In order to develop teacher and administrator evaluation systems based on specific measurable criteria, a research population of three groups (full-time students, teachers, and administrators) was drawn from the 57 North Carolina technical institutes and community colleges. Random samples selected from 16 institutions were surveyed, with findings based on responses from 181 students, 150 teachers, and 92 administrators. From field testing of the evaluation instruments at six institutions it was concluded that the evaluation criteria developed were valid. Survey results indicated that generally attitudes of all three groups toward evaluation were not favorable. Teachers held the lowest attitude while administrator attitude was the most favorable. It was felt that the low level of attitude was due to the evaluation systems currently in use. Each group felt that evaluation of a teacher's or an administrator's effectiveness should be based on a combination of information sources. Teachers and administrators agreed on how often evaluation should be conducted and that the time should be determined by the institution. They also responded positively to all the criteria listed for both groups and were fairly close in their rankings of both sets of criteria. Included in the report are literature reviews on both teacher and administrator evaluation and the teacher and administrator evaluation forms developed. Detailed responses are presented in narrative and tabular form. Appended are the 11 evaluation forms used in the study including the survey instrument, teacher and administrator opinionnaire, student evaluation forms, teacher and administrator self-evaluation forms, and evaluation forms for chairman, peer, and staff. (MF)
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The end is contained in the means. The fact that the talents a person has, the opportunities, have implications, expectations, is easy to ignore, or never learn. Yet as eyes are made for seeing, so is a person made for being and becoming. Each life has a destiny. To ignore it is to mock what might be. To pursue it is in some measure to demonstrate human potential. It may fill a long life to do this. But the good who die young may already have done so.

Universities exist to serve mankind, universal mankind, directly and/or indirectly, each and every one. The primary purpose of universities is to inspire and guide students in the fulfillment of their individual destinies. Universities are not merely havens where scholars may warm themselves in an atmosphere of erudition, admire each other in display of intellectual achievement. Such centrifugal enjoyments are good, but they lead nowhere beyond themselves. Profound researchers have their day, but it is a barren day if it ends only on library shelves.

The life of the intellect ought not to end so. It should be a march. It should move on, beyond itself and into the future. It should be timeless, instinct with past as well as present and supremely with future.

And past, present, and future are all embodied in students. Students are the focus of the true academic life. It is for them that universities exist. Not to indulge or coddle them. Their lives must not be centrifugal either. They need to be stirred to the joys of the life of the mind, as it has been from the beginning, is now, and ever shall be.

Shall be, that is, if each generation of students are truly thus awakened, guided, and dedicated as bearers and exemplars of their individual portions of that joy into the years, the ages, to come.
ABSTRACT


The primary purpose of this research is to develop teacher and administrator evaluation systems based upon specific measurable criteria. The environment for the study was the North Carolina Technical Institute/Community College System (NCTI/CCS).

The population for this research consisted of three groups found in each of the individual institutions of the NCCCS during the winter quarter, 1974-1975 school year.

a. Students included all students in all institutional curricula who were classified as full-time students by the individual institutions.

b. Teachers included those full-time persons of the institutions who were primarily engaged in classroom teaching.

c. Administrators included all full-time persons in positions in the institutions who were involved in the supervision of classroom teachers and those persons who although were not directly concerned with supervision of teachers, nevertheless had some responsibility bearing on the success or failure of the teaching mission.

A two-stage stratified systematic sample design was used in this study. In the first stage, institutions were drawn with equal probability from a stratified listing. In the second stage, ultimate sample units (students, teachers and administrators) were drawn at a constant proportional rate from stratified listings. In both stages, first selections were made randomly. Sixteen institutions were selected from which a sample of 299 faculty-admin-
istrators and 323 students were drawn. A questionnaire was developed, tested and mailed to each sample unit. The findings were based on responses from 181 students, 150 teachers and 92 administrators.

It was found that generally attitudes of students, teachers and administrators toward evaluation were not very favorable. Teachers held the lowest attitude while the administrator attitude was the most favorable. Administrator and student attitudes were significantly more favorable toward evaluation than teachers.

In determining and comparing attitudes about who should be included in the evaluation processes it appeared that each group believed evaluation of a teacher's effectiveness and/or an administrator's effectiveness should not be the responsibility of any one source of evaluative information or group, but a combination of sources.

In determining and comparing attitudes as to how often evaluation should be conducted by the various sources, we find that teachers and administrators are reasonably close in their thinking. The first two responses on the five common sources are in the same order for both groups.

In examining attitudes as to when evaluation should be conducted, we find that most teachers and administrators feel this should be determined by the institution.

In determining and comparing attitudes on criteria for evaluation, we find that teachers and administrators are fairly close in their rankings of both sets of criteria. We also find that teachers and administrators responded positively to all of the criteria listed for both groups.
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INTRODUCTION

Purpose of Study

Instructional quality and management ability are functions of many variables. One of these variables is the evaluation process used to assess faculty and administration performance. Most institutions presently use some sort of rating system based upon a list of generalized traits and methods to evaluate faculty, and many of the institutions use a similar list of generalized traits and methods to evaluate administration, also. In both cases, the evaluation systems are too generalized and inflexible to evaluate the performance of each teacher or administrator. The primary purpose of this research is to develop teacher and administrator evaluation systems based upon specific measurable criteria. This study has four major objectives:

1. Survey a sample of North Carolina Technical Institute/Community College administrators, teachers and students to determine:
   a. Their general attitudes toward evaluation.
   b. Who should be included in the evaluation of teachers and administrators.
   c. The criteria for evaluation of teachers and administrators.
   d. When and how often teachers and administrators should be evaluated.

2. Develop evaluation systems that will allow evaluation of faculty and administration based upon specific measurable criteria.

3. Field test both instruments in several institutions to assess man-hours, determine weak points, strong points, etc.
4. Prepare and disseminate a complete report of all findings to all institutions in the North Carolina Community College System.

Background Information

The guaranteed acquisition of basic skills by all of the citizens is the primary goal of education in the United States. "In principle the American educational commitment has been that every student should have access to an adequate education," but access to an education is not enough. (23,2) "Each student has an inalienable right to be taught what he needs to know in order to take a productive and rewarding part in our society."

Traditionally education has espoused the notion that teachers are dispensers of knowledge and that students are the recipients. This idea has merit but lacks at least two basic ingredients:

1. The fact that a teacher dispenses information is not evidence in and of itself that a student has learned anything.
2. Learning does not require the presence of a second person. (14,81)

In this age of accountability emphasis must change from teaching to learning. The old commitment of access to an education must be changed to a new commitment -- that every student shall learn. "(23,4) Most students can master what we have to teach them; it is up to the instructor to find the means which will enable them to do it."

The teacher's role is probably the most important single factor in the teaching-learning process. The teacher's performance in the classroom will determine whether our schools meet, or fail to meet, the challenge of our times. (23,4) "Rouche states, 'unless there has been learning, there is no evidence that there has been teaching.'"
The "age of accountability" is a term found constantly in today's educational literature, but just what does accountability mean? According to Webster's dictionary, accountable means responsible and responsible means accountable for one's behavior. (29,3) In educational circles, accountability simply means that educators, teachers and administrators, should be held responsible for educational outcomes -- what the student learns. "It refers to the process of expecting each member of an organization or a social system such as an educational institution, to answer to someone for doing specific things according to specific plans; against certain time tables to accomplish tangible performance results." (33,3) Both administrators and teachers are responsible for their performance, and it is in their interest as well as the students' interests that they be held accountable. The sole purpose for the existence of the educational institution is the teaching-learning process; everything else exists -- or should exist -- to facilitate this function. (23,5)

"Without accountability for results, educational practice is unverified, and good educational practice is not identified." (23,4) Specifically defined objectives, learning techniques, and evaluation are all basic to accountability. For teachers, the most valid criteria for assessment of performance is student performance. Teachers can and will be held accountable for the success or lack of success of their students. (14,83)

Thus far instruction has received the major emphasis, but administration is coming under increasing demands for accountability of performance. Taxpayers, trustees, donors, and students have a right to
expect more efficient management. With present economic conditions more
efficient management of higher institutions is essential. Careful ex-
amination fo cost - effectiveness if not done internally, will be done
externally by the new experts working for legislatures and governors.

(11,5)

The role of administrator is changing from fund raiser and maintain-
er of status quo to one who must be interested in and certainly account-
able for the learning of students in his institution. The dollars spent,
books in the library, square footage of classroom space per student, or
Ph. D. - student ratio will no longer be the criteria for good manage-
ment. Education is going to be held accountable for its educational
output. (20,82)

Definition of Terms

An understanding of the key terms as applied to this research is
essential before any definitive statements concerning this research can
be made. The terms used in this study are defined as follows:

a. Teacher effectiveness: "the ability of a teacher to create a
meeting and an interaction between the physical, intellectual, and psy-
chological interests of the student and some given subject - matter
content; the ability of the teacher to relate the learning activities
to the developmental process of the learners and to their current needs
and interests." (11,86)

b. Administrator effectiveness: the extent to which the perform-
ance of the administrator produces satisfactory results through the
control, direction and management of the administrator; satisfactory
results shall be judged in terms of the objectives of the activity.
c. **Evaluation:** the process of ascertaining the value, through the use of formal-structured instruments and/or procedures, of the persons responsible for administration and instruction in an institution.

d. **Evaluative criteria:** the standards against which the administrator and/or teacher performance shall be measured.

e. **Administrators:** those persons in positions of control and management of all matters pertaining to school affairs, and those persons in control and management of those aspects of administration directly related to the instructional process. They are primarily non-teaching persons. (11,15)

f. **Classroom:** includes all formal or structured instruction conducted in a classroom, shop, or laboratory.

g. **Teachers:** all full-time persons at the institution whose primary function is classroom teaching.

h. **Students:** all students who are classified as full-time by the individual institution.

**Research Limitations**

As is the case with any research study, there are limitations to the study. The first of three general limitations is that this study was limited to administrators, teachers, and students of the NCTI/CCS; therefore, the results will be most applicable to this system. Second, only full-time administrators, teachers, and students were included in this study. Part-time institutional personnel were excluded because time, money, and research personnel were insufficient to overcome the difficulties in compiling rosters of part-time personnel. The final limiting factor is change over time. This study as conducted may or...
may not be representative of the system or any particular institution
at some future point in time. (23,10)
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE ON TEACHER EVALUATION

The Good Teacher

"After several decades in attempts to analyze teaching effectiveness, Professor A. S. Barr is reported as saying that his main contribution had been to find so many things that did not work." (25,25)

In the study of teacher effectiveness, the term "good teacher" turns out to be almost as vague and diffuse as the range of human experience relative to teaching. Teaching effectiveness is not tied or related to any single overall pattern of teacher conduct. Yet this "competencies" approach, to teach the beginner to be like the expert, still dominates in teacher education. However, research has shown that good teaching is not a direct function of general traits and methods. In an exhaustive study on teaching procedures, skills, and methodology, Ryans concluded that personal characteristics played the greatest role in teacher effectiveness. He was able to extract only three major dimensions of teacher behavior:

Pattern X  Friendly, understanding, sympathetic
            vs
            Aloof, Egocentric, restricted

Pattern Y  Responsible, systematic, businesslike
            vs
            Unplanned, slipshod

Pattern Z  Stimulating, imaginative, surgent
            vs
            Dull, routine (25,26)
In a similar study by the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at Berkeley, a list of the first eight characteristics all fall into the X, Y, and Z patterns that Ryan found in his study.

1. Dynamic--energetic person  
2. Explains clearly  
3. Interesting presentation  
4. Enjoys teaching  
5. Has a genuine interest in students  
6. Friendly toward students  
7. Encourages class discussions  
8. Discusses other points of view

These two studies and many others support the finding that it is more what a person is than what he does that is important to the full development of his pupils. As a teacher, the most valuable and the most accessible tool which an instructor can use is his own personality.

Teaching is a highly personal matter, and the highly successful practitioner of the art attains his eminence by being the sort of person he is rather than by practicing a set of competencies abstracted from the performance of other master teachers. An effective teacher is a unique human being who has learned to use himself effectively and efficiently for carrying out his own and society's purposes. This 'self as instrument concept' rejects the concept of the teacher as a technician applying rather mechanically the methods he has been taught. (25,26)

Just as different students learn different things in different ways at different rates under different circumstances, so do different teachers teach different things (or perhaps the same thing) in different ways under different circumstances (or perhaps the same circumstances). (20,88)

There are many styles and techniques of teaching. The style that a particular teacher develops will depend on what he is teaching, his knowledge of techniques, his own personality, and most important, how he wants his students to change their behavior. Each teacher has his own style which reflects what the teacher plans to say and what he plans to do in order to say it. The teacher, like an artist, has to develop certain skills and learn to use the various tools of the profession.
Mastery of the skills and tools of his art are essential to becoming an adept craftsman or an expert teacher. In addition to mastery, the artist must have something to say. "The intent of any work of art is to cause the beholder to be somehow different from what he was before he beheld, and so it is with teaching." (20,88) "The good teacher is not the one who flunks 60 per cent of his students; rather he is the one who says when students finish his course, 90 per cent of them can do the things sought." (14,82) In other words, the teacher wants his students to behave differently or do the things sought after completing the course. To bring about a change in behavior, the teacher must develop a plan. Dianne Peters calls this plan a "course design."

There are four essential elements in a course design or plan:

1. The conceptual framework—The point of view or window through which a teacher sees his subject matter and the student to whom he is going to teach it.

2. The statement of objectives—Objectives are the student's building blocks and should be written in behavioral outcomes. Thus written, they underscore what it is a student must do to demonstrate that he knows.

3. Learning activities—Learning activities are the specific learning processes developed by the teacher to achieve the behavior sought. Learning is individual, so there can be almost as many different kinds of learning activities as there are students.

4. Evaluations—Evaluations enable the student and the teacher to know how far along each student is toward achieving the objectives. (20,89)

In developing his course design the instructor should ask himself three questions: (1) What is worth knowing? (2) What is this college's purpose? and (3) Who are the students? This last question has been overlooked far too long. Many instructors do not know or attempt to know their students as individual human beings, and therefore cannot
individualize their instructional techniques so that individualized learning takes place. A course design requires a lot of hard work. Once it is complete and put on paper, the teacher has the means to evaluate what he does at his fingertips. "Whenever an instructor takes pride in his course design, he has become accountable to himself as a professional." (20,90) Thus we see that self-evaluation is basic to the concept of accountability and that effective teaching needs a plan.

Who Should Evaluate?

Teaching is too diverse and complex to be fairly evaluated by just one source. Several sources which could be used are: (1) self-evaluation, (2) student evaluation, (3) peer evaluation, (4) alumni evaluation, (5) evaluation by department heads, (6) evaluation by administrators, (7) evaluation by outside consultants, and (8) evaluation by employers of students.

Self-Evaluation

Self-evaluation is more or less a continuous process, but the use of a systematic, well-planned self-evaluation is rare. (15,35) Research studies on self-evaluation are few in number, and those that are available are not conclusive. In a study conducted at the Jacksonville Naval Air Technical Training school, a comparison of supervisor rating, student rating, and self-ratings was made. A high degree of correlation was found between the student and self-rating, but supervisor's rating showed no correlation on the following measures; intelligence, level of schooling, teaching experience, or desire to teach. Teachers who expressed a great desire to teach were rated superior by their students. In another
study, using fifty college teachers, teachers who were rated superior showed more accuracy in their self-rating than those rated inferior. (17,27) In another study conducted by Centra only a modest correlation (.21) was found between students' ratings and instructors' self-rating.

Although research indicates that many individuals constantly over-rate or underrate their performance, self-evaluation can be most meaningful to the teacher trying to improve his performance when compared with other sources of evaluation. "The main advantage of a self-evaluation is that the employee knows best his goals; and, therefore, he should best be able to judge the degree to which he is able to achieve his goals." (13,42) The teacher, as a professional, should be accountable to himself. "When a teacher establishes his own worth, he becomes genuinely accountable for what he can become." (17,88)

**Student Evaluation**

The use of students as a source of evaluation is not a new idea. Many standard forms, such as the Purdue rating scale (over 30 years), have been in existence for several decades. (17,35) The School of Education at Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College was using student evaluations as early as 1922. In one survey, in which 804 colleges responded, slightly less than 40 per cent used student ratings regularly, but the number of colleges using student evaluations is increasing all the time. (23,23)

In spite of the increasing use of student evaluations, there are many who still question the use of students as a source of evaluation. Some still question the reliability and validity of student ratings, but the evidence for good reliability is clear and consistent. "The picture
of reliability over time is also consistent in that the ratings of alumni correlate well with earlier ratings as students or with students currently studying with the same professors." (17,31) The evidence on the validity of student evaluations is not as numerous or conclusive as that on reliability, but there are several studies (Creager, 1950; Hildebrand, 1971; Mc Keachie, 1971) which indicate that student evaluations are valid procedures for assessing the quality of teaching. (17,32)

Some opponents feel that the complexity of the teaching-learning process is just too difficult to capture by any set of words. But like so many other terms (love, hate, empathy, etc.) which are difficult to capture with words, these feelings are more successfully subject to clinical treatment than to mystical aspersions. "The argument of complexity, therefore, cannot be considered adequate justification for not using student-rating forms, especially because evaluation in some form by somebody does take place." (17,34).

Still others say that students are too immature to evaluate effective teaching. The immaturity argument is a carryover from an earlier era when teacher-student relationships were more formal, but this concept is faulty on two counts: First, no consideration has been given to the students of today. Students in our day and time are pushed into early intellectual and emotional maturity. In the area of testing performance and reasoning ability the average student today may be as high as one standard deviation above the average student of a generation ago. Also, the fact that the average age of puberty has been decreasing steadily for many decades is a well documented fact. We also know that the amount of education that a student receives has increased tremendously.
over the past several decades. Today's students have had a great deal of experience in evaluating and in being evaluated, and they are more mature than past generations. Second, the immaturity position is based upon the concept of Teaching-as-Telling, but teaching, as any teacher knows, is much more than just telling.

Although there are some who question the use of student evaluation, most of those who have written on the subject conclude that students can evaluate fairly and perceptively. (17,31) The individual student knows best whether he is or is not learning, whether he can or cannot understand, and whether he is stimulated to learn or bored to death, and as Howe points out,

We have the obvious fact that students do pay for the instruction they receive; they are not simply a necessary evil to be tolerated as a part of the educational endeavor, but are the purpose of it. The opinions of those who eat the pudding certainly ought to be considered if we wish to know how the pudding tastes. (18,27)

**Peer Evaluation**

In one study on peer evaluation, 29.2 per cent of the junior colleges responding used some sort of peer evaluation as one of the sources in evaluating teaching effectiveness, but the use of this source of evaluation is not widespread. (23,27) Evaluation by one's peers appears to be a very logical source of evaluation for several reasons. A fellow employee who has the same job as another employee will possess more in-depth knowledge of the requirements for that job than any other individual. He is also in the best position to offer a specific, objective analysis of strengths and weaknesses and to offer specific suggestions, based upon his own experience on the job, in overcoming any weakness that
might be revealed. A group of peers possess a special type of friendship and this makes the evaluation process less threatening, and creates a much more relaxed atmosphere. And of course, the very fact that each co-worker is trying to help his fellow employee improve his performance creates much higher morale among the entire employee group. There are also several disadvantages in the use of peer evaluations. The peers limited perspective of the total operation may result in the omission of some very important information. To act as an evaluator without the authority or responsibility puts the fellow worker in a very unfair position. The fact that the evaluator is a member of the same group automatically bias the assessment. Another problem is the peer's evaluation may not agree with that of the immediate supervisor who has to make recommendations as to hiring, firing and promotion. Peer evaluation could also create resentment of a co-worker by the evaluatee if the results are unfavorable, which in turn could create intra-group conflict as well. Finally, the expense of peer evaluations could be very high.

Research on peer evaluation is very limited, but several studies which have been made support the reliability and the validity of this source of evaluation. (23, 29) When used as part of a total evaluation process, peer rating can be very helpful in assessing teaching effectiveness.

Alumni Evaluation

Alumni are older, more mature and have job experience that current students do not have and would seem to be a more logical and a more valid source of evaluation than current students. However, the available research does not support this idea. In one study a very close relation-
ship was found between student and alumni (within five years) ratings of
teachers. In another study between alumni (out ten or more years) and
student ratings the average ratings given to seventeen instructors were
positively correlated. (23,31)

Although these two studies are not conclusive by any means, they
do indicate that current students evaluate instructors as well as alumni
who have been out of school for quite sometime. In view of this close
agreement between student and alumni evaluations plus the procedural
problems and cost involved, it appears there would be very little, if
any, real benefits from alumni evaluations.

However, to exclude alumni evaluation from this study on such meager
evidence particularly in the junior/community college environment would
not be reasonable. It could be of great value to the individual instructor
or particularly if used as part of an overall comprehensive evaluation
process.

Evaluation by Department Heads

The department head is directly responsible for the day-to-day
production level of all the employees in his department. His training,
job experience, and job assignment put him in the best position to con-
duct evaluations of department members, and since he is responsible for
the performance of his department, he must evaluate if he is to be held
accountable. His day-to-day contacts with all department members puts
him in the best position to provide valid, unbiased comparative staff
evaluations, and since he is responsible for each employee’s output his
evaluations will have the greatest impact on department personnel. Al-
though department heads should evaluate their subordinates, there are
several disadvantages from this source. The department head's position as supervisor creates a type of interference to the evaluation process. Another problem is the fact that the department head in many cases has not taught in the classroom for quite sometime, and may not be able to produce an objective evaluation based upon current knowledge or methodology. The supervisor also has the problem of determining what good production levels are for the various tasks in his department. It is extremely difficult for one individual to be knowledgeable in the various disciplines within the department. Finally, the department head; for fear of morale problems, concern for his subordinate's welfare, concern about his own acceptance, or for a variety of similar reasons, often finds it very difficult to "call them as he sees them." (43,49)

This source of evaluation by itself would not be fair to the evaluator or the evaluatee, but when used as a part of a comprehensive program, it will be a very valuable source of evaluation.

Evaluation by Administrators

Administrators, as managers of the institution, are responsible for the educational output, and therefore, should be involved in the evaluation process. Just exactly what their role in the evaluation process should be is hard to say. Some administrators have never had any formal instruction in the methods of teaching and many of those who have, have never taught in the classroom. Also, the very nature of many administrators' jobs is so broad (such as the president) that it would be extremely difficult for them to be directly involved in teacher evaluation. On the other hand, some administrative positions are very narrow (such as the business manager) in scope and have very little direct
involvement with the teaching process.

