

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 287 214

EA 019 729

AUTHOR Weber, James R.
TITLE Teacher Evaluation. Annotated Bibliography.
INSTITUTION North Central Regional Educational Lab., Elmhurst, IL.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Jul 87
CONTRACT 400-86-0004
NOTE 32p.; Prepared by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management under contract to NCREL. For other documents in the same series, see EA 019 726-731.
AVAILABLE FROM Publication Sales, ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, 1787 Agate St., Eugene, OR 97403 (\$6.00); North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, 295 Emroy Ave., Elmhurst, IL 60126 (\$6.00).
PUB TYPE Reference Materials - Bibliographies (131) -- Information Analyses - ERIC Information Analysis Products (071)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accountability; Citation Analysis; Classroom Observation Techniques; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; Feedback; *Instructional Improvement; Lesson Observation Criteria; Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Improvement; *Teacher Supervision
IDENTIFIERS ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management

ABSTRACT

This annotated bibliography was prepared to provide background material for a synthesis paper, "Teacher Evaluation as a Strategy for Improving Instruction." Both formative (teacher improvement) and summative (personnel decisions) aspects of the topic are addressed by the materials collected. The 52 selected items, most of which were published since 1980, reflect major currents of thought and practice in teacher evaluation. Entries were identified through a search of the ERIC database, supplemented by the recommendations of reviewers who read the first draft of the synthesis paper. (TE)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

Teacher Evaluation

Annotated Bibliography

James Weber

July 1987

**Prepared for the
North Central Regional Educational Laboratory**

**by the
ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management
University of Oregon**

Foreword

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management at the University of Oregon and the North Central Regional Laboratory at Elmhurst, Illinois, are pleased to offer this publication, part of a series of syntheses papers and annotated bibliographies on themes related to instructional leadership and school improvement. The Clearinghouse wrote and edited the materials under a sub-contract for the North Central Laboratory. Both agencies are now making the publications available to their respective clientele.

The titles of all the publications in this series are as follows:

Synthesis Papers

Instructional Leadership: A Composite Working Model
Teacher Evaluation as a Strategy for Improving Instruction
From Isolation to Collaboration: Improving the Work Environment of Teaching

Annotated Bibliographies

Models of Instructional Leadership
Teacher Evaluation
The Social and Organizational Context of Teaching

The author of this publication, James R. Weber, is a research analyst and writer for the ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Jane H. Arends
Executive Director
**North Central Regional
Educational Laboratory**

Philip K. Piele
Director
**ERIC Clearinghouse on
Educational Management**

About ERIC

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) is a national information system operated by the National Institute of Education. ERIC serves the educational community by disseminating educational research results and other resource information that can be used in developing more effective educational programs.

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, one of several clearinghouses in the system, was established at the University of Oregon in 1966. The Clearinghouse and its companion units process research results and journal articles for announcement in ERIC's index and abstract bulletins.

Research reports are announced in *Resources in Education (RIE)*, available in many libraries and by subscription for \$51.00 a year from the United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Most of the documents listed in RIE can be purchased through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, operated by Computer Microfilm International Corporation.

Journal articles are announced in *Current Index to Journals in Education. CIJE* is also available in many libraries and can be ordered for \$150.00 a year from Oryx Press, 2214 North Central at Encanto, Phoenix, Arizona 85004. Semiannual cumulations can be ordered separately.

Besides processing documents and journal articles, the Clearinghouse prepares bibliographies, literature reviews, monographs, and other interpretive research studies on topics in its educational area.

Introduction

This annotated bibliography was prepared to provide background material for the writing of a synthesis paper published separately under the title *Teacher Evaluation as a Strategy for Improving Instruction*. Both formative (teacher improvement) and summative (personnel decisions) aspects of the topic are addressed by the materials collected.

This is not intended to be an exhaustive compilation; items were selected that reflect major currents of thought and practice in teacher evaluation. Accordingly, the majority of items were published since 1980, though a few seminal works precede that date.

Initially, entries were identified through a search of the ERIC database. These were supplemented by the recommendations of reviewers who read the first draft of the synthesis paper.

