, 25, 26, 28.

however, of that group, 55 percent had some reservations.
The researchers interpreted these reservations as evidence
that whereas most teachers were not opposed to some type of
accountability in a hypothetical sense, they felt it would
not work in practice.[18]

In discussing accountability, Allan Ornstein stated
that before the accountability movement proceeds any farther
the following questions must be answered: (1) Where does
teacher accountability begin and end? (2) Who determines who
will be held accountable for what and to whom? (3) How are
the results going to be measured?[19] Dr. Ornstein's reaction
to and skepticism about accountability are added indications
that even today numerous people question its value.

<div align="center">THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EVALUATION
AND SUPERVISION</div>

The term "supervision" has many connotations. According to the Merriam-Webster dictionary, supervision is "the
act, process, or occupation of supervising."[20] To the educator, the definition of supervision is probably not as
important as the purpose, that is, to improve instruction.

---

[18]Thomas L. Good and others, "How Teachers View
Accountability," Phi Dela Kappan, 56:367-368, January, 1975.

[19]Allan C. Ornstein, "The Politics of Accountability," Journal of Research and Development in Education, 8:
74-75, November, 1975.

[20]Philip Babcock Gove and others (eds.), Webster's
Third New International Dictionary of the English Language
Unabridged (Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Company,
1966).

Although techniques of supervision have changed in the last seventy years the main goal has not. As early as 1913, an article in A Cyclopedia of Education contained the statement, "The chief function of supervision is to improve teaching practice."[21] Thirty years later, in the Encyclopedia of Modern Education, supervision of instruction was defined as "the variety of means used by administrators, supervisors, and teachers themselves to improve the teaching and learning process."[22]

In 1959, H. M. Harmes defined supervision as "services provided for the improvement of instruction."[23] In 1975, Kimball Wiles defined instructional supervision as "an organizational behavior system that interacts with the teaching behavior system to improve the quality of education for students."[24]

Although educational researchers agree that the most important goal of supervision is the improvement of instruction, they have not determined whether this actually happens.

---

[21] H[enry] S[uzzallo], "Supervision of Teaching," A Cyclopedia of Education (1913), V, 468.

[22] Leo M. Chamberlain and Freeman R. Butts, "Supervision of Instruction," Encyclopedia of Modern Education, ed. Harry N. Rivlin (New York: Philosophical Library Inc., 1943), p. 781.

[23] H. M. Harmes, "Improving Teaching through Supervision: How Is It Working?" Educational Administration and Supervision, 59:169, May, 1959.

[24] Kimball Wiles and John T. Lovell, Supervision for Better Schools (Englewood Cliffs, N. J. : Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975), p. vii.

In 1964 the Research Division of the National Education Association completed a survey of administrative practices in the area of evaluation and the reaction of teachers, principals, and superintendents to these practices. To the question, "What desirable outcomes from the program of teacher evaluation have you observed in your school system? Add other comments if you wish," the outcome mentioned most frequently by superintendents, principals, and teachers was that the program "stimulates staff to improve instruction."[25] Whereas this seems to concur with what educational researchers previously have found, a closer look at the data is in order. In no group participating in the survey did over 42 percent of the superintendents, 52 percent of the principals, or 25 percent of the teachers making written comments, respond that evaluations improved instruction.[26]

In examining these percentages it is important to note that administrators reported more improvements than teachers did. In fact, 26 percent of all teachers who wrote comments stated they "had observed no desirable outcomes from the school system's teacher evaluation program."[27]

One of the teachers' major criticisms concerning their evaluations was that administrators were too busy with

---

[25]National Education Association--Research Division, Evaluation of Classroom Teachers (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1964), p. 64

[26]Ibid., pp. 83, 90, 101.