In spite of these drawbacks, we still have the obvious fact that administrators are in charge of the institution; and therefore, should be involved in the evaluative process.

**Evaluation by Outside Consultants**

This source of evaluation offers several advantages. Since he is outside the institution and has nothing personally at stake at the local institution, his evaluations will not be biased by local problems, etc. The consultants brought in to evaluate are experts in their fields, and as experts are up to date on the latest research findings and the most successful evaluation processes. Of course, the fact that the consultants are outside the institution creates several disadvantages to this source of evaluation. The outside consultants bring with them their own value systems and will tend to evaluate in terms of these values. Another factor is that items that are considered important by local personnel may not be viewed as important by the consultants and may be completely neglected. The biggest problem is that consultants are not cheap and the cost to the local institution could be extremely high. (13,47)

In spite of these drawbacks, outside consultants could be a valuable source of evaluation particularly if used as part of a comprehensive system. The frequent use of outside consultants would be impractical because of the high cost involved, but once every three to four years could prove very valuable to the local institution. This source could detect general trends, serve as a quality control, check on the institutional evaluation system, and provide a valuable source of information on new developments in education.
**Evaluation by Employers of Former Students**

Community colleges and technical institutes are evaluated day in and day out by members of the local community. Most of the people in a community have an opinion concerning the local institution, but only a few have first hand knowledge of the educational output of the institution. These few with first hand knowledge are the employers of former students. As employers they know what qualifications and requirements are needed for a particular job. When the employer hires a student, he does so because of the qualifications that the institution says he has. However, the student will not be judged on his qualifications; he will be judged by his performance on the job.

Since the employer is using a product of the institution, it seems only logical to include him as a part of the evaluation process. After all, he is in the best possible position to judge the employee's (student) performance. In his judgement of the student, he also judges the teacher and the school, and his opinions are vital if quality education is to be maintained. The employer's opinions, whether good or bad, will have a tremendous effect upon the respect and prestige of the institution and the individual instructor.

**Other Relevant Reviews of the Literature**

Although there is research material available on most of the above sources, very little research has been done on the many possible combinations that could be used. One question about the sources which is not answered by research is, what is the relative importance of the various possible sources when used in several different combinations?

Although there is some evidence on most of the above sources of
evaluation which tend to support its reliability and validity, none of the available evidence on the above sources, with the possible exception of student evaluation, is sufficient to conclude that it could be used as solitary source of evaluation. (18,36) This it would seem leads us to the solution of the evaluation problem, and that is to use a combination of sources. However, we still have the most important question to answer: which sources of evaluation should be included?

The majority of those doing research on evaluation conclude that some sort of combination should be used, however the difficult task of deciding which groups to include and what their relative importance is still has not been solved.

In one study conducted on a combination of sources which was based upon the reliability of each of the sources, it was found that much of the time and effort determining the reliabilities of the raters and combining their ratings using differential weights was a waste of time. Elimination of the lowest rater did very little to improve the composite reliability, even were large differences in the reliabilities of the raters existed. (18,37)

None of the available sources of evaluation, according to the research are very useful when used as a solitary source of evaluation. This would suggest that some sort of combination of sources should be used for the assessment of teacher's classroom performance. One of the purposes of this research is to establish the combination of raters to be used and the relative importance of each to the evaluation process. Since the majority of the available research is from the elementary and secondary levels and not at all conclusive, the combination of raters
and their relative importance will be based upon the perceptions of the students, teachers, and administrators in the NCTI/CCS.
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE ON ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION

The Good Administrator

In the study of administrative effectiveness, we find a wide variety of administrative positions with a wide variety of jobs to perform. Many of these positions are very narrow in scope, while others are very broad in scope. Although each administrative position has a definite job to perform which is related to the basic institutional mission, there is no common denominator, such as the student-teacher relationship, between administrative positions. Thus we find the term "good administrator" even more difficult to define than the term "good teacher".

To many people the administrator should be an educator; a teacher, an expert in instruction; to others, he should be adroit manager of the organization; to still others, he should be a public relations expert. (4,2) In other words, the administrator must fill a variety of roles. The good administrator must be aware of all the various roles he must play, and he must develop a plan-of-action to insure continued personal and professional growth in each of these roles.

In developing a plan-of-action the administrator must ask himself three questions: (1) What is this school's purpose? All educational programs exist in a larger context than their own specific boundaries, but they all interact together in some fashion. The good administrator is aware of this context and just how his particular program fits into the larger context. (19,1) (2) What are the various roles for this administrative position? The good administrator will identify the various
roles of his position, establish role priorities, and develop his plan-of-action accordingly. Failure to do so will result in an unbalanced development which will eventually have a detrimental effect on the administrator's overall effectiveness. (3) What are the internal and/or external constraints on this administrative position? Constraints must be considered in the development of performance objectives; otherwise the objectives may be unrealistic. A plan-of-action requires a lot of thought and hardwork, but once it is complete and put on paper, the administrator has a map to success and a means of evaluating what he does at his fingertips.

Who Should Evaluate?

Administration like teaching is a very complex, diverse process and cannot be fairly evaluated by just one source. Several sources which could be used are: (1) self evaluation, (2) student evaluation, (3) peer (other administrators) evaluation, (4) alumni evaluation, (5) evaluation by administrator's staff, (6) evaluation by immediate supervisor, (7) evaluation by teachers, (8) evaluation by outside consultants, and (9) evaluation by lay residents.

Self-Evaluation

Research on administrative self-evaluations is non-existent, but self-evaluation could prove to be a very valuable source of information. After all, it is the individual administrator who best knows his goals, and it is he who should best be able to judge whether he has or has not achieved his goals. Self-evaluation when used as a part of a comprehensive system should serve as a valuable source for improvement of performance.
Student Evaluation

All schools exist for and because of the teaching-learning process. Administrators, although not directly involved in the teaching-learning process, as managers of the school should be held accountable for the achievement or lack of achievement of the students attending their school.

Although the studentadministrator relationship is not as involved as the student-teacher relationship, it is nevertheless extremely important to the effectiveness of the individual administrator. Since administrators are responsible for institutional success (student achievement), they must solicit the opinions of the students concerning their (administrators) effectiveness.

Students, because of their limited contact with administrators, will have very little to offer concerning actual job performance, but nevertheless, they will have opinions about the effectiveness of a given administrator. The good administrator wants to know how students view his effectiveness and actively seeks their opinions.

As mentioned earlier, the administrator has a variety of roles to play and certainly one of those roles is his relationship with students, and therefore, students should be given consideration as a possible source of evaluation.

Peer (other administrators) Evaluation

Another role of the administrator is his relationship with other administrators. As a part of the management of the institution the administrators relationship with other administrators is extremely important to his effectiveness as an administrator.
The administration must function as a close knit team if the institutional objectives are to be met. The individual administrator must perform his job, and certainly one part of this job is to seek ways to improve his performance. Other administrators, since they have similar problems, could provide valuable insight to weaknesses in administrative performance and offer many ideas from their own experience as to ways and means for improvement.

Alumni Evaluation

Alumni as former students of the institution appear to be logical sources of evaluative information. They are more mature, have jobs, and as members of the community can have tremendous effect on the effectiveness of the institution.

Research on this source found that a high correlation existed between current students and alumni on teacher evaluation, and that very little additional evidence if any would be gained from this source. For this reason it is felt very little value would be gained for administrative evaluation as well. However, since there is no evidence available for this conclusion, alumni as a possible source of administrative evaluation has been included in this research study.

Evaluation by the Administrator's Staff

An administrator's staff plays a very important role in the effectiveness of the individual administrator. Their performance is directly related to their opinions and feelings toward their supervisor. Since the administrator's staff has a great effect on the administrator's performance, their opinions and feeling should certainly be solicited as a part of the evaluation process.
The individual staff member knows best whether job assignments are fair, whether instructions are or are not clear, and whether he enjoys or hates his job. The concerned administrator listens to his staff to find out if they are or are not satisfied and takes corrective action when problems arise. Most staff members will be fair, objective, and suggestive if they feel retaliation will not follow, and that their efforts will produce positive results. Awareness of what is happening in the division and of what areas, particularly personnel management, need improvement are the results of staff evaluation.

Evaluation by Immediate Supervisors

The immediate supervisor is directly responsible for the day-to-day production level of all the employees (administrators) in his department. His training, job experience, and job assignment put him in the best position to conduct evaluations of department members, and since he is responsible for the performance of his department, he must evaluate if he is to be held accountable. His contacts with all immediate subordinates (administrators) puts him in the best position to provide valid, unbiased comparative staff evaluations, and since he is responsible for each subordinate's output, his evaluations will have the greatest effect on department personnel. Although immediate supervisors should evaluate their subordinates, there are several disadvantages from this source. The immediate supervisor's position creates a type of interference to the evaluation process. Another problem is the fact that the immediate supervisor in many cases has not been directly involved with this specific task for quite sometime, and may not be able to produce an objective evaluation based upon current knowledge or methodology. The supervisor also had the
problem of determining what good production levels are for the various tasks in his department. It is extremely difficult for one individual to be knowledgeable in the various disciplines within the department. Finally, the immediate supervisor; for fear of morale problems, concern for his subordinate's welfare, concern about his own acceptance, or for a variety of similar reasons, often finds it very difficult to "call them as he sees them."

This source of evaluation by itself would not be fair to the evaluator or the evaluatee, but when used as a part of a comprehensive program, it will be a very valuable source of evaluation.

**Evaluation by Teachers**

One of the most important aspects of the administrator's effectiveness is his relationship with the teachers. The administrators, as managers of the institution, determine institutional policies, who will be hired, what salaries will be paid, who will be fired, etc., and as a result have a tremendous influence on teachers. The opinions that teachers hold toward the administrator are extremely important to his effectiveness as an administrator. The good administrator is aware of this fact and actively seeks the opinions of teachers concerning his effectiveness.

The administrator-teacher relationship is extremely important to the institution. Dissent between the two groups or individuals of the two groups must not be allowed to continue. Administrators must listen to teachers and actively seek their opinions if they are going to be effective as administrators.
Evaluation by Outside Consultants

This source of evaluation offers several advantages. Since he is outside the institution and has nothing personally at stake at the local institution, his evaluations will not be biased by local problems, etc. The consultants brought in to evaluate are experts in their fields, and as experts are up to date on the latest research findings and the most successful evaluation. The outside consultants bring with them their own value systems and will tend to evaluate in terms of these values. Another factor is that items that are considered important by local personnel may not be viewed as important by the consultants and may be completely neglected. The biggest problem is that consultants are not cheap and the cost to the local institution could be extremely high.

In spite of these drawbacks, outside consultants could be a valuable source of evaluation particularly if used as part of a comprehensive system. The frequent use of outside consultants would be impractical because of the high cost involved, but once every three to four years could prove very valuable to the local institution. This source could detect general trends, serve as a quality control check on the institutional evaluation system, and provide a valuable source of information on new developments in education.

Evaluation by Lay Residents

The community college/technical institute by definition is considered to be a part of the local town, county, or area in which it is located. Institutional programs are built on the needs and wants of the local community. The large variety of courses that are offered allow participation by practically all of the local adult members.
Although the vast majority of the local members have very little direct contact with the local institution, most of these people have an opinion or opinions about the institution. These opinions may be based on hearsay, but whatever the basis, the opinions of the lay residents will have some effect on the local institution.

Lay residents should certainly be included as a source of institutional evaluation, however, they do not appear to be a good source for evaluation of individual administrators. Most lay residents identify with the institution as a whole, not with individual administrators or teachers. Those who know the institution through personal contact are so few in number that it would be extremely hard to come up with a reliable, valid evaluation.

The one position that might benefit from lay resident evaluation is the president, since many lay residents identify the institution and president very closely. However, as a part of a total comprehensive source of administrative evaluation, lay residents do not appear to be a good choice. Research on this source is non-existent, and because of the lack of information, evaluation by lay residents has been included in this research study.

Other Relevant Reviews of the Literature

Administrator evaluation is a subject that has received very little attention thus far. Most of the available research is on sources and combinations of sources for teacher evaluation. However, the same questions that exist in teacher evaluation, also exist in administrator evaluation.
The reliability and validity of the various sources of administrator evaluation have not been established by research, nor has any conclusive research been done on the various possible combination of sources. However, most of those who have done research in this area, feel that some sort of combination of sources would provide a better evaluation process than the use of a single source of evaluation. (17,77)

For this reason administrators and teachers in the NCTI/CCS have been solicited for their opinions as to which sources of evaluation should be included, and the relative importance of each source to administrative evaluation.
RESEARCH DESIGN

Introduction

The design of this research was influenced by the fact that it was conducted, in part, in cooperation with a doctoral dissertation project submitted by Mr. Arlie R. Smith to the Graduate Faculty of North Carolina State University at Raleigh. The title of his dissertation was "Student, Teacher and Administrator Attitudes Related to Evaluation of the Classroom Effectiveness of Community College Teachers", and was under the direction of Dr. J. Conrad Glass, Jr. of North Carolina State University. The principal areas of cooperation were in definition of the population, sample design and selection, instrumentation, and data collection including editing, coding and tabulation. The analyses, interpretation and reporting of results were treated as separate functions in order to accomplish the objectives of each of the two original projects. The decision to cooperate was based on the fact that a combination of resources would permit doubling the originally planned sample size, and it was believed that better results would be achieved from one combined questionnaire than two individual questionnaires, on basically the same material, sent out at separate but approximately the same time.

Sample Design and Selection

The sample design and selection for this research were recommended by Mr. Robert G. Templin, Jr., Research Consultant, retained for this purpose. The following description of the sample design and selection
Sample Design

As in most instances of educational research employing a survey research design, it is not possible to collect data from every respondent relevant to this study but only from some fractional part of all the possible respondents.

The sample design for this study is a two-stage stratified systematic sample. For reasons described below, this particular design was considered to be the most appropriate after careful consideration of several alternative designs including simple random, stratified, and other multi-staged systematic designs.

As the word "systematic" implies, the selection of sampling units involves a progression through the sampling frame selection every Kth sampling unit, starting with a random selection of the first unit. This design was selected for its property of distributing the sample more uniformly over the entire population while producing a relatively bias-free and random-based process of selection. (2,514) Snedecor and Cochran note that "systematic sampling" often gives more accurate results than simple random sampling. (24,519)

The universe from which the sample was drawn was defined as all full-time students, teachers, and administrators enrolled or employed in the NCTI/CSC during the winter quarter, 1974-75. Based on estimates of resources available to conduct the survey, the statistical tests to be employed, and the assumption that institutions were relatively homogeneous while institutional populations were comparatively heterogeneous with regard to critical variable characteristics, (16,52) it was deter-
mined that optimum sample size should consist of sixteen institutions in the first stage and two sub-samples (one of faculty and administrators, and the other of students) of three hundred each for a total of six hundred participants in the second stage.

Having defined the sample universe, the primary sampling units in the first stage (institution), and the ultimate sampling units in the second stage (faculty-administrators and students), the first stage sampling frame (the collection of primary sampling units which may be unambiguously defined and indentified) was completed using data on institutional characteristics supplied by the North Carolina Department of Community Colleges.

To establish confidence in the unbiased nature of the selection process and to prevent the systematic cycle from possibly coinciding with periodic variations or wave lengths distributed within the first stage sampling frame, two safeguards were added to the design: stratification dimensions and a two-sample selection.

Stratification dimensions were added to assure that the sample would be representative of the population in terms of the critical factors of this research and to assure an adequate number of cases for subgroup analysis. (3,121) On the basis of projections of institutional size, institutions were stratified by size of student enrollment on the sampling frame. Using the concept of "paper zones," (7,167) four equal size strata were created. Within each of these strata, institutions were further stratified by type of institution (community college or technical institute). The resulting first stage sampling frame is shown in Table 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Projected Population</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Sample 1</th>
<th>Sample 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Zone 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Central Piedmont Community College</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3865</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Davidson County Community College</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1223</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Wayne Community College</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gaston College</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sandhills Community College</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Southeastern Community College</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Coastal Carolina Community College</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>958</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Fayetteville Technical Institute</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Cleveland County Technical Institute</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1431</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Guilford Technical Institute</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Forsyth Technical Institute</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1047</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Wake Technical Institute</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Rowan Technical Institute</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Durham Technical Institute</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Zone 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Lenoir Community College</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>939</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Wilkes Community College</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>726</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. College of the Albemarle</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>673</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Rockingham Community College</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Surry Community College</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Western Piedmont Community College</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>613</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Asheville-Buncombe Technical Institute</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>865</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued
TABLE 1--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Projected Population</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paper Zone 2--Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Catawba Valley Technical Institute</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Central Carolina Technical Institute</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Pitt Technical Institute</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Cape Fear Technical Institute</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Haywood Technical Institute</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Technical Institute of Alamance</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Piedmont Technical Institute</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Zone 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Mitchell Community College</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Caldwell Community College and Tech Inst</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Isothermal Community College</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Craven Community College</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Richmond Technical Institute</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Wilson County Technical Institute</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Carteret Technical Institute</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Halifax County Technical Institute</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Robeson Technical Institute</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Sampson Technical Institute</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Martin Technical Institute</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Randolph Technical Institute</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Beaufort Technical Institute</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Projected Population</th>
<th>Sample 1</th>
<th>Sample 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Zone 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Vance-Granville Technical Institute</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Johnston Technical Institute</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Edgecombe Technical Institute</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Blue Ridge Technical Institute</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. James Sprunt Institute</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Southwestern Technical Institute</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Tri-County Technical Institute</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Nash Technical Institute</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Roanoke-Chowan Technical Institute</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Anson Technical Institute</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Stanley Technical Institute</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. McDowell Technical Institute</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Montgomery Technical Institute</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Bladen Technical Institute</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Pamlico Technical Institute</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instead of making a single systematic draw resulting in a first stage sample of sixteen institutions, it was decided to make two separate sample selections to reduce the chance coincidence with periodic variation on the sampling frame. In addition, the adopted two-sample design offered the attractive feature that either one of the samples could have been used to the exclusion of the other without completely destroying the integrity of the sample design and selection if resources had required a reduction of overall sample size.

The second stage sampling frame consisted of two tests (one of full-time faculty and administrators and the second of full-time students) for each institution selected from the first stage sample draw. The faculty-administrator sampling frame was stratified by faculty-administrator dimensions with faculty further stratified by teaching curriculum (occupational faculty including both vocational and technical teachers, college transfer, and general education). The faculty was not stratified into vocational and technical curricula because of the several institutions which were unable to clearly distinguish between the two. The student sampling frame was also stratified by curriculum (technical, vocational, college transfer, general education, and special education). The consequence of this design was that at each of the sample institutions there were two listing: one containing all full-time faculty and administrators, and the other containing all full-time students; each of these listings was stratified; and one sub-sample from each listing was drawn, resulting in a total of thirty-two sampling frames and sample selections for the research project during the second stage.
Sample Selection

Inasmuch as this research had the dual objectives of studying faculty and administrators on the one hand and students on the other, the only feasible technique for yielding the sample sizes desired while maintaining a sample design which accorded equitability of selection was that of drawing the primary sampling units with equal probability and the ultimate sampling units at a constant proportional rate. To approximate the attainment of desired sample sizes, the sample proportions employed for the second stage were 30 percent for the faculty-administrator sub-sample and 3 percent for the student sub-sample.

Implementing the sample design, the first stage sample of institutions was selected through two separate systematic draws of eight institutions each, using the sampling ratio

$$\frac{N_1}{n_1} = \text{ISG},$$

where $N_1$ was the primary sampling unit population (57), $n_1$ was the desired first stage sample size (8), and ISG was the "Institutional Sampling Gap" (7.125). For the first sample, the number "8" was randomly selected from a table of random digits and identified on the sampling frame. Then by a systematic process of adding the ISG to "8" and each subsequent number, the seven remaining institutions were selected. The second institutional sample of eight was selected in the same manner starting with the random selection of the number "17".

A modification had to be made to the listing of the first sampled draw because one of the institutions selected declined to participate in the study. The replacement selection was made by first restricting the random selection to technical institutes not already selected into either of the.
two institutional samples, but which were in the same strata as the declining institution. Under this criterion five institutions were available as replacements, and were numbered consecutively prior to the random selection. The second institution selected as a replacement also decided not to participate, and the process was repeated. The third institution selected by this process agreed to participate.

The second stage of the sample selection involved the identification of three sub-samples of ultimate sample units: full-time teaching faculty, administrators and students. A complete listing of all full-time faculty, administrators and students was obtained from each of the sixteen institution selected for inclusion in the sample. After the lists were purged of all unqualified or duplicate names, a list was prepared of the faculty, reordered them by program, i.e., occupational including technical and vocational, college transfer, and general, and alphabetical within each of the programs. On the administrator list, the names were reordered alphabetically and added to the end of the faculty listing. Once this single list was constructed, containing occupational faculty, transfer faculty, general faculty and administrators, it was numbered consecutively beginning with number "1" with the first occupational faculty member through the last administrator. The sample units were then selected, using the sampling ratio.

\[
\frac{N_f a}{n_f a} = FASC,
\]

where \( N_f a \) was the total number of faculty and administrators on the list, \( n_f a \) was the desired sample size determined by multiplying the sample proportion, which was a constant 30 percent for faculty and administrators, times \( N_f a \), the total number of faculty and administrators on the list,
and FASG was the "Faculty-Administrator Sampling Gap." At this time a number was selected from a table of random digits and located on the faculty-administrator listing and became the first unit in this sample unit. Then, the FASG was added to this number and each subsequent number until it was done \( n_{fa} \) times.

The same procedure was essentially followed for the student sample. The listings were ordered by technical, vocational, college transfer, general education, and special credit students and alphabetically within each group. After numbering the total list consecutively, the sample was selected using the sampling ratio

\[
\frac{N_s}{n_s} = SSG,
\]

where \( N_s \) was the total number of students on the list, \( n_s \) was the desired sample size determined by multiplying the sample proportion, which was a constant 3 percent for students, times \( N_s \), the total number of students on the list, and SSG was the "Student Sampling Gap." The results of both selection processes are shown by institution in Table 2.