Annotated Bibliography

Teacher Evaluation

Acheson, Keith A., and Gall, Meredith Damien, *Techniques in the Clinical Supervision of Teachers: Preservice and Inservice Applications*. 2nd ed. New York: Longman, 1987.

Acheson and Gall address directly the troublesome issues in building an effective evaluation program. Recognizing the potential conflicts in supervision and summative evaluation, they urge that supervision be the duty of staff who will not evaluate teachers. Moreover, they discuss several essential features of programs that actually do separate the formative and summative duties: (1) District standards must be communicated to teachers and translated into behaviors relevant to each school; (2) job descriptions should reflect those standards and specify teachers' unique duties in their specialized areas of school programs; (3) performance goals should successfully break down the forbidding task of "improvement" into attainable (and recordable) steps; (4) plans of assistance can help teachers reach competence and satisfy the district's due-process responsibilities; (5) postevaluation conferences should keep teachers and evaluators communicating about standards and performances; and (6) policies can be developed on activities following the dismissal of a teacher.

In a related chapter, the authors cover topics in the broadening field of instructional leadership, including leaders' roles and behaviors that are relevant to supervision and evaluation duties.

Bickel, William E., and Artz, Nancy J. "Improving Instruction Through Focused Team Supervision." *Educational Leadership*, 41,7 (April 1984): 22-24. EJ 299 429.

The School Improvement Program (SIP) in seven Pittsburgh elementary schools tries to solve the dilemma of tight budgets limiting adequate supervision by introducing long-range instructional objectives and supervisory teams. The "focused team supervision" in SIP has five basic features. First, it relies on a wide array of data sources: standardized tests, observations, school-level needs, basic skills monitoring of students, teacher plans, and similar measures of teacher performance.

Second, the team focuses its supervision on priority needs in each school rather than skimming over the school's performance as the principal might be forced to do if he or she were the only observer. Third, supervisory meetings are held weekly, allowing supervisors to share information. Biweekly planning sessions are

also held between SIP supervisors and principals. Fourth, regular education and special education supervisors collaborate on planning and other activities. Finally, the instructional supervisors and principals work toward a shared set of goals.

Bird, Tom, and Little, Judith Warren. *Instructional Leadership in Eight Secondary Schools.* Final Report. Boulder, Colorado: Center for Action Research, Inc., June 1985. 281 pages. ED 263 694.

As part of their study of instructional leadership, the authors examined classroom observations in eight secondary schools. They found that where instructional leadership was taken seriously, extensive and skillful observation of teachers was an important part of staff development. Bird and Little analyzed observation practices for nine kinds of information: frequency, duration, preparation, data taken, mutual respect of teacher and observer, followup, role of evaluation in observation process, reinforcement, and initiative regarding changing teaching practices.

Observations by administrators, the most common type, were supported by teachers when teachers found that the procedures provided them support and recognition for their work in the classroom. Department heads often lacked adequate supervisory knowledge, but they were nonetheless in position to provide valuable observations. Collegial observation was opposed by teachers in big-city schools (where teacher autonomy was fierce), but supported in schools where principals had successfully established helpful, supportive models of observation for the school as a whole.

Bird and Little suggest a five-point philosophy of reciprocity in observations to ameliorate the social conflicts that plague observations.

Blumberg, Arthur. "Supervision in Weakly Normed Systems: The Case of the Schools." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada, April 1983. 18 pages. ED 239 381.

Blumberg provides reality therapy for evaluation research by observing that the organizational characteristics of schools compromise supervisors' effectiveness, making them mostly ineffective. Schools are organized so that schools have an almost unshakable autonomy in their teaching practices. That is, schools are "loosely coupled organizations," to use a currently popular phrase.

Moreover, the norms in the school setting operate against

teachers pressuring their colleagues to improve their work. Such pressure comes not from their colleagues but from other sources, such as a principal or central office supervisor. Thus, there is an extremely wide range of tolerable or approved behavior; as far as teachers are concerned, their colleagues can be as ineffective or effective as they choose to be. Teachers, then, get no rewards from colleagues for improving. They may be punished, however, if they violate school norms--if their classroom is too loud, for instance, thus disturbing other teachers and classes.