[27]Ibid., p. 68.

other duties to conduct effective evaluations.[28] Teachers.
were not the only ones with this complaint. In all but one
of the categories of principals surveyed, over half of the
principals surveyed reported their schedules did not allow
enough time for accurate evaluations of classroom teachers.[29]
One principal commented: "I feel I am doing a very poor job
in the area of teacher evaluation. Other duties prevent
visitations as much as I would desire."[30]

In a similar study, some Louisiana school supervisors
revealed they spent most of their time performing tasks such
as visiting classrooms, doing clerical work, conferring with
principals and teachers, working with lay groups, traveling,
and participating in conferences. On analysis, nearly half
of these activities turned out to be unrelated to the
improvement of instruction.[31]

Finally, whether evaluations were written or oral
seemed to have an impact on their effectiveness. In schools
where written evaluations were used, larger percentages of
principals and teachers reported improved instruction than
in schools where oral evaluations were used.[32]

------

[28]Ibid.

[29]Ibid., p. 90.

[30]Ibid., p. 71.

[31]Thomas R. Landry, "Louisiana Supervisors Examine
Their Practices," Educational Administration and Supervision,
59:310, September, 1959.

[32]National Education Association--Research Division,
op. cit., p. 65.

One inference that can be drawn from this evidence is: Supervisors should take a major role in evaluating teachers, but many do not. When supervisors do not spend enough time with evaluations, they cannot determine which teachers are incompetent. More important, potentially good teachers may remain mediocre because many of the recommendations that could have been made to improve teaching have not been made.

TEACHER REACTION TO SUPERVISION

Probably more significant than the method of supervision is the reaction of the teacher to the concept of supervision. In discussing this issue, Cogan noted that whenever teachers anticipate being supervised they react in one of two general ways:

(1) a kind of emotionalized allegiance to the concept of supervision; or

(2) a swift and apprehensive rejection of all but a narrow range of approved supervisory activities.[33]

Beyond these, Cogan listed six specific types of teacher reaction toward supervision:

(1) a clear ambivalence about supervision; a dramatic contrast between a strong commitment to the principle of supervision and a stubborn, deep-seated distrust of direct supervisory intervention in the classroom;

(2) a desire to focus supervision on inspirational leadership and on broad objectives rather than specifics;

(3) a need for a "human relations" orientation in the entire endeavor;

---

[33]Morris Cogan, Clinical Supervision (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1973), p. 16.

(4) a generalized rejection of supervision designed to work directly on changes in the teacher's classroom behavior;

(5) a need to exert powerful controls over the kinds of supervision practiced in the schools, expressing itself sometimes as a demand for self-supervision or for supervision mainly by invitation; and

(6) a need of some teachers to seek the protective anonymity of a group through a focus on group work rather than individual programs of improvement.[34]

Agreeing in principle with Cogan but writing more candidly were Casey Banas and Sandra Feldman. Banas, in observing teachers' distrust of the supervisor, reported that teachers are not likely to report any of their weaknesses to the supervisor lest this be used as "just cause" for not renewing their contract.[35]

Feldman argued that teachers may fear supervisors because they could be the victims of an evasion of responsibility process. That is, in attempting to evade responsibility for some teacher's action that has aroused the anger of parents, of the school board, or of any other group, the principal may complain: "It's not my fault the teacher's contract prevents me from doing what you suggest."[36] In her most acid comment Feldman said teachers fear supervision because:

. . . existing methods of evaluating are subjective, punitively oriented, based on the opinion of supervisors.

[34]Ibid.

[35]Chicago Tribune, October 5, 1977, Sec. I, p. 7, col. 6.

[36]Sandra Feldman, Teacher Evaluation: A Teacher Unionist's View, U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 086-647, November, 1972.

who do not know more about teaching than they do;
[these evaluations] are easily used in a discriminating
way against the outspoken, the nonconformers, the union
activist, the creative 37

SUMMARY

The related literature dealt with three aspects of
evaluation: criticisms of past evaluation procedures; the
relationship between evaluation and supervision; and teach-
ers' reactions to evaluation.

In criticisms of past evaluation procedures it was
noted that teachers and supervisors do not always agree as to
the most effective instrument for these procedures. These
procedures made use of rating scales, merit pay, comparisons
of teacher characteristics with specific outcomes, interac-
tion analysis, teacher involvement in evaluations, micro-
teaching techniques, and accountability techniques.

The literature dealing with the relationship between
evaluation and supervision revealed that in the opinion of
principals, teachers, and superintendents, the most important
goal of evaluation is the improvement of instruction. Both
teachers and principals complained that not enough time was
spent by principals in evaluating teachers.