**Limitations**

As in the case of any scientific sampling, there are limitations to the design and procedures used. The first of three general limitations was that to the degree the assumption regarding the homogeneity of institutions and the heterogeneity of faculty, administrators and students was false, we could expect the larger will be the sampling error. (16,52)

Second, while the first stage sampling frame was limited to two stratification dimensions (institutional size and type) and thus resulted in a more than adequate distribution of these dimensions in the sample, it could not be stratified any further. The consequence of this limited
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution and Code</th>
<th>Faculty-Administrator Sample Unit</th>
<th>Student Sample Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual Population</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>971</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
stratification is that some genographical clustering occurred with urban institutions noticeably absent. To the extent that these dimensions are related to the variables under investigation in this study, the larger will be the sampling error.

Third, the actual sample size achieved during the selection process varied somewhat from the desired sample size since data on which sample calculations were based were population projections made on the most recent data available from the Department of Community Colleges. The variability between the desired and the actual sample sizes, however, was minimal and should have no effect on the integrity of the research design.

Finally, the necessity to replace one of the institutions originally selected into the sample must be recognized as a possible source of bias or the research results.

Instrumentation

The instrument designed and used for the collection of data in this research is a combined questionnaire encompassing the data essential for accomplishment of the objectives of both research studies. The design of this research required that certain demographic data be collected from students, teachers and administrators, as well as information on attitudes of the groups regarding the evaluation of the effectiveness of teachers in the classroom and the effectiveness of the administrator on the job. A copy of the combined questionnaire is enclosed as Appendix A. The primary impact on the combined questionnaire was the increase in length. Considerable effort was made to keep the instrument as brief as possible. All questions designed and included to collect data re-
levant to Smith's study were also determined to be useful to this re-
search study. Clarification of questions occurs in the discussion of
the questionnaire.

The questionnaire consisted of seven sections. The first section
provided brief general instructions for completion of the questionnaires.
The second section included the study's definitions of teacher effect-
iveness and evaluation, which were considered necessary to the respond-
ent in completing the questionnaire.

The third section was designed to obtain demographic information
pertinent to the study, to include current status, (i.e., students, teacher
or administrator), sex, age, and tenure in their current status (for
administrator and teachers only) which included total time in similar
positions within the NCTI/CCS.

The fourth section was designed to collect data on the attitude
related to the general hypothesis that teachers and administrators are
motivated to a better performance by evaluation. This portion of the
questionnaire was adapted from an instrument developed by Wagoner and
O'Hanlon for use in their study of teacher attitudes toward evaluation. (23,7:
The adaptation involved minor rewording of some of the individual questions
to remove the teacher directed posture of the questions and make them
applicable for collecting the attitude of students and administrators
as well. In an effort to obtain a more valid measurement of the respond-
ent's attitude toward evaluation, seven questions were used rather than
just one, and they were constructed to obtain from the respondent a re-
spondent a response on his/her attitude about evaluation as it applies
to others, as well as to himself. The questions, as constructed, were
also designed to obtain data on present and ideal evaluation practices. This questionnaire was originally developed through the use of a panel of experts and was tested in a small pilot study. There are two possible responses to each of the questions: "Yes, in most cases" and "No, in most cases." "Yes" responses were assigned a value of "2" and "no" responses a value of "1." On this basis, a score was determined for each respondent; "14" indicated the most favorable attitude toward evaluation and "7" the least favorable. (23,71)

The design of the next section (Section V) of the questionnaire was based on the need for data on the attitudes of students, teachers and administrators as to the relative importance of the various possible sources of evaluative information on teacher's and administrator's job effectiveness. The sources under consideration for this study were self, peer, student, administrator, alumni, department head (immediate supervisor), outside consultants, and employers of former students. Participants were asked to rate the importance of each of the sources by checking one of five descriptive scales: (1) Absolutely should not be included, (2) Probably should not be included, (3) Maybe (Inclusion depends on local circumstances that differ between institution), (4) Probably should be included, and (5) Absolutely essential. For the purpose of the statistical analysis the responses were assigned values of one to five, commencing with one for the most negative response.

The sixth section was designed to collect data on the attitudes of teachers and administrators as to how often and when evaluation of teachers and administrators should be conducted by each source. On question "R", participants were asked to designate how often evaluation should
be conducted by placing the number of their response in the box provided by each source: (1) once/quarter, (2) once every other quarter, (3) once/course, (4) twice/course, (5) twice/year, (6) once/year, (7) once/2 years, (8) once/3 years, (9) once/4 years, and (10) not at all. On question "S", participants were asked to designate when evaluation should be conducted by placing the number of their response in the box provided by each source: (1) within time periods established by each institution, (2) at a time specified by the evaluated, (3) at a time specified by the evaluator(s), (4) at an unannounced time, (5) all of the previous statements, (6) statements 2, 3, and 4, and (7) never.

The seventh and final section was designed to determine the criteria for evaluation and the relative importance of each of the criteria as perceived by teachers and administrators. On question "T", teachers and administrators were asked to rate the importance of each of the criteria relative to teacher evaluation by checking one of six descriptive scales: (1) poor idea, (2) maybe, (3) good idea, (4) should do, (5) must do, and (X=6) eliminate. For the purpose of computer analysis, the responses were assigned values of 0 - 5, commencing with zero as the most negative response. On question "U", teachers and administrators were asked to rate the importance of each of the criteria relative to administrator evaluation by checking one of six descriptive scales. The descriptive scales and the computer analysis process were exactly the same as those used in question "T."

The survey instrument was pretested for clarity and interpretative quality in order to increase the accuracy and thoroughness of response information. This pretest was accomplished with a group of sixty-seven
students, twenty-four teachers and ten administrators at Carteret Technical Institute, Morehead City, North Carolina, an institution in the NCTI/CCS. This institution was not selected into the sample of this study. The selection of the participants was not made by a random method or any other scientific procedure. A tabulation was made of the results of this pretest and where it appeared there was some misunderstanding of a question, appropriate modifications were made. Improvements were made in cases where questions were not answered or were answered incompletely, as well as in those cases where it appeared that the respondents misunderstood the intent of the question. In addition, recommendations of the researcher's advisory committee were used as a basis for refinements of the questionnaire.

Collection and Coding of Data

After design and construction of the sample and development of the survey instrument, the data were collected by mail during February and March, 1975. The questionnaires were attached to cover letters explaining the purpose of the research and soliciting the cooperation of the respondents in careful and prompt completion and return of the requested information. This initial mailing was made 31 January, 1975 to students, teachers and administrators from fifteen of the sixteen institutions selected in the sample (institutions 02 through 16 in Table 2). A copy of the cover letter is enclosed as Appendix B. In addition to the cover-letter and questionnaire, a self-addressed, stamped envelope was enclosed for return mailing. Two weeks after the initial mailing (15 February, 1975), a follow-up letter was sent to all students, teachers and administrators at the same institutions to which the initial mailing had been made. A copy of this letter is enclosed as Appendix C.
This mailing also included a questionnaire and a self-addressed, stamped envelope for return mailing.

The initial mailing was not made to the sixteenth institution until 15 February, 1975, due to the necessity to substitute for one of the Technical Institutes who declined to participate. The follow-up mailing was made to this institution on 28, February, 1975.

As shown in Table 2, the mailing was made to a sample of 323 students and 299 faculty-administrators for a total sample mailing of 622. A total of 181 student responses were received for a response of 56 per cent. The faculty-administrator response rate was 80.9 per cent on 242 responses. The faculty-administrator sample unit response consisted of 150 faculty and 92 administrator responses. The overall response rate was 68 per cent on 423 responses. Responses received after 7 April, 1975 were not used.

During the period 15 March to 6 April, 1975, the returned questionnaires were reviewed and prepared for coding. Those reflecting unusable data (those primarily using incorrect response scales or interpreting the response scales incorrectly) were discarded. They were not included in the response rates cited above. In addition, during this period decisions were made as to the format for arranging the data on computer cards and a code manual was prepared for use in keypunching, programming and analyzing the data. The questionnaires were delivered to a commercial keypunch firm for keypunching on 7 April, 1975. To maximize accuracy in the coding process, all cards were verified during the keypunch operation, and an accuracy check was made from a computer listing of all data recorded on the computer cards.
ANALYSES AND INTERPRETATIONS

Characteristics of Respondents

This section describes some of the characteristics of the respondents by sample unit, i.e., student, teachers and administrators. The characteristics presented include those that were considered independent variables in this research.

Student Characteristics

Relevant characteristics of students include sex, age, type of program and type of institution. These characteristics are depicted in Table 3.

TABLE 3
STUDENT RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 30 years</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Transfer</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Institute</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher Characteristics

Relevant characteristics of teachers include sex, age, tenure, type of degree, type of program, and type of institution. These characteristics are depicted in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 30 years</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40 years</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40 years</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Degree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma, equivalent, or less</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate degree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS or BA</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters degree</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Transfer</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Institution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Institute</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ten respondents failed to complete this question*
Administrator Characteristics

Relevant characteristics of administrators include sex, age, tenure, type of degree, and type of institution. These characteristics are depicted in Table 5.

**TABLE 5**

**ADMINISTRATOR RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 30 years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40 years</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40 years</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Degree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma, equivalent, or less</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate degree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS or BA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters degree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Institution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Institute</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aOne respondent failed to complete this question.
General Attitudes Toward Evaluation

Teacher Evaluation

The respondents were asked: Please read each question carefully and check either "Yes, in most cases" or "No, in most cases," whichever more clearly describes your feeling about the statement.

Table 6
ATTITUDES TOWARD TEACHER EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Evaluation</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should teaching be evaluated each year?</td>
<td>1.839</td>
<td>1.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is evaluation an effective means of improving the competence of a teacher?</td>
<td>1.801</td>
<td>1.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are evaluations of teacher's competence accurate?</td>
<td>1.683</td>
<td>1.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should the teacher's reemployment depend upon evaluation?</td>
<td>1.585</td>
<td>1.489a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is evaluation an effective means of eliminating incompetent teachers?</td>
<td>1.572</td>
<td>1.389a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it possible to evaluate a teacher's competence accurately?</td>
<td>1.546</td>
<td>1.475a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should teachers be paid according to their competence as determined by evaluation?</td>
<td>1.519</td>
<td>1.435a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean scores below "1.5" indicate more "No's" than "Yes's"

The questions contained in Table 6 were designed to ascertain the attitudes of students, administrators and teachers toward teacher evaluation. In order to analyze the above information each "Yes" response was given a value of "2" and each "No" response a value of "1". A mean score of "2" would indicate all "Yes's", whereas a mean score of "1" would indicate all "No's" to a particular question with a score of "1.5".
indicating an equal member of "Yes's" and "No's" on a particular question. As can be seen from Table 6: student responses to all of the above questions were positive, administrator responses were positive on all of the above questions except one, but teacher responses were positive on only three of the seven questions. This indicates that students and administrators both have overall positive attitudes toward evaluation, whereas teachers appear to have an overall negative attitude toward teacher evaluation.

In Smith's study using the same questions found in Table 6, he used a composite score for all of the above questions for each group of respondents. A total score of "14" would indicate the most positive score, while a score of "7" would indicate the most negative response with a score of "10.5" indicating a neutral position. Mr. Smith found that students and administrators hold a significantly more favorable attitude toward evaluation than teachers. However, the overall combined scores (Table 7) on each group was only slightly more than 10.5 which suggest that none of the three groups hold a highly favorable attitude toward evaluation of the effectiveness of the teacher in the classroom. (23, 85).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Attitude Scale Scores</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td>3.5&lt;sup&gt;a,b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>11.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td>3.11&lt;sup&gt;a,c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>11.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>11.81</td>
<td>.95&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>11.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 7 Continued

a Significant at .05 level.
b Based on an assumption of an equal variance of the population determined by a non-significant F-value at the .05 level.
c Based on an assumption of an unequal variance of the population determined by a significant F-value at the .05 level. *(17,85)*

**Administrator Evaluation**

The respondents were asked: Please read each question carefully and check either "Yes, in most cases," or "No, in most cases," whichever more clearly describes your feelings about the statement.

**TABLE 8**

**ATTITUDES TOWARD ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrator Evaluation</th>
<th>Mean Scores Studentsa</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should administrators be evaluated each year?</td>
<td>1.932</td>
<td>1.895</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is evaluation an effective means of improving the competence of an administrator?</td>
<td>1.831</td>
<td>1.711</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are evaluations of administrator's competence accurate?</td>
<td>1.727</td>
<td>1.489&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it possible to evaluate an administrator's competence accurately?</td>
<td>1.701</td>
<td>1.467&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should the administrator's reemployment depend upon evaluation?</td>
<td>1.617</td>
<td>1.489&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should administrators be paid according to their competence as determined by evaluation?</td>
<td>1.568</td>
<td>1.450&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is evaluation an effective means of eliminating incompetent administrators?</td>
<td>1.483&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.359&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The questions contained in Table 8 were designed to ascertain the attitudes of administrators and teachers toward administrator evaluation. The questions are the same as those asked for teacher evaluation with only minor modifications for administrator evaluation. The analysis of the data was done in the same manner as for teachers, i.e., "Yes's" were given a value of "2" and "No's" a value of "1". A mean score of "2" would indicate all "Yes's", whereas a mean score of "1" would indicate all "No's" to a particular question with a score of "1.5" indicating an equal number of "Yes's" and "No's" on a particular question. As can be seen from Table 8: administrator responses were positive on all the above questions except one, but teacher responses were positive on only two of the seven questions. This indicates that administrators hold a favorable attitude toward administrator evaluation, but teachers appear to have an overall negative attitude toward administrator evaluation.

When comparing the composite scores (Administrators - 11.837, Teachers - 10.793) on the above data, we find that the administrators favor administrator evaluation even more highly than they do teacher evaluation. Teachers, on the other hand, are less favorable to administrator evaluation than to teacher evaluation. Although administrators have a significantly more favorable attitude toward administrator evaluation than teachers, the mean scores, which are only slightly above 10.5, indicate that neither group holds a highly favorable attitude toward administrator evaluation.
Although all three groups (Students, Administrators and Teachers) have positive attitudes toward evaluation, the margin is very slim. It appears that most respondents favor evaluation of teachers and administrators, but they have very little faith in the evaluation process, particularly teachers. This lack of faith comes from the way evaluation processes or systems have been used in the past. Far too often in the past the major goal of evaluation - the improvement of instructional performance and management performance - has been overlooked or completely ignored.

The major goal of evaluation must be to offer positive avenues for improvement of performance by the individual evaluatee, but improvement of performance will not occur until all parties involved (directly or indirectly) in the teaching-learning process accept this as the major goal. Mere acceptance of the major goal is not enough, however. Many systems have already accepted the above as the major goal of evaluation but fail because of inadequate feedback and guidance. We must remember that evaluation is not something done to the individual, but rather something that is done for the individual.

**Attitudes Toward Specified Sources of Teacher Evaluation**

Respondents to this section were asked to rate the importance of each of the sources by checking one of five descriptive scales: (1) Absolutely should not be included, (2) Probably should not be included, (3) Maybe (Inclusion depends on local circumstances that differ between institutions), (4) Probably should be included, and (5) Absolutely essential. For the purpose of analysis the responses were assigned values of one to five, with one as the most negative response.
TABLE 9
MEAN SOURCE ESSENTIALITY SCORES—TEACHER EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Source</th>
<th>Teachers R Mean</th>
<th>Administrators R Mean</th>
<th>Students R Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Heads</td>
<td>1. 4.309</td>
<td>2. 4.333</td>
<td>3. 3.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>2. 4.201</td>
<td>1. 4.522</td>
<td>1. 4.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>3. 3.854</td>
<td>3. 4.133</td>
<td>2. 4.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>4. 3.845</td>
<td>4. 4.044</td>
<td>5. 3.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>5. 3.335</td>
<td>5. 3.483</td>
<td>4. 3.509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>6. 3.084</td>
<td>6. 2.744</td>
<td>6. 2.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers of Former Students</td>
<td>7. 2.457</td>
<td>7. 2.488</td>
<td>8. 2.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Consultants</td>
<td>8. 2.197</td>
<td>8. 2.088</td>
<td>7. 2.506</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R=Rank

The sources in Table 9 have been ranked according to the teacher mean scores received by each of the sources. For purposes of this research a mean score of 3.0 or better was considered a positive response, and therefore, should be included as a source of evaluation information. The first five sources, although not in the same order, (Table 9) received positive scores from all three groups of respondents. The last three sources (with the exception of alumni) all received negative scores from the three groups of respondents and were eliminated as possible sources of evaluation information. Alumni, although receiving a positive score from the teachers, was eliminated as a possible source for two reasons: (1) research indicates that the results of this source would be essentially the same as that from the students, and (2) two (administrators and students) of the three responding groups rejected alumni as a possible source of evaluation information.
Figure 1. Relationship of Teacher, Administrator, and Student Evaluative Source Means

**Attitudes Toward Specified Sources of Administrator Evaluation**

Respondents to this section were asked to rate the importance of each of the sources by checking one of five descriptive scales: (1) Absolutely should not be included, (2) Probably should not be included, (3) Maybe (Inclusion depends on local circumstances that differ between institutions), (4) Probably should be included, and (5) Absolutely essential. For the purpose of analysis the responses were assigned values of one to five, with
one as the most negative response.

TABLE 10
MEAN SOURCE ESSENTIALITY SCORES—ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Source</th>
<th>Administrators R. Mean</th>
<th>Teachers R. Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Supervisor</td>
<td>1. 4.626</td>
<td>1. 4.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>2. 4.077</td>
<td>4. 3.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Staff</td>
<td>3. 3.855</td>
<td>3. 4.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>4. 3.824</td>
<td>2. 4.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>5. 3.670</td>
<td>5. 3.570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>6. 3.263</td>
<td>6. 3.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>7. 2.450</td>
<td>7. 2.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Residents</td>
<td>8. 2.329</td>
<td>8. 2.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Consultants</td>
<td>9. 2.219</td>
<td>9. 2.492</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R=Rank

The sources in Table 10 have been ranked according to the administrator mean scores received by each of the sources. For purposes of this research a mean score of 3.0 or better was considered a positive response, and therefore, should be included as a source of evaluation information. As can be seen from Table 10 the first six sources, although not in the same order, received positive scores from both groups of respondents. The last three sources received negative scores from both groups of respondents and were eliminated as possible sources of evaluation.

Attitudes as to How Often Evaluation Should Be Conducted By Each Source

Respondents to this section where asked to determine how often they should be evaluated by each source by checking one of ten possible selections: (1) once/quarter, (2) once every other quarter, (3) once/course, (4) twice/course, (5) twice/year, (6) once/year, (7) once/2 years, (8)
once/3 years, (9) once/4 years, and (10) not at all. All responses over ten per cent or the first three responses are shown in Table 11.

**TABLE 11**  
ATTITUDES AS TO HOW OFTEN EVALUATION SHOULD BE CONDUCTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(87)</td>
<td>(148)</td>
<td>(150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(86)</td>
<td>(146)</td>
<td>(143)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(85)</td>
<td>(149)</td>
<td>(147)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(81)</td>
<td>(83)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 once/year</td>
<td>59 once/year</td>
<td>39.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 once/quarter</td>
<td>52 once/quarter</td>
<td>35.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 twice/year</td>
<td>17 not at all</td>
<td>11.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 once/year</td>
<td>76 once/year</td>
<td>51.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 not at all</td>
<td>38 not at all</td>
<td>25.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 twice/year</td>
<td>12 once/quarter</td>
<td>8.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 once/year</td>
<td>53* once/year</td>
<td>35.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 once/quarter</td>
<td>49 once/course</td>
<td>32.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 not at all</td>
<td>15 once/course</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 not at all</td>
<td>48 not at all</td>
<td>32.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 once/year</td>
<td>46 once/year</td>
<td>31.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 once/4 years</td>
<td>25 once/2 years</td>
<td>17.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 once/2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 not at all</td>
<td>79 not at all</td>
<td>55.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 once/year</td>
<td>27 once/year</td>
<td>18.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 once/4 years</td>
<td>12 once/4 years</td>
<td>8.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106 once/year</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 once/quarter</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 twice/year</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Heads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93 once/year</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 once/course</td>
<td>21.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 twice/year</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 not at all</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 once/year</td>
<td>28.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 once/2 years</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 once/year</td>
<td>64.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 twice/year</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 not at all</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first two responses on the five common sources (Self, Peers, Students, Alumni, and Consultants) are the same for both administrators and teachers. This seems to indicate that administrators and teachers are in close agreement as to how often evaluation should be conducted. The first response of both groups supports this idea, since there is only one source (Alumni) where the difference in the percentage of response is greater than six percent. However, when comparing the second responses of both groups, we find that three of the common sources (Peers, Students, and Alumni) have a difference in the percentage of response greater than nine percent.
Furthermore, when comparing the first and second teacher responses, we find that the first choice on all but three sources (Self, Students, and Alumni) is better than double or almost double the percentage of the second response. The first and second responses on Self, Students, and Alumni are so close that either response would be considered appropriate for this research. However, when comparing the first and second administrator responses, we find only one source (Self) in which a clear cut margin between the first and second responses is not evident.

Attitudes as to When Evaluation Should Be Conducted By Each Source

Respondents to this question were asked to determine when they should be evaluated by each source by checking one of seven possible choices: (1) Within time periods established by each institution, (2) At a time specified by the evaluated, (3) At a time specified by the evaluator(s), (4) At an unannounced time, (5) All of the previous statements, (6) Statements 2, 3, and 4, and (7) Never.

After reviewing the responses to this question, it was felt that choice number one should not have been included since the majority is naturally going to accept whatever is established by the institution. For this reason all choices that received ten per cent or better or that had ten or more respondents are shown in Table 12. However, the bias created by choice number one does not allow conclusive evidence to be drawn as to when evaluation should be conducted by each of the sources.
**TABLE 12**

**ATTITUDES AS TO WHEN EVALUATION SHOULD BE CONDUCTED**

1. within time periods established 
   by each institution 
2. at a time specified by the evaluated 
3. at a time specified by the evaluator(s) 
4. at an unannounced time 
5. all of the previous statements 
6. statements 2, 3, and 4 
7. never

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>62.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>never</td>
<td>12.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>never</td>
<td>47.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(83)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>never</td>
<td>53.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(143)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(144)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(145)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>never</td>
<td>8.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(144)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>never</td>
<td>47.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>never</td>
<td>22.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(144)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(144)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>never</td>
<td>6.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(142)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>never</td>
<td>33.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(146)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>never</td>
<td>47.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Administrators**

| (143)         |             |         |
| 86            | 1           | 60.14   |
| 22            | 4           | 15.38   |
| 9             | 2           | 6.29    |

**Department Heads**

| (144)         |             |         |
| 86            | 1           | 59.72   |
| 24            | 4           | 16.66   |
| 15            | 3           | 10.41   |

**Employers**

| (144)         |             |         |
| 59            | never       | 40.97   |
| 52            | 1           | 36.80   |
| 14            | 4           | 9.72    |
TABLE 12—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th># Responses</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator's Staff</td>
<td>(85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52.94</td>
<td>(85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>never</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Supervisor</td>
<td>(84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Residents</td>
<td>(84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>never</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a( ) Total respondents on each source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation Criteria—Teachers

Respondents to this question were asked to rate the importance of each of the criteria by checking one of six descriptive scales: (X) Eliminate, (1) Poor idea, (2) Maybe, (3) Good idea, (4) Should do, and (5) Must do. For the purpose of analysis the responses were assigned values of zero to five, with zero as the most negative response.