In this setting, supervisors, too, get little support for their work from the culture of the organization. In reality, because of the organizational characteristics of the schools in which they work, supervisors can expect improvement in their institutions to be slow, perhaps barely perceptible. The supervisor should first attend to improvement in individual teachers because the normative structure probably will not encourage improvement of the faculty as a whole. A supervisor's access to a teacher's world must be earned by the supervisor's expertise.

Blumberg, Arthur. *Supervisors and Teachers: A Private Cold War*. Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1974.

Teachers often find supervision only occasionally helpful, if helpful at all. Indeed, much of the time, supervision is adversarial--a cold war between teachers and supervisors. This gamesmanship can be overcome.

Research has matched supervisors' styles and assumptions with teachers' behaviors and attitudes. Once the problem areas are identified, a behavioral category system can be used to analyze interactions in particular schools. Data should be drawn not only from teachers' classroom functions but also from the interpersonal interactions of supervisors, teachers, and students.

Questions of policy must also be considered in teacher supervision: the place of tenured teachers, the supervisor's conflict in trying both to help and to evaluate, the role of peer supervisors, and the final use of supervision as a process of mutual development.

British Columbia Teachers' Federation. *Program for Quality Teaching: Developing Teaching Practices*. August 1986.

This handbook for teachers involved in the British Columbia "Program for Quality Teaching" aims at developing skills and attitudes for effective teaching. Two of the units are devoted to improving human relations skills and becoming acquainted with alternative teaching approaches. A third unit, however, develops

skills for analyzing teaching (that is, observing and evaluating). In sections liberally illustrated by examples drawn from observation experiences, this unit covers planning for observations, using techniques for observing, analyzing observational data, and giving feedback. Because the units are so closely allied to practice, the advice is pointed and clear.

Burke, Peter J., and Fessler, Ralph. "A Collaborative Approach to Supervision." *The Clearing House*, 57, 3 (November 1983): 107-110. EJ 291 221.

Burke and Fessler want teacher supervision to be a collaborative effort, involving the teacher as self-evaluator and a facilitator, who observes, reacts, and initiates the evaluation process. Professional growth, according to the model these authors adopt, involves identification of a teacher's growth needs, feedback from various sources, the teacher's internalization (self-recognition) of the evaluation and subsequent agreement with its conclusions, and an action plan for further professional development for the teacher.

The feedback required in this model is provided by numerous sources--other teachers, administrators, parents, and students, certainly--but it must be communicated accurately, analyzed, and internalized. Thus, a need exists for facilitators to guide teachers through the process.

Cawelti, Gordon, and Reavis, Charles. "How Well Are We Providing Instructional Improvement Services?" *Educational Leadership*, 38, 3 (December 1980): 236-40. EJ 236 608.

A survey sponsored by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development in 1979-80 measured the perceptions of school professionals with regard to four instructional improvement functions: curriculum development, clinical supervision, staff development, and teacher evaluation.

In the areas of supervision and evaluation, data showed a general similarity of perception among teachers, principals, and central office administrators. On both issues, nearly everyone agreed that schools could do much better. Indeed, instructional supervision was ranked the least adequately provided instructional service, regardless of community size or group surveyed. Only about 25 percent of urban teachers and slightly over 30 percent of suburban teachers rated supervision as adequate. Only about 15 percent of all teachers reported having any experience with clinical supervision (this figure being somewhat higher in medium-sized cities).

The situation was similar for teacher evaluation. Only about

a third of those surveyed thought evaluation was adequate. Over half of the respondents reported using some form of self-evaluation in their system.

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

In this seminal work in the literature of clinical supervision, Cogan records his development of supervision methods that actually improve teaching. He assumes that supervision is an interactive dynamic. That is to say, supervisors allow teachers to assume as many of the supervisory tasks as possible, such as initiating hypotheses about their teaching, proposing actions, analyzing their performance, devising strategies for supervision, and maintaining morale. The supervisor is a contributor rather than a principal character.

Cogan proposes a cycle of supervision in eight phases: (1) establishing the teacher-supervisor relationship, (2) planning lessons or units, (3) planning the strategy of observation, (4) observing classroom instruction, (5) analyzing the events of the class, (6) planning for supervisor-teacher conference, (7) holding the conference, and (8) planning for changes in and future observation of the teacher's instruction.