In discussing teachers' reactions to evaluation, the
literature showed that teachers react in various ways toward
evaluation, from acceptance of evaluative activities to a
total rejection of them.

37Ibid.

Chapter 3.

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the sample
selected for the survey and explain the procedures used in
gathering the data. Also, the chapter includes the results
derived from the data obtained in the survey.

METHODOLOGY

The aim of this study was to gather information and
data related to junior and senior high school teachers'
assessments of evaluations in public and parochial systems
in Northeast Nebraska. A questionnaire and a letter explain-
ing the intent of the survey (see Appendixes) were mailed to
one teacher in each of fifty-seven public schools and six
parochial schools in Northeast Nebraska, selected at random
from the Nebraska Educational Directory (1976-77). Northeast
Nebraska was defined as that part of Nebraska bounded on the
north and east by the Missouri River, on the south by
Nebraska highway 91, and on the west by Nebraska highway 14.
Each teacher was assured anonymity. The questionnaires were
mailed on November 12, 1977, to the selected teachers. Of a
possible sixty-three responses, forty were received, for a
63 percent return. The data were then tabulated and anal-
yzed. A follow-up study of those who did not return the

19

questionnaires was not conducted because, owing to the ano-
nymity of the respondents, it was impossible to determine
which teachers had not returned questionnaires.

ANALYSIS OF TEACHER RESPONSE

Questionnaires used in the survey were sent to each
district in Northeast Nebraska with a school containing
grades seven through twelve. Of the forty returned, three
lacked answers to most of the questions because teachers at
these schools had not been evaluated. Some other respondents
did not answer all questions and still others did not follow
directions, so that the responses to some of the questions
had to be thrown out.

Years Taught by Teachers

Because teachers with more experience might react
differently to evaluations than those with less experience,
teachers were asked the number of years they had taught in
their present school. Table 1 (see page 21) shows the number
of years the teachers had taught in their present school. It
was found in this survey that a majority of the teachers in
the sample had taught four or more years in their school.
The small percentage of first-year teachers can be attributed
to the fact that the sample was selected from the 1976-1977
edition of the Nebraska Educational Directory and the survey
was conducted before the 1977-1978 edition was available; as
a result, most of those teachers who would have been in their

Table 1

Number of Years Taught in Present School

Years taught in present school	Number	Percent
1	1	2.5
2	9	22.5
3	6	15.0
4 or more	24	60.0
Total	40	100.00

first year of teaching would not be included in the sample.

Number and Length of Evaluations

The number and length of classroom evaluations were also considered to have a significant impact on teacher assessment of their evaluations; hence the respondents were asked the number and length of classroom evaluations. Another concern was whether there was any relation between the number of years taught and the number of evaluations a teacher had in a year. Tables 2 and 3 (see page 22) show the number and length of evaluations of these teachers. Of special interest in Table 2 is the fact that 10 percent of the teachers received no formal evaluations.

Table 3 shows that the majority of the evaluations lasted between thirty minutes and one hour. However, 28 percent of the teachers' evaluations lasted less than fifteen minutes, supporting one of the major criticisms by teachers

cited in Chapter 2--that is, administrators are too busy with other duties to conduct comprehensive evaluations.

Table 2

Number of Times Respondents Were Evaluated in a School Year

Number of Evaluations	Number	Percent
0	4	10.0
1	14	35.0
2	19	47.5
3	2	5.0
4 or more	1	2.5
Total	40	100.0

Table 3

Length of Evaluations

Length	Number	Percent
Up to 15 minutes	10	28
From 15 to 30 minutes	10	28
From 30 minutes to one hour	15	41
More than one hour	1	3
Total	36	100

Years Taught versus Number of Evaluations per Year

Table 4 (see page 24) shows a further analysis of the
data, the relation between the number of years taught and the
number of evaluations a teacher had per year. From the data
it appears that the more years of teaching experience a
teacher had, the fewer evaluations made per year. Only one
teacher with four or more years of teaching experience, and
no teacher with three years of teaching experience, had more
than two evaluations per year; whereas 33 percent of teach-
ers with two years of experience had more than two evalua-
tions.