For purposes of this research a mean score of 3.0 or better was considered a positive response. As can be seen from Table 13, all of the criteria for teacher evaluations received a mean score of 3.0 or better by both teachers and administrators, and therefore, they have been included as evaluation criteria for teachers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluative Criteria</th>
<th>Ten. Mean</th>
<th>Adm. Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepare thoroughly for each instructional program</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop clearly defined and appropriate goals</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be fair and reasonably prompt in evaluation of student performance</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate at a level appropriate to the ability of students to understand</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish clearly defined grading procedures and standards in accordance with the grading policy of the institution</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be punctual and consistent in attending scheduled meetings (class, labs, office hours, etc.)</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show concern for the academic welfare of students</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop an outline for his instructional program(s)</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop major (quarterly) objectives for his courses</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and/or use instructional strategies which enable students to achieve learning objectives</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect and use feedback from experience with students to revise and update content, objectives, and instructional strategies</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate textbooks, equipment, and supplies and recommend his choices for adoption by dates specified by the institution</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Properly and promptly perform routine administrative duties (reports, forms, grades, etc.)</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use evaluation instruments which measure the degree to which the student has achieved the goals and objectives of the learning sequence</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide alternative methods of instruction to meet the needs of different students</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show evidence of professional growth by participating in some of the following activities such as:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Internal development workshops, and/or (2) Community college/professionally sponsored workshops, and/or (3) Conference or seminars whenever possible, (4) Courses of related study, and/or (5) Local, state, and national organizations</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in evaluation of instructional programs and teaching effectiveness of his department or division</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach by objectives (own) developed for the courses</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 13--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluative Criteria</th>
<th>Tea. R Mean</th>
<th>Admin. R Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Give each student a copy of the course outline and objectives</td>
<td>19 3.96 11 4.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend all staff and faculty meetings, all general faculty committee meetings unless excused by his divisional chairman</td>
<td>20 3.94 18 4.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in student advisory programs</td>
<td>21 3.84 22 3.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use diagnostic procedures and instruments to ascertain student needs</td>
<td>22 3.71 23 3.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate annually in the development and evaluation of the philosophy, objectives, policies, and procedures of the institution</td>
<td>23 3.70 24 3.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State the objectives in measurable, behavioral outcomes</td>
<td>24 3.60 19 4.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop minor (weekly) objectives for his courses</td>
<td>25 3.57 21 3.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask students to state their purpose and objectives for taking this course</td>
<td>26 3.44 28 3.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask students to state how they intend to accomplish their objectives</td>
<td>27 3.34 27 3.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use his professional skills and abilities in community affairs</td>
<td>28 3.28 26 3.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assume divisional responsibilities</td>
<td>29 3.26 30 3.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve on and/or chair divisional and college wide committees</td>
<td>30 3.23 29 3.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R \] is the numerical ranking by the mean scores

Evaluation Criteria--Administrators

Respondents to this question were asked to rate the importance of each of the criteria by checking one of six descriptive scales: (X) Eliminate, (1) Poor idea, (2) Maybe, (3) Good idea, (4) Should do, and (5) Must do. For the purpose of analysis the responses were assigned values of zero to five, with zero as the most negative response.

For purposes of this research a mean score of 3.0 or better was considered a positive response. As can be seen from Table 14, all of the criteria for teacher evaluations received a mean score of 3.0 or better by both teachers and administrators, and therefore, they have been included as evaluation criteria for teachers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluative Criteria</th>
<th>Adm. R²</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Tpa. R²</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop long range goals for his department or area of responsibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop short range goals for his department or area of responsibility</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate adequate knowledge in his specialty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be punctual and consistent in attending scheduled meetings (office hours, appointments, etc.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize his staff to obtain goals set for department</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request budgetary support for his plans</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop job descriptions for each member of his staff</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Properly and promptly perform routine administrative duties (reports, forms, etc.)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish priorities and allocate his time in accordance with his schedule</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show evidence of professional growth by participating in some of the following activities such as:</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Internal development workshops, and/or (2) Community college/professional sponsored workshops, and/or (3) Conference or seminars whenever possible, and/or (4) Courses of related study, and/or (5) Local, state and national organizations</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate annually in the development and evaluation of the philosophy, objectives, policies, and procedures of the institution</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop organizational plans and procedures to attain goals set for the department</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observe a reasonable and demanding schedule</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate staff members individually each year and make firm recommendations</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrange in-service experience for his staff members as need becomes apparent</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit his plans in conference and in writing to his staff</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend all staff and faculty meetings and all divisional or department meetings unless excused by his supervisor</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State his performance objectives in measurable terms</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit his plans in conference and in writing to his supervisors</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The criteria listed for teachers and administrators are by no means all inclusive. They represent criteria selected from available research which are most applicable to the Community College/Technical Institute environment. Several sources, Pierce, Schulman, and ERS Circulors Number 5, 6, and 7 proved to be very helpful in selecting the lists of criteria for this study.

The evaluation criteria for teachers (Table 13) and the evaluation criteria for administrators (Table 14) have been put into numerical order by the mean scores of the teachers and administrators respectively. The second column for each set of criteria represents the numerical ranking by mean scores of the other group (administrators and teachers) of respondents. When examining the teacher criteria (Table 13), and the administrative criteria (Table 14), we find a great deal of variation in the responses of both groups, but there are only five cases (8, 18, 19, 24, and 25) in the
teacher criteria and only six cases (2, 14, 16, 17, 22, and 25) in the administrator criteria where the numerical difference is greater than three. This indicates that teachers and administrators are fairly close in their opinions about the criteria for evaluation of both groups. Furthermore, positive scores of 3.0 or better were received by all of the teacher and administrator criteria from both groups of respondents. Since all of the criteria received positive scores, all will be used in development of the evaluation instrument.

![Administrator Evaluation](image)

**Figure 2. Relationship of Administrator and Teacher Evaluative Source Means**
DEVELOPMENT OF EVALUATION SYSTEMS AND PROCEDURES

A good, comprehensive evaluation system will require a great deal of time and effort and it will require input from several different sources. Sources to be used for teacher evaluation are: (1) Department heads, (2) Students, (3) Administrators, (4) Self, and (5) Peers. Sources to be used for administrator evaluation are: (1) Immediate Supervisor, (2) Self, (3) Administrator's staff, (4) Teachers, (5) Peers, and (6) Students.

The evaluation process for this study has been adopted from a study conducted at Burlington County College, Pemberton, New Jersey by Pierce and Schroeder. Although there are numerous evaluation procedures which could be used, this process (The Evaluation Practices, Reviews, and Appeals Procedure) was selected as the best method for utilizing the data collected in this study.

The Evaluation Practice, Reviews, and Appeals Procedure

Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

The Evaluation Practices, Reviews, and Appeals Procedure (EPRAP) begins with a pre-evaluation conference between the faculty member and his division chairman. The purpose of this meeting is to establish the specific objectives which the faculty member intends to accomplish during the academic year. The objectives will be based upon the teacher criteria established by this research, and they must be established by mutual agreement between the faculty member and his division chairman.

A formal evaluation should be filled out and completed once per year on each faculty member by the department chairman. This evaluation should
be documented by three to four visits to the instructors classroom(s) during the academic year, and it should contain supplemental information to support the evaluation results.

A formal evaluation of each faculty member every year may be impractical. A more practical approach may be to evaluate experienced teacher every second or third year. If a staggered system is used each experienced teacher must be formally evaluated every second or third year, with an informal evaluation in the other year(s). An informal evaluation by the department head will start with the pre-evaluation conference for establishment of and agreement upon the objectives to be accomplished. The informal evaluation filled out by the department head should be documented by at least one visit to the classroom. If time permits, more visits may be made.

Teachers should also be evaluated each academic year by their students. If the teacher is up for formal evaluation, student evaluation should be conducted once per quarter in each course taught. The best time for this evaluation would be the last class meeting prior to the final exam. The forms should not be collected nor handed out by the teacher but by the class representative selected by the class or the teacher. Students should be advised not to put their names on the forms and to disguise their handwriting.

After all forms have been completed, the class representative will seal them in a folder and deliver it to the department head's office immediately after class. After all final grades have been deposited with the registrar, the teacher will break the seal and tally the results. The teacher will discuss the results with the department chairman and/or dean at an appointed time.

An informal student evaluation will follow the same basic procedure as the formal student evaluation with two exceptions: (1) The student
evaluation should be limited to one course per quarter, and (2) Discussion of results will depend on the available time of the department head.

The teacher, when up for a formal evaluation, should be evaluated at least once during the academic year by an administrator other than the department head. This evaluation should be documented by three to four visits to the instructor's classroom(s) during the academic year, and it should contain supplemental information to support the evaluation results. Administrator evaluation should only be used whenever the teacher is up for formal evaluation.

Teachers should evaluate themselves each academic year, also. A self-evaluation should be filled out once per quarter in one course taught during the quarter. The self-evaluations should be filled out at the same time the students fill out their forms and should be turned into the department head at the same time.

Although self-evaluation is more or less a continuous process, a written formal self-evaluation should be required once per quarter in at least one course whenever the teacher is up for a formal evaluation. The self-evaluation form should be filled out (in duplicate) at the same time the students fill out their forms. One copy should be sealed in the folder with the student forms and delivered to the department head by the class representative. The other copy should be delivered to the department head prior to the end of the quarter. The folder will be returned to the teacher after all final grades have been turned into the registrar, at which time the teacher will break the seal and tally the results. Discussion of the results of the student and self-evaluation should take place at a date and time established by mutual agreement.
One final group which should be included in teacher evaluation is fellow peers. The teacher, when up for formal evaluation, should be evaluated at least once during the academic year by one or two fellow teachers selected by mutual agreement between the department head and the teacher (evaluatee). The fellow teacher(s) should be from the same department and the same discipline if possible. The peer evaluation(s) should be documented by three or four visits to the instructors classroom(s) during the academic year and it should contain supplemental information to support the evaluation results. Peer evaluation should only be used whenever the teacher is up for formal evaluation.

Team Evaluation

Since evaluations by the department heads, administrators, and peers are filled out once per year with three to four visits to document the results, a team approach to formal evaluation seems to be very logical.

A team consisting of the department head, one administrator, and two peers could provide several advantages: (1) By visiting the class as a team, the number of classroom visits can be limited to three or four for any one teacher, (2) By visiting as a team the documentation will occur at the same time, with the same teacher and students, and under the same conditions. This should provide a much more valid cross reference of the final evaluations. (3) By visiting as a team documentation and supplemental information should all be completed at the same time. (4) Completing the visits at the same time should allow the evaluators to fill out their forms and turn in the evaluations on each individual at approximately the same time. (5) Visiting as a team will allow some scheduling of the visits which should create a much smoother evaluation process.
As long as each member does part as scheduled, the evaluation process should flow very smoothly.

Each member of the committee should seal his evaluation and supplemental information in a large folder and put it in the department head's mailbox. The department head should compile the results and deliver a copy to the evaluatee no later than March 31. This should allow ample time for discussion and appeal of the results.

The Appeals Procedure

Since agreement must be reached on numerous points between the faculty member and his division chairman, conflicts about the evaluation process or about the results are bound to arise. A committee of faculty and administrators (The Evaluation Practices, Reviews, and Appeals Committee or EPRAC) should be elected to settle any conflicts that arise in the implementation of the evaluation process or about the results. This committee of faculty and administrators should be elected by the institutional staff, and it should have an odd number of members.

Action can be initiated by petition to the EPRAC by the evaluatee or any of the evaluators who are not satisfied with the evaluation process or results. Once initiated, the EPRAC chairman must request all relevant data from all parties concerned (all evaluators of the evaluatee). Testimony from all parties will be presented at a hearing scheduled to settle the dispute. After hearing the testimony and examining the evaluation forms and other relevant data, EPRAC will make a decision as to whether the evaluation was conducted according to stated procedures. The committee will inform all parties of their decision, which is binding on all parties. If the evaluation was conducted properly, the
original results will stand. If EFRAC is dissatisfied with the procedures, then it may require that all or part of the process be repeated and/or that further data must be submitted by all parties to the evaluation process. EFRAC will review this new material and render its decision. The committee does not recommend action concerning sanctions or dismissals; it only judges the evaluation procedures with respect to the final results. If unsatisfactory results are found to be valid, the appropriate members of the administrative staff must decide what action is to be taken.

The Evaluative Criteria—Faculty

The following list of criteria was determined by a survey of a representative sample of teachers and administrators throughout the community colleges of North Carolina. They have been divided into two major categories: (1) Instructional performance and (2) Responsibilities as a member of the college community.

Evaluative Criteria for Faculty

I. Criteria for Evaluation of Instructional Performance

A. Instructional performance—preparation

1. Develop in writing
   a. Clearly defined and appropriate goals
   b. An outline for each instructional program
   c. Major (quarterly) objectives for each course and state them in behavioral outcomes
   d. Minor (weekly) objectives for each course and state them in behavioral outcomes
   e. Thorough lesson plans for each instructional session

2. Evaluates textbooks, equipment, and supplies and recommends choices for adoption by dates specified by the institution

3. Establishes in writing clearly defined grading procedures and standards in accordance with the grading policy of the institution

4. Uses diagnostic (pretesting) procedures and instruments to ascertain student’s academic needs

5. Is aware of available learning resources appropriate to specified learning objectives

6. Develops instructional strategies to enable students to achieve learning objectives
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B. Instructional performance-implementation
1. Communicates at a level appropriate to the ability of students to understand
2. Teaches by own objectives developed for course
3. Shows concern for the student's academic welfare
4. Gives each student a copy of the course outline, objectives, and method of grading
5. Asks students to state their (in writing) purpose(s) and objectives for taking this course
6. Asks students to state how they intend to accomplish (in writing) their objectives
7. Uses instructional strategies to enable students to achieve learning objectives
8. Uses available learning resources appropriate to specified learning objectives

C. Instructional performance-evaluation of results of instruction
1. Is fair and prompt in evaluation of student performance
2. Collects and uses feedback from experience with students to revise and update both content and methodology
3. Uses evaluative procedures which measure the degree to which the student has achieved the goals and objectives of the course

II. Responsibilities as a Member of the College Community
A. Is punctual and attends all scheduled meetings (class, labs, office hours, faculty-staff meetings, etc.)
B. Properly and promptly perform routine administrative duties (reports, forms, grades, etc.)
C. Shows evidence of professional growth by participating in such activities as:
   1. Internal development workshops
   2. Community college/professionally sponsored workshops
   3. Conferences or seminars whenever possible
   4. Courses of related study
   5. Local, state, and national organizations
   6. Participates in the development and evaluation of the philosophy, objectives, policies, and procedures of the institution
   7. Assumes (accepts) divisional responsibilities (serves on divisional committees, additional teaching loads when necessary, etc.)
   8. Participates in evaluation of instructional programs and teaching effectiveness in the department or division
   9. Serves on college wide committees
   10. Participates in student advisory program and/or sponsors advises any student organization officially recognized by the institution
   11. Uses his professional skills and abilities in community affairs
TEACHER EVALUATION FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Teacher</th>
<th>Date Form Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course Title, number, and section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Night</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following questionnaire format is of a YES-NO type asking whether a particular instructor performance did or did not occur. If you feel your knowledge on a particular question is insufficient to answer yes or no, please check the DON'T KNOW column.

The purpose of this evaluation is to help the teacher improve his performance, so please be frank but be honest in your responses. Do not identify yourself on this form. After completing this form, seal it in a folder and put it in the department head's mail box.

DID THE TEACHER IN THIS COURSE:

I. Instructional performance-preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Develop in writing clearly defined and appropriate goals?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Develop in writing an outline for each instructional program?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Develop in writing major (quarterly) objectives for each course and state them in behavioral outcomes?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Develop in writing minor (weekly) objectives for each course and state them in behavioral outcomes?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Evaluate textbooks, equipment, and supplies and recommend choices for adoption by dates specified by the institution?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Establish in writing clearly defined grading procedures and standards in accordance with the grading policy of the institution?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Use pretesting procedures and instruments to ascertain student's academic needs?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Select learning resources appropriate to the specified learning objectives?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. Develop instructional strategies to enable students to achieve learning objectives?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. Develop in writing thorough lesson plans for each instructional session?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Instructional performance-implementation

1. Communicate at a level appropriate to the ability of students to understand?

2. Teach by own objectives developed for course?

3. Show concern for student's academic welfare?

4. Give each student a copy of the course outline, objectives, and method of grading?

5. Ask students to state their purpose(s) and objectives (in writing) for taking this course?

6. Ask students to state how they intend to accomplish (in writing) their objectives?

7. Use instructional strategies to enable students to achieve learning objectives?

8. Use available learning resources appropriate to specified learning objectives?

III. Instructional performance-evaluation of results

1. Evaluate student performance and review results promptly?

2. Collect and use feedback from experience with students to revise and update both content and methodology?

3. Use evaluative procedures which measure the degree to which the student has achieved the goals and objectives of the course?

IV. Responsibilities as a Member of the College Community

1. Attend all scheduled meetings punctually (class, labs, faculty-staff meetings, etc.)?

2. Perform routine administrative duties (reports, forms, grades, etc.) properly and promptly?

3. Show evidence of professional growth by participating in such activities as:
   - Internal development workshops
   - Community college/professionally sponsored workshops
   - Conferences or seminars whenever possible
Courses of related study

Local, state, and national organizations

4. Participate in the development and evaluation of the philosophy, objectives, policies, and procedures of the institution?

5. Accept divisional responsibilities (serving on divisional committees, additional teaching, leads, etc.)?

6. Participate in evaluation of instructional programs and teaching effectiveness in the department or division?

7. Serve on college-wide committees?

8. Participate in student advisory programs and/or sponsor-advice any student organization officially recognized by the institution?

9. Use his professional skills and abilities in community affairs?

Please identify which Group you belong to by placing the number of your Group in the box provided.

[] 1. Department Head

[] 2. Student

[] 3. Self

[] 4. Administrator

[] 5. Peer
Evaluation of Administrative Effectiveness

The Evaluation Practices, Reviews, and Appeals Procedure begins with a pre-evaluation conference between the administrator and his immediate supervisor. This conference should take place prior to the beginning (JUNE 1-JULY 1) of each fiscal year. The purpose of this meeting is to establish the specific objectives which the administrator intends to accomplish during the year. The objectives will be based upon the administrator criteria established by this research, and they must be established by mutual agreement between the administrator and his immediate supervisor.

A formal evaluation should be filled out and completed once per year on each administrator by the immediate supervisor. This evaluation should be documented by two to three progress meetings between the administrator and the supervisor, and it should contain supplemental information to support the evaluation results.

A formal evaluation of each administrator every year may be impractical. A more practical approach may be to evaluate administrators every second or third year. If a staggered system is used each administrator must be formally evaluated every second or third year, with an informal evaluation in the other year(s). Informal evaluation by the immediate supervisor will start with the pre-evaluation conference for establishment of and agreement upon the objectives to be accomplished. The informal evaluation filled out by the immediate supervisor should be documented by at least one progress meeting. More meetings will depend on the available time of the supervisor.

Although self-evaluation is more-or-less a continuous process, a
formal self-evaluation form should be filled out and completed once per year by each administrator. It should be filled out in duplicate. One copy should be sent to the immediate supervisor and the other kept for comparison with other evaluations. Discussion of the results of the self-evaluation and other evaluations will take place at a date and time established by mutual agreement.

Since the administrator's effectiveness (to a large extent) depends on how well he and his staff work together, he should be evaluated by his staff each year. He should be evaluated at a minimum of once per year; however, it is felt that the administrator-staff relationship is so important to the administrator's overall effectiveness that evaluation once per year will not be frequent enough to uncover and correct any problems that may arise during the year. How often it is used should be established at the pre-evaluation conference.

Teachers are another source which should be included in administrator evaluation. A formal evaluation should be filled out and completed once per year on each administrator by a small sample of teachers. Several methods of selecting the sample could be used, but the best method is a systematic-stratified process where the teachers are stratified by departments, put into numerical order and then systematically selected from the total group of teachers. This technique will insure a broad sample and give the administrator a good look at his total effectiveness with the teachers.

A group of teachers should be selected by this method by each immediate supervisor. Once selected, this group of teachers should be used to evaluate all the administrators up for formal evaluation by the immediate
supervisor. Teacher evaluation should be used only when the administrator is up for formal evaluation. Whenever a supervisor has more than one administrator up for evaluation, he should send out evaluation forms to only one administrator at a time. The supervisor should include a statement of who is to be evaluated, when it is to be completed, and where it should be deposited.

Each teacher, after completing administrator evaluation, should seal it in a folder and deliver it to the immediate supervisor by the specified time. After all the forms have been turned in, the supervisor should send them to the administrator (evaluatee) who will seal and tally the results. Discussion of the results should take place at a date and time established by mutual agreement.

Another group which should be included in administrator evaluation is fellow peers. The administrator, when up for formal evaluation, should be evaluated at least once during the year by one or two of his fellow peers selected by mutual agreement between the immediate supervisor and the administrator (evaluatee). Dispersal and collection of the evaluation forms should follow the same procedures as outlined for the teacher evaluations. Peer evaluation should be used only when the administrator is up for formal evaluation.

One final group which should be included in administrator evaluation is students. The administrator, when up for formal evaluation, should be evaluated at least once per year by a small sample of students. The best method for selecting the sample of students is a simple-random technique. With the exception of the sample procedure, the student evaluation procedure will follow exactly the same procedure as outlined for teacher
evaluations. Student evaluations, like teacher evaluations and peer evaluations, should be used only when the administrator is up for formal evaluation. All administrator evaluations, whether formal or informal, should be completed and turned in by March 31. This will allow ample time for discussion of the results and appeals procedures.