Cruikshank, Donald R., and Applegate, Jane H. "Reflective Teaching as a Strategy for Teacher Growth." *Educational Leadership*, 38, 7 (April 1981): 553-54. EJ 245 690.

A reflective teaching exercise developed at Ohio State University simulates classroom teaching by having each participant devise and teach a fifteen-minute lesson for his or her small group. The lesson and objectives are prescribed for each participant. One objective, for example, may be to teach how to make paper butterflies using origami methods. At the end of the time, the designated teacher is given a few minutes to assess student performance. Finally, in the reflection phase, teachers and learners discuss how the process went for each. Learners report having new insights into students' problems, and all participants report learning more about the mechanics of teaching.

Darling-Hammond, Linda. "A Proposal for Evaluation in the Teaching Profession." *The Elementary School Journal*, 86, 4 (March 1986): 531-551. EJ 337 997.

Darling-Hammond distinguishes bureaucratic from professional evaluation of teachers. The former assumes that teachers simply perform their work and do not participate in diagnosing and

planning. Although there are compelling reasons for the existence of bureaucratic evaluation methods--particularly, the minimum competency concerns of government and public--in fact, the bureaucratic approach misses the vital matters of teachers' knowledge and judgment. Teachers thus become "street-level bureaucrats" rather than professionals. In other professions, peer review is the rule, and it is allowed by society because these professions lay claim to a body of knowledge that relies heavily on the professionals' judgments.

Applied to teaching, the lessons of other professions' review practices suggest first that rigorous training and continuous education are essential for professional control over decisions affecting teaching. Furthermore, teachers' professional control over their work situations depends on their articulating, transmitting, and enforcing professional standards themselves, among the members of their profession. Of course, this self-enforced professional accountability requires ongoing peer reviews of individuals and substantial peer control over both the training and selection of teachers. Teachers must also supply forums and support systems for putative cases of malpractice, incompetence, or unprofessional conduct.

Darling-Hammond, Linda, and Wise, Arthur E. "Teaching Standards, or Standardized Teaching?" *Educational Leadership*. 41,2 (October 1983): 66-69. EJ 286 674.

Although merit pay and master teacher plans continue to be proposed for teacher improvement, both reforms lack teachers' input. Both plans try to raise standards from outside the profession, imposing norms on teachers rather than having teachers as professionals generate their own norms. "The process of defining what constitutes good teaching content and methods," say the authors, "has increasingly been wrested from teachers and is instead conducted by policymakers. The result is a bureaucratic conception of teaching reflected in policies that prescribe educational processes and outcomes to be implemented by teacher-bureaucrats."

Three types of policies obstruct efforts to improve teaching through applying standards:

1. curriculum and testing policies that limit what can be taught and how--the "remote-control" method of governing education
2. policies that create paperwork and divert teachers' energies from teaching
3. policies that de-professionalize teaching by excluding teachers' judgments about what constitutes appropriate teaching and learning (including mechanistic teacher-evaluation practices, one-dimensional student placement and promotion practices, and bureaucratic decisions about

program design)

In sum, *how* one seeks to improve teaching is at least as important as goals and standards.

Darling-Hammond, Linda, and others. "Teacher Evaluation in the Organizational Context: A Review of the Literature." *Review of Educational Research*, 53, 3 (Fall 1983): 285-328. EJ 290 819.

According to the authors, many teacher evaluation models are developed with little regard for the context in which they will be used. When a mismatch takes place between an evaluation model and the needs of those employing it, little can be accomplished.

In an analysis drawn from an extensive literature review, the authors identify a number of factors that should be considered when engaging in teacher evaluation. Methods appropriate for formative (teaching improvement) evaluations may be inappropriate for summative (personnel decision) evaluations, and vice-versa. Evaluation methods should take into consideration the perceived needs of students, teachers, administrators, and the community. And they must take into consideration collective bargaining agreements and state laws.