Person Conducting Evaluation

Other than the teacher, the most important person
involved in the evaluation is the evaluator. This person
has to make a judgment as to whether the teacher's perform-
ance is superior, mediocre, or poor. Also, because many edu-
cators assert that evaluating teachers is one of the primary
functions of the principal, this researcher sought to dis-
cover if this were the case in this survey. For these rea-
sons, teachers were asked who at their school was responsible
for evaluating teachers. It appears from Table 5 (see
page 25) that in most schools the principal alone is the
evaluator.

Forms and Procedures Used in Evaluations

Impersonal aspects of the evaluation that also have
a major impact on teachers are the type of form used and the

Table 4

Relation between Number of Years Taught and Number of Evaluations per Year

Years taught in present school	Number of evaluations per year	Number of teachers having this number of evaluations	Percent
1	0		
	1		
	2	1	100
	3		
	4		
2	0		
	1	2	22
	2	4	45
	3	2	22
	4	1	11
3	0	1	17
	1	1	17
	2	4	66
	3		
	4		
4 or more	0	2	8
	1	12	50
	2	9	38
	3	1	4
	4		

Table 5

Person(s) Responsible for Conducting Evaluations

Person(s) responsible for Evaluations	Number	Percent
Principal	28	77
Superintendent	2	6
Department head	0	0
Committee of evaluators	1	3
Principal and superintendent	5	14
Total	36	100

various procedures used before and after the evaluation.
Because these forms vary from district to district, teachers
were asked what forms and procedures were used in their eval-
uations. The data in Table 6 (see page 26) show that several
types of forms are used. Although no single type of form is
the most popular, a small majority of the evaluators used a
single type, not a combination. Those that checked "other"
described different forms used. Among them were: "closed
form with written comments," "no formal form," "verbal evalu-
ation," and "strong and weak points listed."

As with the forms, several evaluation procedures were
used in the different schools. Table 7 (see page 27) shows
the procedures used by the evaluators. It must also be
mentioned that every respondent to this question specified a
combination of two or more procedures. What could not be

Table 6

Type of Form Used in Evaluations

Type of form used	Number	Percent
Open form with written comments	10	27.0
Closed form with a checklist	5	13.5
Rating scales	3	8.0
Videotaped evaluations	0	0.0
Combinations of two or more of the above	12	32.5
Other single types	7	19.0
Total	37	100.0

shown in the table were the exact combinations, and because
they were not a major concern of the study they were not
tabulated.

Purpose of Evaluations

If evaluations are to have any significance they must
serve a specific purpose. Many educational researchers agree
that the primary purpose of evaluations is to improve instruc-
tion. Yet in one study, based on written comments, only 25.5
percent of the teachers reported this was the reason for
their evaluations. In order to determine what teachers in
the sample believe is the main purpose of evaluations they
were asked to make a judgme- as to this main purpose.
Table 8 (see page 28) shows that many of the teachers

Table 7

Procedures Used in Teacher Evaluations

Procedures	Number	Percent
Preconference concerning the lesson taught	0	0
Postconference concerning the lesson taught	15	40
Date and time of the evaluation set by the teacher	6	16
Evaluation criteria known to the teacher	22	60
Explanation of evaluation results	28	76
Unannounced evaluations	26	72
Teacher signature on all evaluations	27	74
Teacher receives a copy of evaluation results	25	70
Teacher receives help as a result of evaluations	16	43

surveyed maintained that evaluations are intended to improve instruction. One teacher commented that the main purpose of evaluations was to determine salary increases. Evaluations underlie "merit pay raises to those of us at the top of the master's scale. They get $100, $300, $500 depending on their evaluation." Another teacher, obviously displeased with an evaluation, commented, "Who knows?"

Because evaluations are used to detect superior, mediocre, and poor teaching, evaluators can suggest ways to

Table 8

Teacher Perceptions of the Main Purpose of Evaluations

Perceptions	Number	Percent
Stimulates staff to improve instruction	12	40
Increases communication between teachers and administrators	3	10
Improvement of the school facilities and curriculum	3	10
Serves as a means of keeping "good" teachers and removing "poor" ones	6	20
Other	6	20
Total	30	100

improve teaching. Many evaluators probably do this, but it is not clear how many teachers make changes in their teaching after their evaluations. This was a concern in this study; hence teachers were asked if they had made changes in their teaching techniques after their evaluations. Of the thirty-five respondents to this question, eighteen, or 51 percent, of the teachers answered that they did not make changes and seventeen, or 49 percent, answered that they did. One teacher who said he had made changes comented: "I force learning less and now I am able to understand students and their mistakes with more insight." One teacher who said he did not make any changes wrote: "The person doing the evaluation knows less about teaching than the teacher."