The Appeals Procedure

The appeals procedure for administrators will be exactly the same as that outlined for teachers on page 72, and the same committee (EPRAC) will be used for both teacher and administrator appeals. A new EPRAC should be elected each year. Ideally no one should be allowed to repeat until every staff member has served at least one turn on the committee.

The Evaluative Criteria—Administrators

The following list of criteria was determined by a survey of a representative sample of teachers and administrators throughout the community colleges of North Carolina. They have been divided into two major categories: (1) Management performance and (2) Responsibilities as a member of the college community.

Evaluative Criteria for Administrators

I. Criteria for Evaluation of Management Performance

A. Management performance-departmental
   1. Develop in writing
      a. Long-range goals for area of responsibility (consistent with the school’s mission)
      Short-range goals for area of responsibility
      Organizational plans and procedures to attain goals set for department
   2. Organize staff (personnel) to obtain goals set for department

B. Management performance-personnel
   1. Develop in writing
      a. Job descriptions for each staff position
      b. Job specifications
   2. Make job assignments according to specifications
   3. Require staff to develop written performance objectives
4. Evaluate staff members each year and make firm recommendations
5. Arrange in-service experience for staff members as need becomes apparent

Management performance-personal
1. Demonstrate adequate knowledge in his specialty
2. Is punctual in attending scheduled meetings (office hours, appointments, faculty-staff meetings, etc.)
3. Request (seeks) support (budgetary, etc.) for plans
4. Establishes priorities and allocates time according to these priorities
5. Observes a reasonable and demanding schedule
6. Develops (in writing) performance objectives stated in measurable outcomes
7. Develops (in writing) a program (reading, etc.) to keep up with the latest developments in specialty
8. Submits his plans in conference and in writing to supervisor
9. Submits plans in conference and in writing to staff

II. Responsibility as a Member of the College Community
1. Is punctual in attending scheduled meetings (office hours, appointments, faculty-staff meetings, etc.)
2. Properly and promptly performs routine administrative duties (reports, forms, etc.)
3. Shows evidence of professional growth by participating in such activities as:
   a. Internal development workshops
   b. Community college/professionally sponsored workshops
   c. Conferences or seminars whenever possible
   d. Courses of related study
   e. Local, state, and national organizations
4. Participates in the development and evaluation of the philosophy, objectives, policies, and procedures of the institution
5. Participates in evaluation of management techniques and management effectiveness
6. Participates in evaluation of instructional programs in teaching effectiveness
7. Uses his professional skills and abilities in community affairs
8. Participates in student advisory programs
9. Serves as sponsor-advisor for any student organization officially recognized by the institution
ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION FORM

Name of Administrator

Date Form Completed

Position

The following questionnaire format is of a YES-NO type asking whether a particular administrator performance did or did not occur. If you feel your knowledge on a particular question is insufficient to answer yes or no, please check the DON'T KNOW column.

The purpose of this evaluation is to help the administrator improve his performance, so please be frank but be honest in your responses. Do not identify yourself on this form. After completing this form, seal it in a folder and put it in the immediate supervisor's mailbox.

|----|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------|-----------|--------|------------|

DID THE ADMINISTRATOR:

I. Management performance-departmental

1. Develop (in writing) long-range goals for area of responsibility (consistent with the school's mission)?

2. Develop short-range goals for area of responsibility (in writing)?

3. Develop (in writing) organizational plans and procedures to attain goals set for department?

4. Organize staff (personnel) to obtain goals set for department?

II. Management performance-personnel

1. Develop (in writing) job descriptions for each staff position?

2. Develop (in writing) job specifications?

3. Make job assignments according to specifications?

4. Require staff to develop written performance objectives?

5. Evaluate staff members each year and make firm recommendations?

6. Arrange in-service experience for staff members as need becomes apparent?
DID THE ADMINISTRATOR:

III. Management performance-personal

1. Demonstrate adequate knowledge in his specialty?

2. Request (seeks) support (budgetary, etc.) for his plans?

3. Establish priorities and allocate time according to these priorities?

4. Observe a reasonable and demanding schedule?

5. Develop (in writing) performance objectives stated in behavioral outcomes?

6. Develop (in writing) a program (reading, etc.) to keep up with the latest developments in his specialty?

7. Submit his plans in conference and in writing to supervisor?

8. Submit his plans in conference and in writing to staff?

---

IV. Responsibility as a Member of the College Community

1. Attend all scheduled meetings punctually (office hours, appointments, etc.)?

2. Properly and promptly perform routine administrative duties (reports, forms, etc.)?

3. Show evidence of professional growth by participating in such activities as:
   - Internal development workshops
   - Community college/professionally sponsored workshops
   - Conferences or seminars whenever possible
   - Courses of related study
   - Local, state, and national organizations

4. Participate in the development and evaluation of the philosophy, objectives, policies, and procedures of the institution?

5. Participate in evaluation of management techniques and management effectiveness?

6. Participate in evaluation of instructional programs in teaching effectiveness?

7. Use his professional skills and abilities in community affairs?

8. Participate in student advisory programs?

9. Serve as sponsor-advisor for any student organization officially recognized by the institution?
FIELD-TEST REPORT
FIELD-TESTING OF THE EVALUATION SYSTEMS
and PROCEDURES

Introduction

The field-test of the Criterion Referenced Evaluation Systems for Faculty and Administrators in Technical Institutes/Community Colleges was conducted during the 1975-76 Spring Quarter and involved a number of students, teachers and administrators at six field test sites.

The purpose of the Field test was to answer four major questions: (Fig. 3)
1. Should any of the sources for evaluation of teachers and administrators (determined by a survey of students, teachers and administrators in February, 1975) be excluded as a source of evaluation information?
2. Should a formal-informal procedure as proposed (previous chapter) by this research project, be used?
3. Can the teacher instrument and the administrator instrument proposed by this project, provide good useable evaluation information from each of the sources of evaluation?
4. Should any of the criteria listed be reworded or eliminated, and should any additional criteria be added?

Field-Test Design

All 57 institutions, by a letter to each president, were asked if they would like to participate in the field-test phase of the project. Seven institutions indicated a desire to participate in the field-test. Six of the seven schools were asked to participate. The seventh school, which had just hired a new president and was also in the process of occupying a new campus at the time of the field-test, was not asked to participate.

Stratification dimensions of size, type of institution, and location (Fig. 4) do exist among the field-test sites. However, this was a matter of pure chance, since the project had no control over which schools would or would not agree to participate.
## FIELD TEST CHART

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR QUESTION</th>
<th>INSTRUMENT(S) TO BE USED</th>
<th>SCHEDULE OF DATA COLLECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should any of the sources of evaluation be eliminated?</td>
<td>1. Teacher administrator opinionnaire.</td>
<td>1. Opinionnaires should be completed and returned by May 9, 1976.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should a formal-informal procedure, as proposed by this research project, be used?</td>
<td>1. Teacher/administrator opinionnaire.</td>
<td>1. Opinionnaires should be completed and returned by May 9, 1976.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the teacher evaluation instrument and the administrator evaluation instrument, as proposed by this project, provide good, usable evaluation information from each of the sources of evaluation?</td>
<td>1. Teacher evaluation instrument 2. Administrator evaluation instrument. 3. Teacher/administrator opinionnaire.</td>
<td>1. Student evaluation shall be completed during one class period. 2. All other sources of evaluation should be completed by April 31. 3. Opinionnaires should be completed and returned by May 9, 1976.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should any of the criteria listed be changed, worded, or eliminated?</td>
<td>1. Teacher/administrator opinionnaire.</td>
<td>1. Opinionnaires should be completed and returned by May 9, 1976.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each school that participated in the field test was asked to test the teacher and administrator evaluation instruments developed by this research as thoroughly as they could. After testing the instruments, a number of teachers and administrators at each field-test gave their opinions about the evaluation procedures and instruments by answering the Teacher/Administrator Opinionnaire. A copy of the opinionnaire is enclosed as Appendix.

The opinionnaire consisted of five sections. The first section provided general information and instructions for completion of the opinionnaire. The second section was designed to obtain demographic information pertinent to the study, which included current status, institution of employment, and (for teachers) their major area (technical, vocational, etc.) of instruction.

The third section was designed to obtain data about the attitudes of teachers and administrators toward the evaluation procedures and instruments used in the field-test.

The fourth section was designed to determine which source or sources of evaluation could provide good, useable information on each of the criteria listed in the field-test instruments.

The fifth and final section was designed to add, reword, or eliminate criterion as deemed necessary by the teachers and administrators at the six field-test sites.
FIELD-TEST ANALYSIS
and
INTERPRETATIONS

Characteristics of Respondents

In the initial survey of students, teachers, and administrators, characteristics of sex, age group, tenure, type of degree, and type of institution were found to be insignificant in every case except one and were not included as characteristics.

Respondent Characteristics

Relevant characteristics of respondents include status, employing institution, and area of major instructional (teachers) program. (Table 15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Head/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division Chairman</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time teacher</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time administrator</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failed to respond</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guilford</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catawba</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carteret</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anson</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldwell</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craven</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources of Teacher Evaluation According To Field-Test Results

Respondents to this section were asked to determine which sources could or could not use the proposed teacher instrument by indicating one of two possible responses: (1) cannot be used and (2) can be used. (Table 16)
Table 16: Percentage Responses — Teacher Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Source</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No %</th>
<th>Unclear %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Self</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Department Head</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Administrator</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Peer</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sources in Table 16 have been ranked according to the percentage of positive responses received by each source. The unclear column was a result of the respondent putting check marks instead of a one or a two in the space provided. In most cases, it appears the respondent was checking those sources he felt could be used; however, the few who appeared to be answering No make it necessary to place all check mark responses in the unclear column. As can be seen from Table 16, most responses were unclear. For purposes of this research, the unclear responses were considered as no-responses. The only two sources, using the field-test instrument, that received an overwhelming "Yes" response were Self and Department Head. The Administrator as a source received an equal number of Yes’s and No’s. The Peer and the Student as sources received the same percentage of Yes’s, but the No response for Peer evaluation was 0.1% less than double the Yes response, and the No response for student evaluation was 1.6% better than double the Yes response. From this data, it would appear that two of the evaluation sources (Self and Department Head) could use the proposed Teacher Evaluation instrument, and that, three of the sources (Administrator, Peer, and Student) could not use the proposed Teacher Evaluation instrument.

Sources of Administrator Evaluation According To Field-Test Results

Respondents to this section were asked to determine which sources could or could not use the proposed administrator instrument by indicating one of two possible responses: (1) Cannot be used and (2) Can be used. (Table 17)

Table 17: Percentage Responses — Administrator Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Source</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No %</th>
<th>Unclear %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Self</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Immediate Supervisor</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teacher</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Administrator’s Staff</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>66.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Peer</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Student</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>66.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The sources in Table 17 have been re-ranked according to the percentage of positive responses received by each source. The unclear column was a result of the respondent putting check marks instead of a one or a two in the space provided. Upon visually examining the results, some check marks appear to be Yes's and some appear to be No's. For this reason all check mark responses where put into the Unclear column. The majority of responses (Table 17) were unclear. For purposes of this research the Unclear responses were considered as No responses. Three of the sources, using the Field-Test instrument, received positive responses. However, only two of those (Self and Immediate Supervisor) were clearly Yes responses. The third source (Teacher) had only a 5% margin over the No responses. A forth source (Administrator's Staff) received an equal number of Yes and No responses. The last two sources (Peer and Student) both had an excess of No responses. The student source actually had no Yes responses. From this data, it appears that two of the sources (Self and Immediate Supervisor) could use the proposed administrator evaluation instrument, that a third source (Teacher) could possibly use the Administrator instrument, and that the last three sources (Administrator's Staff, Peer, and Student) could not use the proposed Administrator evaluation instrument.

**Formal-Informal Evaluation**

Respondents to this section were asked: do you feel that a formal-informal evaluation process, as proposed by this research project, is a good idea? Those who answered "Yes" were asked: how often should a formal-informal evaluation be conducted (Table 18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO-RESPONSE</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once/Two Years</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once/Three Years</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once/Four Years</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once/Five Years</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No-Response</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from Table 18, 64.4% felt that the formal-informal process, as proposed by this research project, was a good idea. From those responding "Yes", 54.2% felt a formal evaluation should be conducted every two years.
The Proposed Evaluation Instruments

The respondents to this section were asked; can the teacher evaluation instrument and the administrator evaluation instrument provide good, useable evaluation data from ANY of the sources of evaluation? Fifty-point-eight per cent said No, 44.1 per cent said Yes, and 5.1 per cent did not respond. It appears, from the above data and the data in Tables' 16 & 17, that the proposed teacher evaluation instrument and the proposed administrator evaluation instrument should be limited to use by the first two sources (Table 16) of teacher evaluation and to use by the first two sources (Table 17) of the administrator evaluation.

Teacher Criteria-Field-Test Results

Respondents to this section were asked to indicate which source or sources could provide good, useable evaluation information on each of the criteria by placing X's in the spaces provided by each of the criteria or to leave all spaces blank if they felt none of the sources could use the criterion.

For purposes of this research all responses of 56% or better were considered positive and all responses of 44% or less were considered negative. Those falling on, or between were reported as slightly positive or negative depending on their position above or below the 50% point.

The criteria listed in Table 19 were determined by a survey of teachers and administrators throughout the NCTI/CCS in February, 1975. (Table 13) The evaluation instrument developed from the 1975 survey was field-tested during the Spring Quarter 1976. Results of the Field-Test are shown in Table 19.

TABLE 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DH ST SF A</td>
<td>a. Develop in writing clearly defined and appropriate goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.3 78.0</td>
<td>b. Develop in writing an outline for each instructional program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.3 74.6</td>
<td>c. Develop in writing major (quarterly) objectives for each course and state them in behavioral outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.0 71.2</td>
<td>d. Develop in writing minor (weekly) objectives for each course and state them in behavioral outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.0 62.7</td>
<td>e. Evaluate textbooks, equipment, and supplies and recommend choices for adoption by dates specified by the institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.2 71.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

108
### TABLE 19 Con't

**TEACHER CRITERIA - FIELD-TEST RESULTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses %</th>
<th>Department Head (DH)</th>
<th>Student (ST)</th>
<th>Self (SF)</th>
<th>Administrator (A)</th>
<th>Peer (P)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DH</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>v.</td>
<td>w.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **f.** Establish in writing clearly defined grading procedures and standards in accordance with the grading policy of the institution.
- **g.** Use pretesting procedures and instruments to ascertain student's academic needs.
- **h.** Select learning resources appropriate to the specified learning objectives.
- **i.** Develop instructional strategies to enable students to achieve learning objectives.
- **j.** Develop in writing thorough lesson plans for each instructional session.
- **k.** Communicate at a level appropriate to the ability of students to understand.
- **l.** Teach by own objectives developed for course.
- **m.** Show concern for student's academic welfare.
- **n.** Give each student a copy of the course outline, objectives, and method of grading.
- **o.** Ask students to state their purpose(s) and objectives (in writing) for taking this course.
- **p.** Ask students to state how they intend to accomplish (in writing) their objectives.
- **q.** Use instructional strategies to enable students to achieve learning objectives.
- **r.** Use available learning resources appropriate to specified learning objectives.
- **s.** Evaluate student performance and review results promptly.
- **t.** Collect and use feedback from experience with students to revise and update both content and methodology.
- **u.** Use evaluative procedures which measure the degree to which the student has achieved the goals and objectives of the course.
- **v.** Attend all scheduled meetings punctually (class, labs, faculty-staff meetings, etc.).
- **w.** Perform routine administrative duties (reports, forms, grades, etc.) properly and promptly.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses %</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Head (DH)</td>
<td>Student (ST)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DH</td>
<td>ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>71.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>71.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>71.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Careful examination of Table 19 reveals several interesting facts. One of the more obvious facts is that the Peer (P) source of evaluation is not shown in the Responses % column which means that the percentage response to Peer evaluation on each criterion was less than 44%. A second fact is that the Self (SF) sources of evaluation received a 61.0% or better response on every criterion except (o) and (p). We also find that criterion (o) and (p) failed to receive a single positive response for any of the sources. A fourth fact is that the Department Head (DH) source of evaluation received positive responses on all of the broad instructional preparation criteria and on all of the institutional responsibility criteria except one. Table 19 also shows that the Student (ST) source of evaluation received only five responses above 50.0%, and that the Administrator (A) source of evaluation had only two responses better than 50.0%. 
It appears, from the data in Table 19, that the proposed evaluation instrument could be used by the teacher as a guideline for the development of his objectives and as a means of agreement between the teacher and department head on the major (broad) instructional and institutional objectives.

**Administrator Criteria - Field-Test Results**

Respondents to this section were asked to indicate which source or sources could provide good, usable evaluation information on each of the criteria by placing X's in the spaces provided by each of the criteria or to leave all spaces blank if they felt none of the sources could use the criterion.

For purposes of this research all responses of 56% or better were considered positive and all responses of 44% or less were considered negative. Those falling on, or between were reported as slightly positive or negative depending on their position above or below the 50% point.

The criteria listed in Table 20 were determined by a survey of teachers and administrators throughout the NCTI/CCS in February, 1975 (Table 14). The evaluation instrument developed from the 1975 survey was field-tested during the Spring Quarter, 1976. Results of the Field-Test are shown in Table 20.

**TABLE 20**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses %</th>
<th>Immediate Supervisor (IS)</th>
<th>Administrator's (AS) Self (SF)</th>
<th>Teacher (T)</th>
<th>Peer (P)</th>
<th>Student (ST)</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Develop (in writing) long-range goals for area of responsibility (consistent of the school's mission).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Develop short-range goals for area of responsibility (in writing).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Develop (in writing) organizational plans and procedures to attain goals set for department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Organize staff (personnel) to obtain goals set for department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Develop (in writing) job descriptions for each staff position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Develop (in writing) job specifications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Make job assignments according to specifications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Require staff to develop written performance objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Evaluate staff members each year and make firm recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examination of Table 20 reveals a number of interesting facts. The first and most obvious fact is that the last three sources of evaluation, (Teacher, Peer, and Student) are not shown in the Responses % column which means that the percentage response to the last three sources on each criterion was less than 44%. A second fact is that the Self (SF) sources of evaluation received a 52.5% or better responses on every criterion. A third fact is
that the Immediate Supervisor (IS) source of evaluation received a response of 54.2% or better on all but six of the criteria. We also find that the Administrator's Staff (AS) sources of evaluation received eleven reportable scores; four of which were above 50.8%.

It appears, from the data in Table 20, that the proposed evaluation instrument could be used by the administrator as a guideline for the development of his objectives and as a means of agreement between the administrator and department head on the personal and institutional objectives.

Attitudes Toward the Criteria Selected for use in the Field-Test

Respondents to this section were asked for their opinions about each criterion by indicating one of four descriptive scales: (1) should be eliminated, (2) needs a great deal of modification, (3) should be reworded, and (4) okay as stated. If the response was a 3 or a 2, each respondent was asked to indicate any rewording or changes. Only responses of 20% or better have been shown in Table 21.

**Table 21**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses %</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Okay as Stated</td>
<td>Needs a great deal of modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be reworded</td>
<td>Should be eliminated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>a. Develop in writing clearly defined and appropriate goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Develop in writing an outline for each instructional program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Develop in writing major (quarterly) objectives for each course and state them in behavioral outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Develop in writing minor (weekly) objectives for each course and state them in behavioral outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Evaluate textbooks, equipment, and supplies and recommend choices for adoption by dates specified by the institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. Establish in writing clearly defined grading procedures and standards in accordance with the grading policy of the institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g. Use pretesting procedures and instruments to ascertain student's academic needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h. Select learning resources appropriate to the specified learning objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Develop instructional strategies to enable students to achieve learning objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 21  
**ATTITUDES TOWARD SELECTED TEACHER CRITERIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **4**
  - Okay as Stated
  - Should be reworded
  - Needs a great deal of modification
  - Should be eliminated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>j. Develop in writing thorough lesson plans for each instructional session.</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Communicate at a level appropriate to the ability of students to understand.</td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Teach by own objectives developed for course.</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Show concern for student's academic welfare.</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Give each student a copy of the course outline, objectives, and method of grading.</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Ask student to state their purpose(s) and objectives (in writing) for taking this course.</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Ask students to state how they intend to accomplish (in writing) their objectives.</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Use instructional strategies to enable students to achieve learning objectives.</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Use available learning resources appropriate to specified learning objectives.</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. Evaluate student performance and review results promptly.</td>
<td>81.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. Collect and use feedback from experience with students to revise and update both content and methodology.</td>
<td>66.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u. Use evaluative procedures which measure the degree to which the student has achieved the goals and objectives of the course.</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Attend all scheduled meetings punctually (class, labs, faculty-staff meetings, etc.)</td>
<td>83.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w. Perform routine administrative duties (reports, forms, grades, etc.) properly and promptly.</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. Show evidence of professional growth by participating in such activities as: Internal development workshops, community college/professionally sponsored workshops, conferences or seminars whenever possible, courses of related study, local, state, and national organizations.</td>
<td>72.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y. Participate in the development and evaluation of the philosophy, objectives, policies, and procedures of the institute.</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z. Accept divisional responsibilities (serving on divisional committees, additional teaching loads, etc.)</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 21 Con't

**ATTITUDES TOWARD SELECTED TEACHER CRITERIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses %</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Okay as Stated</td>
<td>Should be reworded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- aa. Participate in evaluation of instructional programs and teaching effectiveness in the department or division.
- bb. Serve on college-wide committees.
- cc. Participate in student advisory programs and/or sponsor-advice any student organization officially recognized by the institution.
- dd. Use his professional skills and abilities in community affairs.