Having identified these and other important factors, the authors finally pose "four minimal conditions for the successful operation of a teacher evaluation system": (1) All interested parties must share an "understanding of the criteria and processes" involved. (2) There must be a "shared sense" that those criteria "capture the most important aspects of teaching." (3) Teachers must perceive that the procedure helps them in their teaching, while principals must perceive that it helps them provide instructional leadership. (4) And the teachers and principal must perceive that the "procedure achieves a balance between control and autonomy" for everyone involved.

Duffy, Francis M. "Analyzing and Evaluating Supervisory Practice." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Chicago, March 23, 1985. 14 pages. ED 254 896.

Emphasizing the organizational restrictions on and aids to evaluation, Duffy holds that four premises must guide school efforts toward improving instructional supervision. First, increasing the effectiveness of supervision requires recognizing the unique characteristics of each teacher and district. Second, not only might attitudes, philosophies, and skills change, but the organization of the school may change too, in such areas as the definition of teacher roles. Third, a comprehensive organizational analysis is needed to successfully match systems to needs. Finally, to maintain supervisory effectiveness, a problem-

solving capacity must be a part of the school's organization.

On these premises, Duffy builds a model program of supervision. It is composed of a purpose statement clarifying the goals of supervision, the five-year goals and staff developmental activities engaged in by participants in the process, the policies and procedures of supervision as well as the supervisory practices, and the ways to determine the relative success of supervision and to locate strategies for improvement.

Duke, David L., and Stiggins, Richard J. "Five Keys to Growth Through Teacher Evaluation." Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. December 1986.

The authors identify five keys to successful teacher evaluation that correspond to factors in the evaluation process: the teachers being evaluated, the evaluators, the nature of performance data, the sort of feedback provided, and the context of the evaluation.

Besides differing in instructional competence, teachers also differ in their personal expectations for their teaching and in their degree of receptiveness to evaluation--their openness to criticism and orientation to change. Moreover, they vary in the extent of their knowledge about their disciplines and in their general professional experience (their record of success with students, for instance, or previous evaluation experiences).

Evaluators, in turn, must be credible, persuasive, and patient to be effective. They must also be able to inspire trust in teachers. Besides these personal qualities, their professional strengths, particularly their reputations for sound advice and ability to demonstrate teaching skills, contribute to a trustworthy reputation.

The nature of the data gathered is as important in evaluations as the qualities of the people involved. Performance standards, for instance, vary with the purposes of evaluation; competency evaluations require different standards than do professional development reviews. Sources of data must also be selected, as well as methods of gathering and analyzing the data. Someone must also identify those most fitting to perform the evaluation, whether peers, supervisors, students, or outsiders.

Finally, the diplomacy of feedback and the context of evaluation must be considered. Contextual considerations cover a wide range of concerns, from the time required for evaluations to the role that state law and district policies have in evaluating teachers.

All these considerations add up to seven particular strategies

to use in improving teacher evaluations. A "Teacher Evaluation Experience Questionnaire" allows staff to gauge teachers' receptivity to evaluation.

Eisner, Elliott. "An Artistic Approach to Supervision." In *Supervision of Teaching*, edited by Thomas J. Sergiovanni. 53-66. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1982. ED 213 075.

Taylorism, the philosophy of scientific management, has had pernicious effects on the practice and theory of teacher supervision. By treating teaching as if it could be scientifically managed, this philosophy has encouraged a host of fallacies. The fallacy of additivity, for instance, asserts that increasing the number of teaching behaviors that have an effect on learning must necessarily make better teaching. The fallacy of method, to cite another sort of mistake, is the tendency to ignore those aspects of teaching that are not covered by a researcher's criteria and instruments.

The approach to teaching as a scientifically based technology too often ignores the artistry and complex trains of intuition and thought that go into teaching. An artistic approach to supervision accounts for the full range of teaching problems and environments. Such an approach "relies on the sensitivity, perceptivity, and knowledge of the supervisor as a way of appreciating the significant subtleties occurring in the classroom, and . . . exploits the expressive, poetic, and often metaphorical potential of language to convey to teachers or to others whose decisions affect what goes on in schools, what has been observed."

Eisner, Elliott. "On the Uses of Educational Connoisseurship and Criticism for Evaluating Classroom Life." *The Educational Imagination*. New York: MacMillan, 1979.