Is there any relation between a teacher's perception of the main purpose of evaluations and a teacher's making changes in his teaching techniques after his evaluation? Apparently there is. A further analysis of the data shows that 64 percent of those who stated that the main purpose of evaluations was to improve instruction made changes in their teaching techniques. Of those who felt their evaluation serves some other purpose, 63 percent did not make any changes in their teaching techniques. This suggests that if evaluators seek changes in teaching techniques from evaluations they should have some sort of agreement with teachers as to the purpose of evaluations.

Evaluations as Accurate Assessments of Teaching

In order for teachers to find their evaluations beneficial they must accept these evaluations as accurate assessments of their performance in the classroom. Evaluations are worth little to teachers who question their accuracy. In order to determine whether teachers accept the accuracy of their evaluations, the sample was asked whether their evaluations were accurate assessments of their teaching performance. Of the thirty-five respondents to this question, twenty-three, or 66 percent, asserted their evaluations were not an accurate assessment of their teaching, and twelve, or 34 percent, asserted they were. In making negative comments on this question one teacher wrote, "When an administrator is in your room pupils will react differently." Another

commented, "One period per year gives very little indication of teaching performance."

Do teachers make changes in their teaching if they accept their evaluations as accurate assessments of their teaching performance? The data seem to indicate they do. Of the twelve who accepted their evaluations as accurate assessments of their teaching performance, 92 percent made changes in their teaching practices. One may infer from this statistic that before teachers make changes in their teaching practices, they must acknowledge that their evaluations accurately reflect their teaching potential.

Time Spent by Supervisors on Evaluations

A major complaint of teachers is that supervisors do not spend enough time on evaluations. Yet, the amount of time spent on this complex task of evaluating a lesson may influence the quality of that evaluation. Do supervisors spend enough time on evaluations? Teachers were asked if their supervisors spent enough time in evaluating them. Of the thirty-five respondents, twenty, or 57 percent, answered that their supervisors did not spend enough time in evaluating them. One teacher commented his supervisor spent "enough time but not enough effort." How much time is enough? As is clear from the teachers' contradictory responses in Table 9 (see page 31), there is no consensus among the respondents concerning how much time is enough for the supervisor to spend in evaluating teachers. The largest numbers of both

Table 9

A Comparison of Length and Number of Evaluations to
Teachers' Responses to the Question, "Do You Feel
Your Supervisor Spends Enough
Time Evaluating You?"

Length	"Yes"	Percent	"No"	Percent
Up to 15 minutes	4	27	5	25
From 15 to 30 minutes	4	27	5	25
From 30 minutes to one hour	6	40	10	50
More than one hour	1	6		
Total	15	100	20	100

positive and negative responses were from teachers whose
evaluations were the same length of time--from thirty min-
utes to one hour.

Teachers' Reactions to Administrators' Use of Evaluations

A vital concern to most teachers is administrators'
use of their evaluations. In order for evaluations to be
beneficial, teachers must not fear that the results of their
evaluations will be used to their disadvantage. Do teachers
have this fear? Of the thirty-six respondents to this ques-
tion, thirty-three, or 91 percent, did not fear that the
results of their evaluations were used to their disadvantage.
One teacher who responded that the evaluations were used to
his disadvantage commented, "Only because there was very lit-
tle feedback for change."

Teacher Reaction to Evaluation

Another factor influencing the accuracy of the assessment in an evaluation is the teacher's reaction to the evaluation. Therefore, teachers were asked their reactions to their evaluations. The results in Table 10 show that although many teachers welcome the opportunity to be evaluated, there are also many who are quite anxious while they are being evaluated.