### TABLE 22

**ATTITUDES TOWARD SELECTED ADMINISTRATOR CRITERIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses %</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Okay as Stated</td>
<td>Should be reworded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a. Develop in writing long-range goals for area of responsibility (consistent of the school's mission.)
- b. Develop short-range goals for area of responsibility (in writing).
- c. Develop in writing organizational plans and procedures to attain goals set for department.
- d. Organize staff (personnel) to obtain goals set for department.
- e. Develop in writing job descriptions for each staff position.
- f. Develop in writing job specifications.
- g. Make job assignments according to specifications.
- h. Require staff to develop written performance objectives.
TABLE 22 Con't

ATTITUDES TOWARD SELECTED ADMINISTRATOR CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Okay as Stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Should be reworded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Needs a great deal of modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Should be eliminated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>Evaluate staff members each year and make firm recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>Arrange in-service experience for staff members as need becomes apparent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>Demonstrate adequate knowledge in his specialty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>Request (seeks) support (budgetary, etc.) for his plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>Establish priorities and allocate time according to these priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>Evaluate staff members each year and make firm recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o.</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>Develop in writing performance objectives stated in behavioral outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>Develop in writing a program (reading, etc.) to keep up with the latest developments in his specialty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q.</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>Submit his plans in conference and in writing to supervisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r.</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>Submit his plans in conference and in writing to staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>Properly and promptly perform routine administrative duties (reports, forms, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t.</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>Show evidence of professional growth by participating in such activities as: Internal development workshops, community college/professionally sponsored workshops, conferences or seminars whenever possible, courses of related study, local, state, and national organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u.</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>Participate in the development and evaluation of the philosophy, policies, and procedures of the institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>Participate in evaluation of management techniques and management effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w.</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>Participate in evaluation of instructional programs in teaching effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x.</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>Use his professional skills and abilities in community affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y.</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>Participate in student advisory programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Serve as sponsor-advisor for any student organization officially recognized by the institution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen from Tables 21 and 22, only two of the four possible categories received scores (20% or better) large enough to report. Every teacher criterion except (p.) and every administrator criterion received reportable scores in the fourth (Okay as stated) category. Four of the teacher criteria (d, j, a, and p) and five of the administrator criteria (h, o, p, q and aa) received reportable scores in the first (Should be eliminated) category. Three of the teacher scores (d, o & p) were high enough to eliminate them as criteria for teacher evaluation. None of the administrator criteria received scores high enough to eliminate them, however, the responses in the first and fourth categories for criterion (p) were so close that a revision or rewording should be considered.

Limitations

The field-test data presented in this report, at the very best, must be considered as good indicators of the teacher and administrator opinions since there were a number of limiting factors.

The first limiting factor was the method of choosing the field-test sites on a voluntary basis. This automatically biased the results since volunteers have a more favorable attitude toward evaluation than non-volunteers. Another limiting factor was the choice of the Spring quarter as the time period for the field-test. With the end of quarter, end of the fiscal year, and summer vacations coming up, it just increased the work load and caused a great deal of resentment. A third limiting factor was the length of the field-test. One quarter did not provide the time needed to thoroughly test the proposed evaluation procedures and instruments. A fourth limiting factor is that very few of the teachers and administrators studied the proposed evaluation procedures, and as a result their answers on the teacher/administrator opinionnaire are based more on their opinions than actual field-test results. A fifth limiting factor is that only 59 out of 180 teacher/administrator opinionnaires were returned. A sixth limiting factor was that none of the institutions actually tested the evaluation instruments with all of the sources of evaluation. A seventh and final limitation was the fact that each institution conducted the field test more or less as they felt it should be done. Some schools used a large number of students to test the teacher instrument while others used only a handful. Some schools used the test instrument in lieu of their own while others used it in conjunction with their current evaluation instruments.
CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Conclusions

The purpose of this research was to develop an evaluation system for teachers and administrators, based upon measurable criteria. The findings were based upon two separate questionnaires. The responses of 181 full-time students, 150 full-time teachers, and 92 full-time administrators enrolled or employed in the NCTI/CCS during the Winter quarter, 1974-75 school year. The results of the second questionnaire were based upon the responses of 21 full-time teachers, 21 full-time administrators, and 2 unknown respondents enrolled or employed in the NCTI/CCS during the Spring quarter, 1975-76 school year. The findings appear to justify the following conclusions.

a. Although all three groups had positive attitudes toward evaluation, generally, attitudes toward evaluation were rather poor.

b. Although most teachers believe evaluations should be conducted each year (Table 6), most teachers have very little faith in the evaluation process. Students and administrators, although slightly more favorable than teachers, appear to have very little faith in the evaluation process, also.

c. Teachers held significantly lower attitudes toward evaluation of their classroom effectiveness than either the students or administrators.

d. Attitudes toward administrator evaluation, although positive, were also rather poor.

e. Teacher attitudes toward administrator evaluation were even less favorable than they were for teacher evaluation while the administrators were slightly more favorable toward administrator evaluation than toward teacher evaluation.

f. Students felt that the "student", "administrator", and "department head" sources of evaluation were essential to evaluation of the teacher's classroom effectiveness. However, students placed very little value on "peer" and "self" sources of evaluation.

g. Teacher attitudes toward the "department head", "student", "administrator", and "self" sources of teacher evaluation were very favorable, and teachers appeared to consider them essential to any evaluative process. They placed very little value on the "peer" source of evaluation.

h. Administrators appeared to consider the "student", "department head", "administrator", and "self" sources of evaluation essential to an evaluation system of the teacher's classroom effectiveness. They appeared to place very little value on the "peer" source of evaluation.

i. Teachers appeared to consider the "immediate supervisor", "teacher", "administrative staff", and "self" sources essential to an evaluation system of the administrator's effectiveness on the job. They seemed to place little value on the "peer" and "student" sources of administrator evaluation.
j. Administrators felt that the "immediate supervisor", "self", "administrative staff", and "teacher" sources were essential to an evaluation system of the administrator's effectiveness on the job. Administrators seemed to judge the "peer" and "student" sources of very little value to the evaluative process.

k. Although the teachers and administrators appeared to consider the "department head", "student", "administrator", and "self" sources of evaluation essential to teacher evaluation, they both felt that the "self" and "department head" sources of evaluation were the only sources that could use the teacher evaluation instrument developed from the initial research.

l. Although the administrators and teachers appeared to consider the "immediate supervisor", "self", "administrative staff", and "teacher", sources of evaluation essential to administrator evaluation, they both felt that the "self" and "immediate supervisor" were the only sources that could use the administrator evaluation instrument developed from the initial research.

m. Based upon results from the initial survey, teachers and administrators both had positive attitudes toward each teacher evaluation criterion and each administrator evaluation criterion. As a result, all the teacher criteria were included in the teacher evaluation instrument developed from this research, and all the administrator criteria were included in the administrator evaluation instrument developed from this research.

Implications

The analysis of the data and the conclusions drawn therefrom should hold a great deal of significance for the administrators and teachers throughout the NCTI/CCS. The author considers the following to be important implications.

a. The low level of attitude exhibited by students, teachers, and administrators toward evaluation must come from evaluation systems currently in use. Inadequately designed or incompletely designed evaluation systems have contributed a great deal to the low level of attitude toward evaluation, but the most important factor to this low level of attitude toward evaluation is the manner in which the evaluation system is implemented. In many cases the evaluation instrument(s) are fill out, sent to the proper individuals, filed, and that is the end of it. On the other hand some evaluation systems are built on negative feedback, and only those individuals who are doing poorly in the eyes of the evaluator are made aware of the results. There is no doubt that the above conditions have contributed to the low level of attitude toward evaluation.

b. The lack of a clear declaration of the purpose of the evaluation process probably contributed a great deal to the low level of attitude
The primary function of the community college/technical institutes is teaching, and therefore, the primary purpose should be to improve classroom teaching, rather than any number of other frequently used purposes. A declaration of the purpose of evaluation will go a long way toward improving attitudes toward evaluation, particularly among teachers.

c. Based on the results and conclusions of the initial survey, students, teachers, department heads, and administrators should be included in the teacher evaluation process. In view of this, evaluation systems must be developed with the involvement of all the groups mentioned above. Although all of the above groups should be involved in teacher evaluation, field-test results indicate that a single evaluation instrument cannot provide good, usable evaluation data from all of the sources.

d. Based on the results and conclusions of the initial survey, immediate supervisors, administrators, administrators' staffs, and teachers should be included in the administrator evaluation process. In view of this, evaluation systems must be developed with the involvement of all the groups mentioned above. However, as with the teacher system, field-test results indicate that a single evaluation instrument cannot provide good, usable evaluation data from all of the sources.

e. The "peer" source of evaluation was also perceived to have a positive role in the teacher evaluation process. Although "peer" evaluation appears to be a very logical, valuable source, further research should be conducted using an instrument specifically designed for "peer" evaluation before including or excluding the "peer" source from the teacher evaluation process.

f. The "peer" and "student" sources of evaluation were also perceived to have positive roles in the administrator evaluation process. However, further research, with instruments specially designed for each group, is suggested before including or excluding the "peer" and/or the "student" sources of evaluation.

g. Based upon the field-test results, it appears that all but three of the teacher criteria are okay-as-stated. Of the three that are questionable, it appears that two should be eliminated as criteria, and the third should be rewritten.

h. Based upon the field-test, it appears that all of the administrator criteria are okay-as-stated.

i. The field-test results showed to indicate that the list of teacher criteria and the list of administrator criteria presented by this project were all inclusive. However, it is safe to assume that thirty or so criteria cannot possibly cover all of the numerous and large varieties of responsibilities and activities of the community college teacher and/or administrator.

j. Based on the field-test results, it also appeared that most teachers and administrators felt that the evaluation instruments required every teacher and administrator to have a written objective for every single one of their respective criteria. However, the probability of an individual teacher or administrator having job duties and activities covered by every one of the criteria is highly unlikely.
Based upon the field-test, it appeared that the teacher evaluation instrument and the administrator evaluation instrument could be used by the "self" and "department head" sources of evaluation and the "self" and "immediate supervisor" sources of evaluation respectively.

1. Finally, the inclusion of the other sources for teacher and administrator evaluation will probably require the use of other instruments specifically designed for each source of evaluation. Instruments for the various sources of evaluation, prepared from this research or selected from other research material can be found in the appendices.

One final conclusion that can be drawn from this research study is that the teacher and administrator criteria can be used as good, valid evaluation criteria. This conclusion is based on the fact that every single teacher and administrator criterion received a positive score of 3.0 or better on the initial survey, and the fact that almost all of the teacher and administrator criteria were judged to be okay-as-stated by the field-test sites. The instruments proposed by this study merely represent one method of using the criteria determined by this research.
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APPENDICES

Appendix A. Survey Instrument

EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

I. GENERAL INFORMATION. This is a questionnaire designed to obtain information about evaluation of teachers and administrators in the community colleges and technical institutes in North Carolina. Please read all parts carefully and be sure to complete all questions that apply to you. Please note that some questions are restricted to specific groups. Such questions are annotated and you should not complete them unless you are a part of the group(s) indicated. In those questions asking how you feel about specific items, please give your real attitude all times. When you have completed the questionnaire, please check to make sure all questions that apply to you have been answered; then place it in the self-addressed envelope and drop it in the mail. Do not place your name on the questionnaire.

II. DEFINITIONS. The following terms are defined in order for your complete understanding of the questions. Teacher effectiveness refers to the extent that the teacher acts in ways in the classroom that are favorable to the development of basic skills, understandings, work habits, desirable attitudes, value judgments, and adequate personal adjustment of students. Evaluation is used to mean a formal rating involving use of structured instruments and/or procedures containing criteria as determined useful to and describable of administrators and teachers.

III. BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION. The following information is necessary in order to completely analyze your opinions along with those of the others that have been included in this survey. Please read each question carefully and clearly place in the box provided the number of the response which best answers the question. Question "H" is an exception and requires you to fill in the appropriate block.

A. What is your current status with the community college or technical institute?

☐ 1. Full-time student  3. Full-time administrator
☐ 2. Full-time teacher
B. Sex?

- 1. Male
- 2. Female

C. Race?

- 1. Black
- 2. American Indian
- 3. White
- 4. Other (specify) __________

D. Age?

- 1. Less than 20
- 2. 20-22
- 3. 23-25
- 4. 26-29
- 5. 30-39
- 6. 40-49
- 7. 50-59
- 8. 60-65
- 9. Over 65

E. (FOR STUDENTS ONLY) In what program are you currently enrolled?

- 1. College transfer
- 2. General education
- 3. Technical
- 4. Vocational
- 5. Other

F. (FOR ADMINISTRATORS AND TEACHERS ONLY) What degree (highest) do you currently hold?

- 1. High school diploma, equivalent, or less
- 2. Associate degree
- 3. Bachelor's degree
- 4. Master's degree
- 5. Doctorate

G. (FOR TEACHERS ONLY) In which of the following programs is your major area of instruction?

- 1. College transfer
- 2. General education
- 3. Technical
- 4. Vocational
- 5. Other

H. (FOR ADMINISTRATORS AND TEACHERS ONLY) How much experience do you have in each of the following areas? (Please enter your experience to the nearest full year.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Instruction</th>
<th>Teaching Exp.</th>
<th>Administrative Exp.</th>
<th>Other Exp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Grades K-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Grades 9-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Community College/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Junior College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 4-Year Institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Military</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I. (FOR ADMINISTRATORS AND TEACHERS ONLY) How long have you been employed in that capacity in your current institution and in any similar position in the North Carolina Community College System?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>5-10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Over 10 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

J. (FOR ADMINISTRATORS AND TEACHERS ONLY) Does your institution have an evaluation instrument and/or evaluation procedure for teachers?

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

K. (FOR ADMINISTRATORS AND TEACHERS ONLY) Does your institution have an evaluation instrument and/or evaluation procedure for administrators?

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. This section of the questionnaire is designed to obtain data about your attitude toward formal evaluation of the classroom effectiveness of teachers and the competence of administrators. Please read each question carefully and check either "Yes, in most cases" or "No, in most cases," whichever more clearly describes your feeling about the statement. In answering these questions, evaluation need not be interpreted as evaluation by any particular individual or group, or any combination of individuals or groups.

L. (FOR STUDENTS, TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is evaluation an effective means of improving the competence of a teacher?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are evaluations of teacher's competence accurate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is evaluation an effective means of eliminating incompetent teachers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Should teachers be paid according to their competence as determined by evaluation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
L. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes, in most cases</th>
<th>No, in most cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Should teaching be evaluated each year?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Should the teacher's reemployment depend upon evaluation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Is it possible to evaluate a teacher's competence accurately?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M. (FOR ADMINISTRATORS AND TEACHERS ONLY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes, in most cases</th>
<th>No, in most cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is evaluation an effective means of improving the competence of an administrator?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are evaluations of administrator's competence accurate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is evaluation an effective means of eliminating incompetent administrators?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Should administrators be paid according to their competence as determined by evaluation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Should administrators be evaluated each year?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Should the administrator's re-employment depend upon evaluation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Is it possible to evaluate an administrator's competence accurately?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
N. In your opinion, what is evaluation? (Please rate the following definitions of evaluation in accordance with the following scale.)

5 4 3 2 1 X
Excellent Good Average Fair Poor Eliminate

a. ___ an assessment of merit.

b. ___ a method of acquiring and processing the data collected which can be used to improve instruction and the student's learning process.

c. ___ an aid of clarifying the significant goals and objectives of education.

d. ___ a process for determining the extent to which students are developing in the desired ways.

e. ___ a system of quality control in which it may be determined at each step in the teaching-learning process whether the process is effective or not, and if not, what changes must be made to ensure its effectiveness before it is too late.

O. In your opinion, what is the purpose of evaluation? (Please rate the following purposes of evaluation in accordance with the following scale.)

5 4 3 2 1 X
Excellent Good Average Fair Poor Eliminate

a. ___ to improve instruction.

b. ___ to maintain and improve the effectiveness of administration.

c. ___ to improve task performance.

d. ___ to screen teachers and administrators for future promotions and/or greater job responsibilities.

e. ___ to differentiate teaching and administrative assignments.

f. ___ to grant merit or performance pay.

g. ___ to provide a basis for tenure decisions.

h. ___ to let the individual teacher or administrator know exactly what is expected of him and the degree to which his evaluator(s) feels he is meeting his responsibilities.
i. ___ to provide information on the strengths and weaknesses of individuals with the purpose of developing in-service and job upgrading programs to strengthen the individual in his areas of weaknesses.

j. ___ to provide a variety of input information for the purpose of making wise administrative decisions in regard to the total staff, departments and individuals.

V. This section of the questionnaire is designed to obtain your attitude as to what sources should be included in evaluating the teacher's classroom effectiveness and the competence of administrators. From the scale listed below, select the response which most accurately describes your attitude about each of the sources. If there is an additional source that you feel should be considered, please add it in the space provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely Essential</td>
<td>Probably Should Be Included</td>
<td>Probably Should Be Included</td>
<td>Absolutely Should Not Be Included</td>
<td>Absolutely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should Be Included</td>
<td>Depends on Local Circumstances that Differ between Institutions</td>
<td>Should Be Included</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P. (FOR STUDENTS, TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS) Teachers should be evaluated by-

a. ___ Self (written form)
b. ___ Peers
c. ___ Students
d. ___ Administrators
e. ___ Alumni (includes former students)
f. ___ Department heads
g. ___ Outside consultants
h. ___ Employers of former students
i. ___ Other (specify) ______________________

Q. (FOR TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS ONLY) Administrators should be evaluated by-

a. ___ Self (written form)
b. ___ Peers (other administrators)
R. (FOR TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS ONLY) How often should you be evaluated by each of the sources listed below? (Please place the number designating your response in the box provided by each source.)

1. once/quarter  2. once every other quarter  3. once/course  4. twice/course  5. twice/year  6. once/year  7. once/2 years  8. once/3 years  9. once/4 years  10. not at all


[ ] [ ] [ ]

d. Alumni, including former students  e. Outside consultants  f. (TEACHERS ONLY) Administrators

[ ] [ ] [ ]

g. (TEACHERS ONLY) Department heads  h. (TEACHERS ONLY) Employers of former students  i. (ADMINISTRATORS ONLY) Teachers

[ ] [ ] [ ]

j. (ADMINISTRATORS ONLY) Administrator's staff  k. (ADMINISTRATORS ONLY) Immediate supervisor  l. (ADMINISTRATORS ONLY) Lay residents

[ ] [ ] [ ]
S. (FOR TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS ONLY) When should your evaluation be conducted? (Please place the number designating your response in the box provided by each source.)

1. within time periods established by each institution
2. at a time specified by the evaluated
3. at a time specified by the evaluator(s)
4. at an unannounced time
5. all of the previous statements
6. statements 2, 3, and 4
7. never

a. Self
b. Peers
c. Students
d. Alumni, including former students
e. Outside consultants
f. (TEACHERS ONLY) Administrators
g. (TEACHERS ONLY) Department heads
h. (TEACHERS ONLY) Employers of former students
i. (ADMINISTRATORS ONLY) Teachers
j. (ADMINISTRATORS ONLY) Administrator’s staff
k. (ADMINISTRATORS ONLY) Immediate supervisor
l. (ADMINISTRATORS ONLY) Lay residents

VI. (FOR TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS ONLY) This section is designed to obtain your opinion about possible criteria to be used in evaluation. There are two questions, the first refers to criteria for evaluating teachers, and the second refers to criteria for administrators. Teachers and administrators should complete both questions. Please rate each of the listed criteria in accordance with the scale listed.

T. Should a teacher— (Use the scale listed below)

5 4 3 2 1 X
MUST DO SHOULD DO GOOD IDEA MAYBE POOR IDEA ELIMINATE

a. develop clearly defined and appropriate goals?
b. develop an outline for his instructional program(s)?
c. develop major (quarterly) objectives for his course(s)?
d. develop minor (weekly) objectives for his course(s)?
e. state the objectives in measurable behavioral outcomes?
f. give each student a copy of the course outline and objectives

g. prepare thoroughly for each instructional program?
h. develop and/or use instructional strategies which enable students to achieve learning objectives?
i. provide alternative methods of instruction to meet the needs of different students?
j. teach by objectives (own) developed for the course(s)?
k. use evaluation instruments which measure the degree to which the student has achieved the goals and objectives of the learning sequence?
l. show concern for the academic welfare of students?
m. use diagnostic procedures and instruments to ascertain student needs?

n. communicate at a level appropriate to the ability of students to understand?
o. be fair and reasonably prompt in evaluation of student performance?
p. establish clearly defined grading procedures and standards in accordance with the grading policy of the institution?

q. collect and use feedback from experience with students to revise and update content, objectives, and instructional strategies?
r. ask students to state how they intend to accomplish their objectives?
s. ask students to state their purpose and objectives for taking this course?
t. serve on and/or chair divisional and college wide committees?
u. assume divisional responsibilities?
v. use his professional skills and abilities in community affairs?
w. properly and promptly perform routine administrative duties (reports, forms, grades, etc.)?
x. participate in student advisory programs?
y. participate in evaluation of instructional programs and teaching effectiveness of his department or division?
z. attend all staff and faculty meetings, all general faculty committee meetings unless excused by his divisional chairman?

aa. be punctual and consistent in attending scheduled meetings (class, labs, office hours, appointments, etc.)?
bb. participate annually in the development and evaluation of the philosophy, objectives, policies, and procedures of the institution?
cc. evaluate textbooks, equipment, and supplies and recommend his choices for adoption by dates specified by the institution?
show evidence of professional growth by participating in some of the following activities such as: (1) Internal development workshops, and/or (2) Community college/professional sponsored workshops, and/or (3) Conference or seminars whenever possible, and/or (4) Courses of related study, and/or (5) Local, state and national organizations? (PLEASE CIRCLE HOW MANY OF THE FIVE ACTIVITIES LISTED ABOVE A TEACHER SHOULD PARTICIPATE IN.)

(5 of 5) (4 of 5) (3 of 5) (2 of 5) (1 of 5)

U. Should an administrator—(Use the scale listed below)

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
5 & 4 & 3 & 2 & 1 & \times \\
MUST DO & SHOULD DO & GOOD IDEA & MAYBE & POOR IDEA & ELIMINATE \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
a. & \quad \text{develop long range goals for his department or area of responsibility?} \\
b. & \quad \text{develop short range goals for his department or area of responsibility?} \\
c. & \quad \text{develop performance objectives?} \\
d. & \quad \text{state his performance objectives in measurable terms?} \\
e. & \quad \text{develop organizational plans and procedures to attain goals set for the department?} \\
f. & \quad \text{develop job descriptions for each member of his staff?} \\
g. & \quad \text{organize his staff to obtain goals set for his department?} \\
h. & \quad \text{submit his plans in conference and in writing to his supervisors?} \\
i. & \quad \text{request budgetary support for his plans?} \\
j. & \quad \text{observe a reasonable and demanding schedule?} \\
k. & \quad \text{establish priorities and allocate his time in accordance with his schedule?} \\
l. & \quad \text{submit his plans in conference and in writing to his staff?} \\
m. & \quad \text{develop job specifications and make job assignments based on these specifications?} \\
n. & \quad \text{demonstrate adequate knowledge in his specialty?} \\
o. & \quad \text{develop a reading program to keep up with the latest developments in his specialty?} \\
p. & \quad \text{ask his staff to develop performance objectives?} \\
q. & \quad \text{evaluate staff members individually each year and make firm recommendations?} \\
r. & \quad \text{arrange in-service experience for his staff members as need becomes apparent?} \\
s. & \quad \text{serve on, or chair divisional and college wide committees?} \\
t. & \quad \text{use his professional skills and abilities in community affairs?} \\
u. & \quad \text{properly and promptly perform routine administrative duties (reports, forms, etc.)?}
\end{align*}
\]
V. ___ participate in student advisory programs?

w. ___ participate in evaluation of instructional programs in teaching effectiveness?

x. ___ participate in evaluation management techniques and management effectiveness?

y. ___ serve as sponsor or advisor for any student organization officially recognized by the institution?

z. ___ attend all staff and faculty meetings and all divisional or department meetings unless excused by his supervisor?

aa. ___ be punctual and consistent in attending scheduled meetings (office hours, appointments, etc.)?

bb. ___ participate annually in the development and evaluation of the philosophy, objectives, policies, and procedures of the institution?

c. ___ show evidence of professional growth by participating in some of the following activities such as; (1) Internal development workshops, and/or (2) Community College/professional sponsored workshops, and/or (3) Conference or seminars whenever possible, and/or (4) Courses or related study, and/or (5) Local, state and national organizations? (PLEASE CIRCLE HOW MANY OF THE FIVE ACTIVITIES LISTED ABOVE AN ADMINISTRATOR SHOULD PARTICIPATE IN.)