Table 10

Teacher Reaction to Evaluation

Reaction	Number	Percent
Welcome the opportunity to be evaluated	13	35
Controlled anxiety	13	35
Outright fear	0	0
Outright rejection of evaluations	2	6
Unaffected by evaluation	9	24
Total	37	100

Changes in Evaluation Procedures

Teachers may be not completely satisfied with part or all of the procedures used in their evaluation and as a result may want some changes made. The last portion of the questionnaire was designed to give the teachers an opportunity to specify the changes they would like in evaluation procedures. The analysis of the responses in Table 11 (see

page 34) reveals that teachers would like to see a wide vari-
ety of changes. In writing comments about these procedures
one teacher favored more discussion following evaluations,
and another urged the use of a checklist in evaluations. An
inference that can be drawn from this table is that a major-
ity of the teachers favor and even welcome evaluation. How-
ever, many teachers hold they should have input in evalua-
tion procedure.

This completes the analysis of the data. A summary
of Chapter 3 and the conclusions derived from Chapter 3 are
presented in Chapter 4.

Table 11

Changes Teachers Say They Favor in
Evaluation Procedures

Change	Number	Percent
More evaluations	13	36
Less evaluations	0	0
Different evaluation for teach- ers with more experience	12	33
Evaluation by a teacher committee	6	16
Evaluation by the department head	6	16
More time spent on evaluation	9	25
Evaluation by a committee con- sisting of teachers, parents, students, and administrator	1	3
Merit pay increases based on evaluations	5	14
No evaluations	0	0
Teacher input in evaluation procedures	22	61
More objective evaluations	6	16
More subjective evaluations	7	19
Others	1	3

Chapter 4

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this chapter is twofold. First, the procedures used in gathering the data and the analysis of the data are summarized. Second, this chapter includes the conclusions derived from this study.

SUMMARY OF THE ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The teachers surveyed in this study were selected, one from each school, at random out of the Nebraska Educational Directory (1976-77). Questionnaires dealing with eleven aspects of teachers' experience with, and reactions to, evaluation were sent to sixty-three teachers in Northeast Nebraska--the area bounded on the north and east by the Missouri River, on the south by Nebraska highway 91, and on the west by Nebraska highway 14. Forty of the sixty-three responded.

The results of the analysis of the data can be summarized as follows:

1. Most of the teachers who responded had been teaching four or more years in their present school.

2. The number of evaluations ranged from none to four per year.

3. The majority of evaluations lasted from fifteen

35

minutes to one hour.

4. The more years of teaching experience a teacher had, the fewer evaluations made per year.

5. The principal was usually responsible for conducting evaluations.

6. There were a variety of forms and procedures used in evaluations.

7. Teachers expressed different opinions as to the main purpose of evaluations.

8. There is a positive relationship between a teacher's perception of the main purpose of evaluations and a teacher's making changes in his teaching techniques after his evaluation.

9. Many teachers said their evaluations were not accurate assessments of their teaching performance.

10. Teachers are apt to make changes in their teaching if they accept their evaluations as being accurate.

11. Many teachers said evaluators did not spend enough time in evaluating them, but there was no consensus as to how much time was enough.

12. Most teachers did not complain that evaluations were used to their disadvantage by administrators.

13. Teacher reactions toward evaluations were generally positive.

14. Teachers urged a wide variety of changes made in evaluation procedures.

CONCLUSIONS

The analysis of the data presented in Chapter 3 warrants the following conclusions related to the major purpose of this study--teacher assessments of their evaluations:

1. There is no agreement among teachers as to the main purpose of evaluations.

2. There is a positive relationship between teachers who agree that the main purpose of evaluation is to improve instruction and those who make changes in their teaching techniques after their evaluations.

3. A majority of the teachers do not regard their evaluations as accurate assessments of their teaching performance.

4. Teachers who regard evaluations as accurate assessments of their teaching performance are more likely to make changes in their teaching techniques.

5. Although a majority of the teachers say their supervisors do not spend enough time in evaluating them, there is no consensus among teachers as to how much time is adequate.