(5 of 5) (4 of 5) (3 of 5) (2 of 5) (1 of 5)

VII. The two questions in this section are designed to obtain your opinion of this effort to collect data on evaluation. Administrators and teachers should complete both questions.

V. What is your opinion of this questionnaire? (Please answer the following statements (1)=No or (2)=Yes.

a. ___ Are the questions clear in meaning?

b. ___ Is it thorough enough?

c. ___ Do you think we will be able to determine what a teacher and an administrator are supposed to do?

d. ___ Did we leave out some important questions? If so, what?

W. What is your overall opinion of this research? (Please circle the number on the following scale which most appropriately represents your feeling about this research.)

9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
One of the most interesting, informative, and useful surveys.

About average in interest, information, and usefulness.

One of the least interesting, informative, and useful surveys.
II. BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION. The following information is necessary in order to completely analyze your opinions along with those of the others that have been included in this survey. Please read each question carefully and clearly place in the box provided the number of the response which best answers the question.

A. What is your current status with the Community College/Technical Institute

1. Department Head/Division Chairman
2. Full-time teacher
3. Full-time administrator

B. At which of the following institutions are you employed?

1. Guilford
2. Catawba
3. Carteret
4. Anson
5. Caldwell
6. Craven

C. (FOR TEACHERS ONLY). In which of the following programs is your major area of instruction?

1. College Transfer
2. General Education
3. Technical
4. Vocational
5. Other

III. This section of the opinionnaire is designed to obtain data about your attitude toward the evaluation procedures proposed for this field-test. Please read each question carefully and select the response which accurately describes your feeling about the statement.
Appendix B

D. Which of the following sources of teacher evaluation can use or cannot use the proposed teacher evaluation instrument?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 can be used by</th>
<th>1 cannot be used by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Department Heads</td>
<td>d. Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Students</td>
<td>e. Peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Self</td>
<td>f. Any of the sources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Which of the following sources of administrator evaluation can use or cannot use the proposed administrator evaluation instrument?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 can be used by</th>
<th>1 cannot be used by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Immediate Supervisor</td>
<td>e. Peer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Administrative Staff</td>
<td>f. Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Self</td>
<td>g. Any of the sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Do you feel that a formal-informal evaluation process, as proposed by this research project, is a good idea?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. (If your answer is yes, how often should a formal evaluation be conducted)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 1. Once/two years</td>
<td>3. Once/three years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Once/four years</td>
<td>4. Once/five years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. Can the teacher evaluation instrument and the administrator evaluation instrument, as proposed by this project, provide good, useable evaluation from ANY of the sources of evaluation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. Please indicate which source or sources of evaluation you feel can provide good, useable evaluation information on each of the criteria listed below by placing X"s in the spaces provided by each of the criteria. IF YOU FEEL THAT A CRITERION CANNOT BE USED BY ANY OF THE SOURCES, PLEASE LEAVE ALL THE SPACES BLANK.

H. TEACHER CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DH</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Develop in writing clearly defined and appropriate goals.

b. Develop in writing an outline for each instructional program.
c. Develop in writing major (quarterly) objectives for each course and state them in behavioral outcomes.

d. Develop in writing minor (weekly) objectives for each course and state them in behavioral outcomes.

e. Evaluate textbooks, equipment, and supplies and recommend choices for adoption by dates specified by the institution.

f. Establish in writing clearly defined grading procedures and standards in accordance with the grading policy of the institution.

g. Use pretesting procedures and instruments to ascertain student's academic needs.

h. Select learning resources appropriate to the specified learning objectives.

i. Develop instructional strategies to enable students to achieve learning objectives.

j. Develop in writing thorough lesson plans for each instructional session.

k. Communicate at a level appropriate to the ability of students to understand.

l. Teach by own objectives developed for course.

m. Show concern for student's academic welfare.

n. Give each student a copy of the course outline, objectives, and method of grading.

o. Ask students to state their purpose(s) and objectives (in writing) for taking this course.

p. Ask students to state how they intend to accomplish (in writing) their objectives.

q. Use instructional strategies to enable students to achieve learning objectives.

r. Use available learning resources appropriate to specified learning objectives.

s. Evaluate student performance and review results promptly.

t. Collect and use feedback from experience with students to revise and update both content and methodology.

u. Use evaluative procedures which measure the degree to which the student has achieved the goals and objectives of the course.

v. Attend all scheduled meetings punctually (class, labs, faculty-staff meetings, etc.)

w. Perform routine administrative duties (reports, forms, grades, etc.) properly and promptly.

x. Show evidence of professional growth by participating in such activities as: Internal development workshops, community college/professionally sponsored workshops, conferences or seminars whenever possible, courses of related study, local, state, and National organizations.

y. Participate in the development and evaluation of the philosophy, objectives, policies, and procedures of the institute.

z. Accept divisional responsibilities (serving on divisional committees, additional teaching loads, etc.)

aa. Participate in evaluation of instructional programs and teaching effectiveness in the department or division.
H. TEACHER CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DH</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- bb. Serve on college-wide committees.
- cc. Participate in student advisory programs and/or sponsor-advice any student organization officially recognized by the institution.
- dd. Use his professional skills and abilities in community affairs.

I. ADMINISTRATOR CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>ST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a. Develop (in writing) long-range goals for area of responsibility (consistent of the school's mission).
- b. Develop short-range goals for area of responsibility (in writing).
- c. Develop (in writing) organizational plans and procedures to attain goals set for department.
- d. Organize staff (personnel) to obtain goals set for department.
- e. Develop (in writing) job descriptions for each staff position.
- f. Develop (in writing) job specifications.
- g. Make job assignments according to specifications.
- h. Require staff to develop written performance objectives.
- i. Evaluate staff members each year and make firm recommendations.
- j. Arrange in-service experience for staff members as need becomes apparent.
- k. Demonstrate adequate knowledge in his specialty.
- l. Request (seeks) support (budgetary, etc.) for his plans.
- m. Establish priorities and allocate time according to these priorities.
- n. Observe a reasonable and demanding schedule.
- o. Develop (in writing) performance objectives stated in behavioral outcomes.
- p. Develop (in writing) a program (reading, etc.) to keep up with the latest developments in his specialty.
- q. Submit his plans in conference and in writing to supervisor.
- r. Submit his plans in conference and in writing to staff.
- s. Attend all scheduled meetings punctually (office hours, appointments, etc.).
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I. ADMINISTRATOR CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immediate (IS)</th>
<th>Administrator's (AS)</th>
<th>Self (SF)</th>
<th>Teacher (T)</th>
<th>Peer (P)</th>
<th>Student (ST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supervisor Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IS</th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>ST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- t. Properly and promptly perform routine administrative duties (reports, forms, etc).
- u. Show evidence of professional growth by participating in such activities as: Internal development workshops, community college/professionally sponsored workshops, conferences or seminars whenever possible, courses of related study, local, state, and national organizations.
- v. Participate in the development and evaluation of the philosophy, policies, and procedures of the institution.
- w. Participate in evaluation of management techniques and management effectiveness.
- x. Participate in evaluation of instructional programs in teaching effectiveness.
- y. Use his professional skills and abilities in community affairs.
- z. Participate in student advisory programs.
- aa. Serve as sponsor-advisor for any student organization officially recognized by the institution.

V. This section of the opinionnaire is designed to obtain data about your attitude toward the evaluation criteria selected for use in this field-test. There are two questions, the first refers to criteria for teachers, and the second refers to criteria for administrators. Teachers and administrators should complete both questions. Please place the number of your response in the space provided which accurately describes your feelings about each of the criteria. If your selection is 3 or 2 please indicate your rewording or changes in the space provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Okay as stated</td>
<td>Should be reworded</td>
<td>Needs a great deal of modification</td>
<td>Should be eliminated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

J. TEACHER CRITERIA

Instructional performance-preparation

a. Develop in writing clearly defined and appropriate goals.

b. Develop in writing an outline for each instructional program.

c. Develop in writing major (quarterly) objectives for each course and state them in behavioral outcomes.
J. TEACHER CRITERIA...con't

4    3    2    1
Okay as stated Should be Needs a great Should be
           reworded deal of modification eliminated

d. Develop in writing minor (weekly) objectives for each course and state them in behavioral outcomes.

e. Evaluate textbooks, equipment, and supplies and recommend choices for adoption by dates specified by the institution.

f. Establish in writing clearly defined grading procedures and standards in accordance with the grading policy of the institution.

g. Use pretesting procedures and instruments to ascertain student's academic needs.

h. Select learning resources appropriate to the specified learning objectives.

i. Develop instructional strategies to enable students to achieve learning objectives.

j. Develop in writing thorough lesson plans for each instructional session.

Instructional performance-implementation

k. Communicate at a level appropriate to the ability of students to understand.

l. Teach by own objectives developed for course.

m. Show concern for student's academic welfare.

n. Give each student a copy of the course outline, objectives, and method of grading.

o. Ask students to state their purpose(s) and objectives (in writing) for taking this course.
J. TEACHER CRITERIA con't

Instructional performance-implementation

Okay as stated

Should be

Reworded

Needs a great deal of modification

1

Eliminated

p. Ask students to state how they intend to accomplish (in writing) their objectives.

q. Use instructional strategies to enable students to achieve learning objectives.

r. Use available learning resources appropriate to specified learning objectives.

Instructional performance-evaluation of results

s. Evaluate student performance and review results promptly.

t. Collect and use feedback from experience with students to revise and update both content and methodology.

u. Use evaluative procedures which measure the degree to which the student have achieved the goals and objectives of the course.

Responsibilities as a member of the college community

v. Attend all scheduled meetings punctually (class, labs, faculty-staff meetings, etc.)

w. Perform routine administrative duties (reports, forms, grades, etc.) properly and promptly.

x. Show evidence of professional growth by participating in such activities as: Internal development workshops, community college/professionally sponsored workshops, conferences or seminars whenever possible, courses of related study, local, state, and national organizations.

y. Participate in the development and evaluation of the philosophy, objectives, policies, and procedures of the institution.
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J. TEACHER CRITERIA con't

Responsibilities as a member of the college community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>Okay as stated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Should be reworded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Needs a great deal of modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Should be eliminated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

z. Accept divisional responsibilities (serving on divisional committees, additional teaching leads, etc.)

aa. Participate in evaluation of instructional programs and teaching effectiveness in the department or division.

bb. Serve on college-wide committees.

c. Participate in student advisory programs and/or sponsor-adviser any student organization officially recognized by the institution.

d. Use his professional skills and abilities in community affairs.

K. ADMINISTRATOR CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>Okay as stated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Should be reworded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Needs a great deal of modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Should be eliminated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Management performance-departmental

a. Develop (in writing) long-range goals for area of responsibility (consistent with the school's mission).

b. Develop short-range goals for area of responsibility (in writing).

c. Develop (in writing) organizational plans and procedures to attain goals set for department.

d. Organize staff (personnel) to obtain goals set for department.
K. ADMINISTRATOR CRITERIA con't

Management performance-personnel

e. Develop (in writing) job descriptions for each staff position.

f. Develop (in writing) job specifications.

g. Make job assignments according to specifications.

h. Require staff to develop written performance objectives.

i. Evaluate staff members each year and make firm recommendations.

j. Arrange in-service experience for staff members as need become apparent.

Management performance-personal

k. Demonstrate adequate knowledge in his specialty.

l. Request (seeks) support (budgetary, etc.) for his plans.

m. Establish priorities and allocate time according to these priorities.

n. Observe a reasonable and demanding schedule.

o. Develop (in writing) performance objectives stated in behavioral outcomes.

p. Develop (in writing) a program (reading, etc.) to keep up with the latest developments in his specialty.

q. Submit his plans in conference and in writing to supervisor.

r. Submit his plans in conference and in writing to staff.
K. ADMINISTRATOR CRITERIA con't

Okay as stated  Should be  Needs a great deal of modification  Should be eliminated

Responsibility as a member of the College Community

s. ___ Attend all scheduled meetings punctually (office hours, appointments, etc.)

t. ___ Properly and promptly perform routine administrative duties (reports, forms, etc.)

u. ___ Show evidence of professional growth by participating in such activities as: internal development workshops, community college/professionally sponsored workshops, conferences or seminars whenever possible courses of related study, local, state, and national organizations.

v. ___ Participate in the development and evaluation of the philosophy, policies, and procedures of the institution.

w. ___ Participate in evaluation of management techniques and management effectiveness.

x. ___ Participate in evaluation of instructional programs in teaching effectiveness.

y. ___ Use his professional skills and abilities in community affairs.

z. ___ Participate in student advisory programs.

aa. ___ Serve as sponsor-advisor for any student organization officially recognized by the institution.
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STUDENT EVALUATION FORM

Name of Teacher __________________________ Date Form Completed ____________________

Course Title, number, and section __________________________ Quarter ________ S

The following questionnaire format is of a YES-NO type asking whether the behavior did or did not occur. The purpose of this evaluation is to improve the teachers instructional performance by pointing out areas that need improvement as students see it.

Do not sign your name, and print or otherwise disguise your handwriting. Please be fair and honest in your responses.

After completing the questionnaire, turn it into the class representative (student). The class representative, after all forms are in, will seal them in a large envelope and deliver it to the Academic Dean's or Department Head's office immediately after class. The contents will not be returned to the teacher until after all final grades have been deposited with the registrar.

DID THE TEACHER IN THIS COURSE:

I. Personal Relationships With Students

1. Know or attempt to know student's? YES NO
2. Talk with students before and/or after class? _____
3. Give advice or assistance with personal problems upon student's request? _____
4. Discuss (answer questions) extraclass issues? _____
5. Compliment students on good answers? _____
6. Encourage (answer) all relevant questions in class? _____
7. Treat all students equally regardless of sex, race, major, etc.? _____
8. Ridicule, "ride" or otherwise embarrass students? _____
9. Give individual help with course material? _____
10. Lose control of himself in class (shout, curse, etc.)? _____
11. Bother (harass) students during recitation, quizzes, etc.? _____
12. Make threats concerning classwork? _____
13. Make threats concerning personal behavior? _____
14. Accept legitimate excuses, explanations for missing quizzes, etc.? _____
15. Refuse to listen to or recognize other viewpoints in class? _____
16. Say or indicate in some way that students are inferior? _____
17. Provide special "help" sessions for course material (individual and/or class)? _____
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II. Classroom Administration.
   1. Meet all scheduled (rescheduled) classes? __________ YES  __________ NO
   2. Arrive on time for all classes? __________
   3. Inform class if he would be absent? __________
   4. Discuss quiz dates or deadlines with students? __________
   5. End classes at end of classtime?
      a. Frequently let the class out early? __________
      b. Frequently hold class past scheduled time? __________
   6. Distribute a course outline or study plan (course objectives)? __________
   7. Follow course outline or study plan? __________
   8. Give examples of quiz items? __________
   9. Require and grade homework? __________
  10. Return papers and quizzes promptly? __________
  11. Permit classroom disturbances? __________
  12. Make false statements concerning course requirements (number of cuts, grading, etc.)? __________
  13. Give excessive work? __________
  14. Encourage use of library? __________

III. Student Participation
   1. Ask students preference as to topics covered? __________
   2. Ask students to critique his teaching? __________
   3. Schedule quizzes, deadlines, etc., at the convenience of the class majority whenever possible? __________
   4. Encourage (ask for) discussion, questions, or student opinions? __________
   5. Ask questions to determine class (individual) understanding of course material? __________
   6. Encourage class members to suggest guest speakers, field trips, etc.? __________

IV. Classroom presence
   1. Appear well groomed? __________
   2. Speak clearly and distinctly?
      a. Mumble? __________
      b. Talk too softly? __________
      c. Talk in a monotone? __________
   3. Use dramatic gestures (phrases) to emphasize important points? __________
   4. Use humor in lecture to illustrate points? __________
   5. Use a variety of audio visual materials? __________
   6. Read lectures from notes or book? __________
   7. Appear nervous, ill-at-ease during lecture? __________
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8. Talk or present material to rapidly?
9. Give rambling, disorganized lecture?
10. Look at students during lecture?
11. Use language students understand?
12. Use profane language excessively?

V. Organization and Presentation of Material
1. Begin class with a review of previous work?
2. Stress, in some way, important points in the material?
3. Use current, pertinent, and/or personal examples to illustrate a point?
4. Show usefulness of material in "real world"?
5. Admit not knowing answer to a question?
6. Use outside references to supplement course?
7. Distribute handouts/notes to supplement lecture?
8. Use visual aids to supplement lecture?
9. Provide for field trips?
10. Have guest lecturers?
11. Have full command of the subject matter?
   Give lectures different from (supplement) text?
   Cover all course requirements?
12. Avoid trivial detail?
13. Answer questions; work problems if requested?
14. Lecture over students heads?
15. Give erroneous information about course material?
16. Refuse to explain material?
17. Make students learn "on their own"?
18. Follow course schedule?
19. Prepare for class?

VI. Evaluation of Student Performance
1. Base tests on relevant (covered) material?
2. Base tests on knowledge of principles rather than memorization?
3. Base tests on emphasized material?
4. Make tests too easy?
5. Make tests too difficult?
6. Schedule quizzes at regular intervals?
7. Allow adequate time to complete tests?
8. Provide proper environment for test (quiet, etc.)?
9. Control cheating on tests?
10. Comment on (correct) returned papers, quizzes, etc.?
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11. Permit additional work to improve grade? 
12. Disregard lowest test score in grading? 
13. Use same test every quarter? 
14. Refuse to explain grading system? 
15. Tell how students are to be graded? 
16. Curve grades? 
17. Return all papers and quizzes? 
18. Grade all quizzes and assignments? 
19. Give makeup tests at mutual convenience? 
20. Grade on such things as major, sex, race, athlete, etc.? 
21. Grade on class attendance? 
22. Give final grades in accord with test scores? 
23. Grade on final exam only? 
24. Pass/fail a predetermined percentage of the class? 
25. Try to have makeup tests excessively difficult? 
26. Change a clearly unfair grade? 
27. Consider effort, participation, application in assigning final grade? 
28. Use student to grade work? 

VII. Interest in Job of Teaching 
1. Make derogatory comments about teaching? 
2. Make derogatory comments about the course? 
3. Indicate he would rather consult and/or do research? 
4. Criticize fellow teachers? 
5. Encourage students to enter the teaching profession?
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TEACHER SELF-EVALUATION FORM

Name of Teacher ___________________________ Date Form Completed _________________________

Course Title, number, & section ___________________________ Quarter ______ SP ______ S ______

The following questionnaire format is of a YES-NO type asking whether the behavior did or did not occur. The purpose is to give the teacher a visible means of comparing what he thinks he does to what the students think he does, so that he will be able to detect areas in his teaching that need improvement.

Please be completely honest with yourself.

After completing the questionnaire, and after all student forms are in, turn your form in to the class representative. He will seal your form and all the student forms in a large envelope and deliver it to the Academic Dean's or Department Head's office immediately after class. After all final grades have been deposited with the registrar, the teacher will break the seal and tally the results. The teacher and the dean or department head will discuss the results and the teacher's plan-of-action at a date and time they agree upon.

IN THIS COURSE DID I:

I. Personal Relationships With Students

1. Know or attempt to know student's? YES NO
2. Talk with students before and/or after class?
3. Give advice or assistance with personal problems upon student's request?
4. Discuss (answer questions) extraclass issues?
5. Compliment students on good answers?
6. Encourage (answer) all relevant questions in class?
7. Treat all students equally regardless of sex, race, major, etc.?
8. Ridicule, "ride" or otherwise embarrass students?
9. Give individual help with course material?
10. Lose control of myself in class (shout, curse, etc.)?
11. Bother (harass) students during recitation, quizzes, etc.?
12. Make threats concerning classwork?
13. Make threats concerning personal behavior?
14. Accept legitimate excuses, explanations for missing quizzes, etc.?
15. Refuse to listen to or recognize other viewpoints in class?
16. Say or indicate in some way that students are inferior?
17. Provide special "help" sessions for course material (individual and/or class)?
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II. Classroom Administration

1. Meet all scheduled (rescheduled) classes?  [YES/NO]
2. Arrive on time for all classes?  [YES/NO]
3. Inform class if I would be absent?  [YES/NO]
4. Discuss quiz dates or deadlines with students?  [YES/NO]
5. End classes at end of classtime?
   a. Frequently let the class out early?  [YES/NO]
   b. Frequently hold class past scheduled time?  [YES/NO]
6. Distribute a course outline or study plan (course objectives)?  [YES/NO]
7. Follow course outline or study plan?  [YES/NO]
8. Give examples of quiz items?  [YES/NO]
9. Require and grade homework.  [YES/NO]
10. Return papers and quizzes promptly?  [YES/NO]
11. Permit classroom disturbances?  [YES/NO]
12. Make false statements concerning course requirements (number of cuts, grading, etc.)?  [YES/NO]
13. Give excessive work?  [YES/NO]
14. Encourage use of library?  [YES/NO]

III. Student Participation

1. Ask students preference as to topics covered?  [YES/NO]
2. Ask students to critique his teaching?  [YES/NO]
3. Schedule quizzes, deadlines, etc., at the convenience of the class majority whenever possible?  [YES/NO]
4. Encourage (ask for) discussion, questions, or student opinions?  [YES/NO]
5. Ask questions to determine class (individual) understanding of course material?  [YES/NO]
6. Encourage class members to suggest guest speakers, field trips, etc.?  [YES/NO]

IV. Classroom presence

1. Appear well groomed?  [YES/NO]
2. Speak clearly and distinctly?
   a. Mumble?  [YES/NO]
   b. Talk too softly?  [YES/NO]
   c. Talk in a monotone?  [YES/NO]
3. Use dramatic gestures (phrases) to emphasize important points?  [YES/NO]
4. Use humor in lecture to illustrate points?  [YES/NO]
5. Use a variety of audio visual materials?  [YES/NO]
6. Read lectures from notes or book?  [YES/NO]
7. Appear nervous, ill-at-ease during lecture?  [YES/NO]
Appendix D

8. Talk or present material to rapidly? 

9. Give rambling, disorganized lecture? 

10. Look at students during lecture? 

11. Use language students understand? 

12. Use profane language excessively? 

V. Organization and Presentation of Material 

1. Begin class with a review of previous work? 

2. Stress, in some way, important points in the material? 

3. Use current, pertinent, and/or personal examples to illustrate a point? 

4. Show usefulness of material in "real world"? 

5. Admit not knowing answer to a question? 

6. Use outside references to supplement course? 

7. Distribute handouts/notes to supplement lecture? 

8. Use visual aids to supplement lecture? 

9. Provide for field trips? 

10. Have guest lecturers? 

11. Have full command of the subject matter? 

12. Give lectures different from (supplement) text? 

13. Cover all course requirements? 

14. Avoid trivial detail? 

15. Answer questions; work problems if requested? 

16. Lecture over students heads? 

17. Give erroneous information about course material? 

18. Refuse to explain material? 

19. Make students learn "on their own"? 

20. Follow course schedule? 

21. Prepare for class? 

VI. Evaluation of Student Performance 

1. Base tests on relevant (covered) material? 

2. Base tests on knowledge of principles rather than memorization? 

3. Base tests on emphasized material? 

4. Make tests too easy? 

5. Make tests too difficult? 

6. Schedule quizzes at regular intervals? 

7. Allow adequate time to complete tests? 

8. Provide proper environment for test (quiet, etc.)? 

9. Control cheating on tests? 

10. Comment on (correct) returned papers, quizzes, etc.?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Permit additional work to improve grade?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Disregard lowest test score in grading?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Use same test every quarter?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Refuse to explain grading system?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Tell how students are to be graded?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Curve grades?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Return all papers and quizzes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Grade all quizzes and assignments?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Give makeup tests at mutual convenience?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Grade on such things as major, sex, race, athlete, etc.?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Grade on class attendance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Give final grades in accord with test scores?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Grade on final exam only?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Pass/fail a predetermined percentage of the class?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Try to have makeup tests excessively difficult?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Change a clearly unfair grade?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Consider effort, participation, application in assigning final grade?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Use student to grade work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VII. Interest in Job of Teaching

1. Make derogatory comments about teaching? |     |
2. Make derogatory comments about the course? |     |
3. Indicate I would rather consult and/or do research? |     |
4. Criticize fellow teachers? |     |
5. Encourage students to enter the teaching profession? |     |
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CHAIRMAN EVALUATION FORM

Name of Teacher

Date Form Completed

Course Title, number, and section Quarter Day Night Curriculum

The following questionnaire format is of a YES-NO type asking whether a particular instructor performance did or did not occur. The chairman should determine whether the teacher is following his course outline, is teaching and testing by his objectives, and if learning is taking place. The chairman should also determine if non-instructional objectives are being met, and if the performance of routine administrative duties are being done satisfactorily.

After all evaluation team members have turned in their forms, the chairman will examine all of the forms, including student and self-evaluation forms, and make suggestions for improvement of the teacher's performance. He will send a copy of each team member's results and a copy of his suggestions to the teacher.

DID THE TEACHER IN THIS COURSE:

I. Instructional performance--preparation

1. Develop in writing clearly defined and appropriate goals?
2. Develop in writing an outline for each instructional program?
3. Develop in writing long range (quarterly) objectives for each course and state them in behavioral outcomes?
4. Develop in writing short range objectives for each course and state them in behavioral outcomes?
5. Develop in writing thorough lesson plans for each instructional session?
6. Evaluate testbooks, equipment, and supplies and recommend choices for adoption by dates specified by the institution?
7. Establish in writing clearly defined grading procedures and standards in accordance with the grading policy of the institution?
8. Use pretesting procedures and instruments to ascertain student's academic needs?
9. Select learning resources appropriate to the specified learning objectives?
10. Develop instructional strategies to enable students to achieve learning objectives?

II. Instructional performance--implementation

1. Communicate at a level appropriate to the ability of students to understand?
2. Show concern for the students' academic performance?
3. Teach by own objectives developed for course?
4. Give each student a copy of the course outline, objectives, and method of grading?
5. Use instructional strategies to enable students to achieve learning objectives?
Appendix E

6. Use available learning resources appropriate to specified learning objectives?

III. Instructional performance—evaluation of results

1. Evaluate student performance and review results fairly and promptly?

2. Collect and use feedback from experience with students to revise and update both content and methodology?

3. Use evaluative procedures which measure the degree to which the student has achieved the goals and objectives of the course?

IV. Responsibilities as a Member of the College Community

1. Attend all scheduled meetings punctually (class, labs, office hours, faculty-staff meetings, etc.)?

2. Perform routine administrative duties (reports, forms, grades, etc.) properly and promptly?

3. Show evidence of professional growth by participating in such activities as:
   ___ Internal development workshops
   ___ Community college/professionally sponsored workshops
   ___ Conferences or seminars whenever possible
   ___ Courses of related study
   ___ Local, state, and national organizations
   ___ Other approved activities

4. Accept divisional responsibilities (evaluation of instructional programs and teaching effectiveness, divisional committees, additional teaching loads when necessary, etc.)?

5. Serve on college-wide committees?

6. Participate in student advisory programs and/or sponsor or advise any student organization officially recognized by the institution?

(Signature) __________
Division Chairman/Department Head

(Signature) __________
Teacher
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PEER EVALUATION FORM

Name of Teacher __________________________ Date Form Completed ____________

Course Title, number, and section: __________________________ Quarter: ____________ Day: ____________ Night: ____________

Curriculum: ____________

The following questionnaire format is of a YES-NO type asking whether a particular instructor performance did or did not occur. The peer should determine whether the teacher is following his course outline, is teaching and testing by his objectives, and if learning is taking place. The peer evaluation should be limited to instructional performance.

After completing this form, turn it in along with suggestions for improvement of the teacher's performance to the division chairman.

DID THE TEACHER IN THIS COURSE:

I. Instructional performance--preparation

1. Develop in writing clearly defined and appropriate goals? YES NO

2. Develop in writing an outline for each instructional program? ____________

3. Develop in writing long range (quarterly) objectives for each course and state them in behavioral outcomes? ____________

4. Develop in writing short range objectives for each course and state them in behavioral outcomes? ____________

5. Develop in writing thorough lesson plans for each instructional session? ____________

6. Evaluate testbooks, equipment, and supplies and recommend choices for adoption by dates specified by the institution? ____________

7. Establish in writing clearly defined grading procedures and standards in accordance with the grading policy of the institution? ____________

8. Use pretesting procedures and instruments to ascertain student's academic needs? ____________

9. Select learning resources appropriate to the specified learning objectives? ____________

10. Develop instructional strategies to enable students to achieve learning objectives? ____________

II. Instructional performance--implementation

1. Communicate at a level appropriate to the ability of students to understand? ____________

2. Show concern for the students' academic performance? ____________

3. Teach by own objectives developed for course? ____________

4. Give each student a copy of the course outline, objectives, and method of grading? ____________

5. Use instructional strategies to enable students to achieve learning objectives? ____________
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6. Use available learning resources appropriate to specified learning objectives?

III. Instructional performance--evaluation of results

1. Evaluate student performance and review results fairly and promptly?

2. Collect and use feedback from experience with students to revise and update both content and methodology?

3. Use evaluative procedures which measure the degree to which the student has achieved the goals and objectives of the course?
### Teacher Self-Evaluation Form

This form is to be completed by the teacher and brought to the Chairman's conference after the chairman has visited your class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Teacher</th>
<th>Date Form Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Area I - General Characteristics

1. **Appearance**
   - Acceptable
   - Unacceptable

2. **Ability to get along with:**
   - Fellow Teachers
   - Parents
   - Chairman
   - Other Administrators
   - Secretaries, custodians, cafeteria workers
   - Teacher Aides
   - Others

3. **Health**
   - Acceptable
   - Unacceptable

4. **Attendance Record**
   - Acceptable
   - Unacceptable

#### Area II - Specific Teaching Variables

1. I feel my knowledge of my teaching area is:
   - Excellent
   - Poor

2. I feel my knowledge of individual student's interests, abilities and needs is:
   - Excellent
   - Poor

3. I believe that my goals and objectives for my lessons are to me:
   - Very Clear
   - Not Clear

4. I believe that my goals and objectives for my students:
   - Very Clear
   - Not Clear

5. I believe my ability to use a variety of techniques and tools for instruction is:
   - Excellent
   - Poor
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6. I individualize the student's program in my classes:

   \[
   \begin{array}{cccc}
   \frac{1}{5} & \frac{4}{5} & \frac{3}{5} & \frac{2}{5} & \frac{1}{5} \\
   \text{Very Much} & \text{Moderate} & \text{Slight} & \text{Not at All} \\
   \end{array}
   \]

10

7. The classroom procedures that I use are:

   \[
   \begin{array}{cccc}
   \frac{1}{5} & \frac{4}{5} & \frac{3}{5} & \frac{2}{5} & \frac{1}{5} \\
   \text{Well Organized} & \text{Somewhat} & \text{Somewhat Unorganized} & \text{Confusing} \\
   \end{array}
   \]

10

8. I make my lessons for the students:

   \[
   \begin{array}{cccc}
   \frac{1}{5} & \frac{4}{5} & \frac{3}{5} & \frac{2}{5} & \frac{1}{5} \\
   \text{Very Interesting} & \text{Moderate} & \text{Slight} & \text{Poor} \\
   \end{array}
   \]

10

9. My explanations to the students are:

   \[
   \begin{array}{cccc}
   \frac{1}{5} & \frac{4}{5} & \frac{3}{5} & \frac{2}{5} & \frac{1}{5} \\
   \text{Very Clear} & \text{Moderate} & \text{Slight} & \text{Confusing} \\
   \end{array}
   \]

10

10. My concerns for each student are:

   \[
   \begin{array}{cccc}
   \frac{1}{5} & \frac{4}{5} & \frac{3}{5} & \frac{2}{5} & \frac{1}{5} \\
   \text{Outstanding} & \text{Moderate} & \text{Slight} & \text{Poor} \\
   \end{array}
   \]

10

11. My grading practices are:

   \[
   \begin{array}{cccc}
   \frac{1}{5} & \frac{4}{5} & \frac{3}{5} & \frac{2}{5} & \frac{1}{5} \\
   \text{Very Fair} & \text{Moderate} & \text{Slight} & \text{Unfair} \\
   \end{array}
   \]

5

12. I come to my classes:

   \[
   \begin{array}{cccc}
   \frac{1}{5} & \frac{4}{5} & \frac{3}{5} & \frac{2}{5} & \frac{1}{5} \\
   \text{Well Prepared} & \text{Moderate} & \text{Slight} & \text{Unprepared} \\
   \end{array}
   \]

10

13. The homework I assign is:

   \[
   \begin{array}{cccc}
   \frac{1}{5} & \frac{4}{5} & \frac{3}{5} & \frac{2}{5} & \frac{1}{5} \\
   \text{Very Purposeful} & \text{Moderate} & \text{Slight} & \text{Not Purposeful} \\
   \end{array}
   \]

5

14. My control of student behavior is:

   \[
   \begin{array}{cccc}
   \frac{1}{5} & \frac{4}{5} & \frac{3}{5} & \frac{2}{5} & \frac{1}{5} \\
   \text{Excellent} & \text{Moderate} & \text{Slight} & \text{Poor} \\
   \end{array}
   \]

5

15. My classroom assignments are:

   \[
   \begin{array}{cccc}
   \frac{1}{5} & \frac{4}{5} & \frac{3}{5} & \frac{2}{5} & \frac{1}{5} \\
   \text{Reasonable and Clear} & \text{Somewhat} & \text{Unreasonable and Confused} \\
   \end{array}
   \]

10

16. My students treat me with:

   \[
   \begin{array}{cccc}
   \frac{1}{5} & \frac{4}{5} & \frac{3}{5} & \frac{2}{5} & \frac{1}{5} \\
   \text{Respect} & \text{Moderate} & \text{Slight} & \text{Disrespect} \\
   \end{array}
   \]

5

17. I would rank myself, compared to other teachers, as:

   \[
   \begin{array}{cccc}
   \frac{1}{5} & \frac{4}{5} & \frac{3}{5} & \frac{2}{5} & \frac{1}{5} \\
   \text{Outstanding} & \text{Moderate} & \text{Slight} & \text{Poor} \\
   \end{array}
   \]
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Note: All 10 point weightings received 2 points per interval, all 5 point weightings receive 1. Weighting = __________

Area III - Overall Statements
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TEACHER YEARLY PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES FORM

Name of Teacher ___________________________ Date Form Completed ____________

This form is to be completed in triplicate with two copies given to your Department Chairman and one copy retained by you. Department Chairman's copies should be presented by November 30th, yearly. Your statements will be reviewed at a chairman's conference as a part of the total evaluation procedure.

I expect to improve my teaching this year by accomplishing the following:

In the area of subject area knowledge:

1. ______________________________________

2. ______________________________________

In the area of techniques of instruction:

1. ______________________________________

2. ______________________________________

In the area of individualizing instruction:

1. ______________________________________

2. ______________________________________

In the area of clarification of instructional objectives for myself and my students:

1. ______________________________________

2. ______________________________________
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In the area of positive reinforcement of each student:

1.

2.

In the area of communication and cooperation with:

A. Fellow Teachers:

1.

2.

B. Building Administrators:

1.

2.

C. Students:

1.

2.

D. Parents:

1.

2.

E. Other School Employees (catering, custodial, secretarial):

1.

2.
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F. Teacher Sites:
1. 

2. 

C. District Level Participation in Future Planning:
1. 

2. 

In the area of other performance objectives (name):
1. 

2.
Immediate Supervisor Evaluation Form

Name of Administrator

Date Form Completed

Position

The following questionnaire format is of a YES-NO type asking whether a particular administrator's performance did or did not occur. The supervisor should determine whether short-range departmental goals have been accomplished, whether the administrator's personal objectives have been met, whether his department is still working toward their long-range goals, and whether routine administrative duties have been performed satisfactorily.

The supervisor will furnish his subordinate with a copy of his evaluation at their conference to discuss the results of the evaluation.

DID THE ADMINISTRATOR:

**YES** | **NO**
--- | ---

**I. Management performance--departmental**

1. Develop in writing long-range goals for area of responsibility consistent with the mission of the school?
2. Develop in writing short-range goals for his area of responsibility?
3. Develop in writing organizational plans and procedures to attain goals set for department?
4. Organize personnel to obtain goals set for department?

**II. Management performance--personnel**

1. Develop in writing job descriptions for each staff position?
2. Develop in writing job specifications?
3. Make job assignments according to specifications?
4. Require staff to develop written performance objectives for approval?
5. Evaluate staff members each year and make firm recommendations?
6. Arrange in-service experience for staff members?

**III. Management performance--personal**

1. Establish priorities and allocate time according to these priorities?
2. Develop written performance objectives stated in measurable outcomes?
3. Submit plans in conference and in writing to supervisor?
4. Submit plans in conference and in writing to staff?
5. Seek support for plans?
6. Demonstrate management ability?
7. Develop (in writing) a program to keep up with the latest developments in his speciality?

**IV. Responsibilities as a member of the college community**

1. Is punctual in attending scheduled meetings (office hours, appointments, faculty-staff meetings, etc.)?
2. Properly and promptly performs routine administrative duties?
DID THE ADMINISTRATOR:

YES   NO

3. Show evidence of professional growth by participating in activities such as:
   ______ Internal development workshops
   ______ Community college/professionally sponsored workshops
   ______ Conferences or seminars whenever possible
   ______ Courses of related study
   ______ Participation in local, state, and national organizations
   ______ Other approved activities

4. Accept management responsibilities (evaluation of management effectiveness and practices, instructional programs, staff, etc.)?

5. Accept divisional responsibilities (divisional committees, additional administrative duties when necessary, etc.)?

6. Serve on college-wide committees?

7. Participate in student advisory programs and/or sponsor or advise any student organization officially recognized by the institution?
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ADMINISTRATOR SELF-EVALUATION FORM

Name of Administrator ___________________________  Date Form Completed ____________

Position ____________________________

The following questionnaire format is of a YES-NO type asking whether action did or did not occur. This form is identical to the supervisor's form and offers a direct comparison of what the administrator thinks he does to what his supervisor thinks he does.

On or before the beginning of each evaluation period, each administrator will submit a copy of his self-evaluation and any other relevant data (teacher evaluation, subordinate evaluation, etc.). This data and the observations by the supervisor will be the subject of a conference between the two prior to the end of each evaluation period.

DID I:

YES  NO

I. Management performance--departmental

1. Develop in writing long-range goals for area of responsibility consistent with the mission of the school?

2. Develop in writing short-range goals for my area of responsibility?

3. Develop in writing organizational plans and procedures to attain goals set for department?

4. Organize personnel to obtain goals set for department?

II. Management performance--personnel

1. Develop in writing job descriptions for each staff position?

2. Develop in writing job specifications?

3. Make job assignments according to specifications?

4. Require staff to develop written performance objectives for approval?

5. Evaluate staff members each year and make firm recommendations?

6. Arrange in-service experience for staff members?

III. Management performance--personal

1. Establish priorities and allocate time according to these priorities

2. Develop written performance objectives stated in measurable outcome

3. Submit plans in conference in writing to supervisor?

4. Submit plans in conference in writing to staff?

5. Seek support for plans?

6. Demonstrate management ability?

7. Develop (in writing) a program to keep up with the latest developments in my specialty?

IV. Responsibilities as a member of the college community

1. Is punctual in attending scheduled meetings (office hours, appointments, faculty-staff meetings, etc.)?

2. Properly and promptly performs routine administrative duties?
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DID THE ADMINISTRATOR:

YES  NO  3. Show evidence of professional growth by participating in activities such as:
   ___ Internal development workshops
   ___ Community college/professionally sponsored workshops
   ___ Conferences or seminars whenever possible
   ___ Courses of related study
   ___ Participation in local, state, and national organizations
   ___ Other approved activities

4. Accept management responsibilities (evaluation of management effectiveness and practices, instructional programs, staff, etc.)?

5. Accept divisional responsibilities (divisional committees, additional administrative duties when necessary, etc.)?

6. Serve on college-wide committees?

7. Participate in student advisory programs and/or sponsor or advise any student organization officially recognized by the institution?
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STAFF EVALUATION FORM

Name of Supervisor ___________________________ Date Form Completed ____________

Position ___________________________

The following questionnaire format is of a YES-NO type asking for your opinion on the following questions.

Do not sign your name, and please be fair and honest in your responses.

After completing this questionnaire, seal it in an envelope and put it in your supervisor's mailbox.

YES  NO

1. Do you find talking with your supervisor a positive experience?
2. Is your supervisor easy to get along with?
3. Does your supervisor welcome your suggestions?
4. Is your supervisor as willing to compliment you for good work as he is to find fault with your mistakes?
5. When you make a mistake, does your supervisor - in a constructive way - discuss it with you?
6. Does your supervisor realize the problems and difficulties that confront you in carrying out your responsibilities?
7. When you talk with your supervisor do you feel that an honest exchange of ideas is possible?
8. When your supervisor gives instructions to you, do they seem sound?
9. When your supervisor gives you instructions, are they clearly stated?
10. When you are dealing with your supervisor on a problem, does he have the ability to ask questions which get at the heart of the matter?
11. Does your supervisor usually let you know how you are doing?
12. When you complain about something to your supervisor, does he listen and discuss the matter in a fair, logical way?
13. When you want to see your supervisor, is he available?
14. Can you depend on your supervisor to keep his commitments?
15. Is your supervisor decisive?
16. Does your supervisor generally inform you in advance of impending changes that affect you?
17. Does your supervisor admit it when he is wrong?
18. Does your supervisor serve as a resource of current practices and trends in his area of expertise?
19. Does your supervisor allow you an opportunity to participate in staff meetings?
20. Does your supervisor encourage a full range of opinions at staff meetings?
21. Are your supervisor's meetings informative?

22. Is the agenda for staff meetings wisely selected?

23. Does your supervisor encourage your initiative in innovation?

24. When innovation is attempted, does your supervisor help you to assess the project?

25. Does your supervisor encourage you to assist in the evaluation of on-going projects?

26. Does your supervisor assist you in solving difficulties with interpersonal relationships?
Ocher Administrator/Teacher Evaluation Form

Name of Administrator

Date Form Completed

Position

This questionnaire format is of a YES-NO type asking the teacher for his opinion on each of the following questions. The purpose of this evaluation is to provide the administrator with information about how others see him. This information should be used by the administrator to enhance his own personal and professional growth.

Do not sign your name, and please be fair and honest in your responses.

After completing this questionnaire, seal it in an envelope and put it in the administrator's mailbox.

YES  NO

1. Is the administrator's appearance neat and appropriate?
2. Does the administrator speak clearly?
3. Does the administrator use correct English?
4. Is the administrator able to meet frustration without becoming hostile toward teachers, administrators, and others?
5. Does the administrator show a respect and concern for others?
6. Is the administrator open-minded, happy in his outlook on life?
7. Is the administrator able to work effectively with others?
8. Is the administrator's office neat and attractive?
9. Does the administrator's office have a congenial and friendly atmosphere?
10. Does the administrator communicate pertinent information to teachers and students?
11. Is the administrator receptive to new ideas?
12. Is the administrator willing to accept advice and suggestions from others?
13. Is the administrator enthusiastic about his work?
14. Does the administrator ever ridicule or otherwise embarrass anyone publically?
15. Do you find talking with this administrator a positive experience?
16. Is the administrator's behavior ethical and professional?
17. Does the administrator appear to be well organized?