6. Evaluations are rarely used by administrators to the teachers' disadvantage.

7. Teachers exhibit a positive reaction toward being evaluated.

8. Teachers ask to have more input in evaluation procedures.

Conclusions that can be made related to the second-ary purposes of this paper are:

1. The principal is chiefly responsible for conducting evaluations.

2. Teachers with more teaching experience receive fewer evaluations.

3. Evaluations usually last from fifteen minutes to one hour.

4. There is no single predominant form used in evaluations.

5. The most common procedures used in evaluations are (a) unannounced evaluation, (b) teacher signature on evaluations, (c) explanation of evaluation results, and (d) a copy of evaluation results given to the teacher.

6. The change in evaluation procedures advocated by most teachers is increased teacher input in evaluation procedures.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Biddle, Bruce J., and William J. Ellena, eds. Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, inc., 1964.

Cogan, Morris L. Clinical Supervision. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1973.

Gove, Philip Babcock, and others, eds. Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language Unabridged. Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Company, 1966.

Lovell, John T., and Kimball Wiles. Supervision for Better Schools. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975.

National Education Association--Research Division. Evaluation of Classroom Teachers. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1964.

Rivlin, Harry N., ed. Encyclopedia of Modern Education. New York: Philosophical Library Inc., 1943.

Ryans, David G. Characteristics of Teachers: Their Description, Comparison, and Appraisal. A Research Study. Menasha, Wis.: George Banta Company, Inc., 1960.

Slakter, Malcolm J. Statistical Inference for Educational Researchers. Reading: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1972.

TenBrink, Terry D. Evaluation. A Practical Guide for Teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1974.

Periodicals

Anderson, Harold Milton. "A Study of Certain Criteria of Teaching Effectiveness," Journal of Experimental Education, 23:41-71, September, 1954.

Barnes, Cyrus W., and James Reed Campbell. "Interaction Analysis--A Breakthrough," Phi Delta Kappan, 50:587-590, April, 1970.

39

Chicago Tribune, October 5, 1977, and November 17, 1977.

Cory, Christopher. "The Heavy Hand of Accountability,"
    Learning: The Magazine for Creative Teaching, 2:24-28,
    March, 1974.

Gage, N. L. "An Analytical Approach to Research on Instruc-
    tional Methods," Phi Delta Kappan, 49:601-606, June,
    1968.

Good, Thomas L., and others. "How Teachers View Accounta-
    bility," Phi Delta Kappan, 56:367-368, January, 1975.

Hall, G. L. "Assessing Teacher Effectiveness: Practical
    Approaches to Meaningful Evaluations," NASSP Bulletin,
    58:153-163, May, 1974.

Harmes, H. M. "Improving Teaching through Supervision: How
    Is It Working?" Educational Administration and Supervi-
    sion, 59:169-172, May, 1959.

Hause, Ernest, Wendell Rivers, and Daniel L. Stufflebeam.
    "An Assessment of the Michigan Accountability System,"
    Phi Delta Kappan, 55:663-669, June, 1974.

Hellfritzsch, A. G. "A Factor Analysis of Teacher Abilities,"
    Journal of Experimental Education, 14:166-199, December,
    1945.

Landry, Thomas R. "Louisiana Supervisors Examine Their Prac-
    tices," Educational Administration and Supervision, 59:
    305-311, September, 1959.

McAfee, David T. "Evaluation of the Teacher: Do Teachers
    and Supervisors Agree?" High School Journal, 58:336-342,
    May, 1975.

Ornstein, Allan C. "The Politics of Accountability," Journal
    of Research and Development in Education, 8:73-81, Novem-
    ber, 1975.

Robeson, E. Wayne. "Teacher Self Appraisal: A Way to Improve
    Instruction," Journal of Teacher Education, 22:469-473,
    Winter, 1971.

Rosenshine, Borah. "Interaction Analysis: A Tardy Comment,"
    Phi Delta Kappan, 51:441-448, April, 1970.

"Teacher Evaluation: A Symposium," NASSP Bulletin, 59:1-50,
    December, 1975.

ERIC Documents

Buck, James J., and James F. Parsely, Jr. The Way We See
    It: A Survey of Teacher Evaluation Policies and Prac-
    tices Operant in the State of Washington. U.S., Educa-
    tional Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED
    084-223, March, 1973.

Feldman, Sandra. Teacher Evaluation: A Teacher Unionist's
    View. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center,
    ERIC Document ED 086-647, November, 1972.

McPhail, James H. Teacher Evaluation--A State-by-State
    Analysis. U.S., Educational Resources Information
    Center, ERIC Document ED 014-449, October, 1967.

Encyclopedia Article

S[uzzallo], H[enry]. "Supervision of Teaching," A Cyclo-
    pedia of Education, 1913, Vol. V.

APPENDIXES

42

Dear Colleague:

I feel that teachers are deeply concerned about the way they are being evaluated. In my talks with teachers I have found some who are quite satisfied with their evaluation, but others who are not. I am attempting by means of the enclosed questionnaire to assess teacher opinions of their evaluations. I plan to use the data collected as a basis for a graduate research paper I am writing at Wayne State College.

I would appreciate your taking the time to fill out this questionnaire. Please feel free to add any comments you desire and return it in the self-addressed, stamped envelope provided. You can be assured that in my paper I shall not identify any school or teacher.

I shall be grateful for your cooperation in my project.

Cordially yours,

Patrick K. Osmond

Patrick K. Osmond

1. Please check the number of years taught in your present school.
   1st year _____
   2nd year _____
   3rd year _____
   4 or more _____

2. How many times are you evaluated in a school year?
   Once _____
   Twice _____
   Three _____
   Four or more _____

3. Which of the following are used in Teacher Evaluations at your School?
   Procedure: Teacher and Supervisor Interaction:

       A Preconference concerning the lesson taught............._____
       B Postconference concerning the lesson taught..........._____
       C Date and time of the Evaluation set by teacher........_____
       D Evaluative criteria known to teachers................._____
       E Explanation of evaluation results....................._____
       F Unannounced evaluations..............................._____
       G Teacher signature on all evaluations.................._____
       H Teacher receives a copy of evaluation results........._____
       I Teacher receives help as a result of evaluations......_____
   Evaluator:
       A Principal..._____
       B Superintendent......................................._____
       C Department Head......................................_____
       D Committee of evaluators.............................._____
   Explain:

   Evaluation Form:
       A Open form with written comments......................._____
       B Closed form with a check list........................._____
       C Rating scales..._____
       D Video taped evaluations..............................._____
       E Other..._____
   Explain:

   Comments:

4. What do you perceive as the main purpose of evaluations? Check only one.

       A Stimulates teaching staff to improve instruction..............._____
       B Increases communication between teachers and administrators...._____
       C Improvement of the school facilities and curriculum............_____
       D Serves as a means of keeping "good" teachers and removing
          "poor" ones..._____
       E Other..._____

5. How long does your evaluation usually last?
    Up to 15 minutes......._____
    15 to 30 minutes......._____
    30 minutes to 1 hour..._____
    more than 1 hour......._____

Explain:

6. Have you made any changes in your teaching practices as a result of
    your being evaluated?

                Yes _____   No_____

Comments?

7. Do you feel your evaluation is an accurate assessment of your teaching
    performance?

                Yes _____   No _____

Comments:

8. Do you feel your supervisor spends enough time in evaluating you?

                Yes _____   No _____

Comments:

9. Do you feel the results of your evaluation are used to your
    disadvantage?

                Yes _____   No _____

Comments:

10. Which of the following <u>best</u> describes your reaction to your evaluation?

    A Welcome the opportunity to be evaluated.............. _____

    B Controlled anxiety.......................... _____

    C Outright fear.............................. _____

    D Outright rejection of evaluation................ _____

    E Unaffected by evaluations..................... _____

11. Which of the following changes would you like to see in your Evaluation? (check as many as you desire)

    A More evaluations......................... _____

    B Less evaluations......................... _____

    C Different evaluations for teachers with
       more experience........................ _____

    D Evaluation by a teacher committee............ _____

    E Evaluation by the Department Head............ _____

    F More time spent on evaluation............... _____

    G Evaluation by a committee consisting of..........
       teachers, parents, students and administration....... _____

    H Merit pay increases as a result of good evaluations.. _____

    I No evaluations.......................... _____

    J Teacher input in evaluation procedures......... _____

    K More objective evaluations................. _____

    L More subjective evaluations................ _____

    M Others:

Additional comments:

Please return in the enclosed envelope as soon as possible, but no later than November 27th.