Scientific management is still the formative influence behind most conceptions of evaluation. This approach presupposes that the same evaluation methods can be universally successful in any school, with any teachers, in any subject. An alternative approach can include educational connoisseurship and educational criticism.

Connoisseurship is the art of awareness, of seeing the characteristics of teaching for what they are and do. It involves a wide experience with teaching, a *savoir faire*, both with teaching that works and teaching that doesn't. Criticism, a complementary art, reveals what the knowing observer understands about a particular performance--why it works and why it doesn't. Evaluations that use the evaluator's fullest resources of

knowledge and judgment may also require their using creative language and other aesthetic dimensions of observation and feedback.

Embretson, Gary, and others. "Supervision and Evaluation: Helping Teachers Reach Their Maximum Potential." *NASSP Bulletin*, 68, 469 (February 1984): 26-30. EJ 294 876.

This article describes the teacher-evaluation practices in the Rosemount, Minnesota, school district. The process is both supervisory and evaluative, but it emphasizes supervision as an ongoing commitment to teacher improvement. A nine-step process takes new teachers from the interview stage (even before they are hired) through observations and planned improvement strategies.

Fitzgerald, James, and Muth, Rodney. "It Takes More than Money to Improve Teaching." *NASSP Bulletin*, 68, 470 (March 1984): 37-40. EJ 294 981.

The authors offer a hypothetical supervisory model and compute the costs of its implementation. Intended for formative evaluation, the model involves training selected teachers through a six-week summer training session and freeing five teachers of teaching duties every three years to serve as supervisors. The cost of the system--projecting about 6 percent of the instructional staff budget for the supervisors' salaries, 1 percent for training, and 4 percent for released time--averages about \$2,200 for each teacher. This cost is much less than training programs for professional and technical employees in business.

Garawski, Robert A. "Collaboration Is Key: Successful Teacher Evaluation Not a Myth." *NASSP Bulletin*, 64, 434 (March 1980): 1-7. EJ 217 698.

This article contains nine guidelines, with accompanying rationales, designed for teacher evaluation. Successful evaluation procedures are shared responsibilities: administrators and teachers planning, analyzing, and observing as colleagues. Evaluation is a formative process of mutual growth rather than simply a summative statement of personnel management. Consonant with the emphasis on evaluation as staff development, Garawski's observation model gives the essential steps in a three-stage evaluation cycle that involves preobservation conferences, observations, and postobservation conferences in the manner of a scaled-down clinical supervision model.

Garman, Noreen B. "The Clinical Approach to Supervision." In

Supervision of Teaching, edited by Thomas J. Sergiovanni. 35-52. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1982. ED 213 075.

Since the advent of clinical supervision practices in the early 1970s, a knowledge base has been generated among practitioners that provides a conceptual framework for understanding variant approaches. Four concepts in particular describe and guide the clinical practice of supervision: collegiality, collaboration, skilled service, and ethical conduct. Collegiality involves the supervisors as genuinely interested participants in the process of teaching. Collaboration includes the kind and quality of a supervisor's and teacher's involvement in instructional development--the "educational alliance" that they form. Skilled service brings the supervisor's experienced knowledge of teaching and learning into the supervisory relationship with the teacher. And ethical conduct ensures that the supervisor's knowledge will not violate the reciprocity or confidence of the professional relationship between supervisor and teacher.

Garman, Norven B. "Reflection, the Heart of Clinical Supervision: A Modern Rationale for Professional Practice." *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 2, 1 (Fall 1986): 1-24. EJ 341 166.

"Educators need a modern rationale for their practice . . . a rationale that makes sense within everyday events and contributes to the professional community one represents." Garman contributes to a working rationale for education by inquiring into the philosophical backgrounds of clinical supervision as Morris Cogan developed them. She draws out the implications of Cogan's work for seeing clinical supervision as a collaborative involvement in professional development.

Garman states that educators use a shared body of knowledge in education in one of two ways--by application or by reflection. Whereas the application approach has practitioners "plan, implement, and evaluate," the reflective approach directs them to "plan, act, reflect, and evaluate." Reflection on action is the heart of clinical supervision. Reflection can be helped by developing scenarios from actual classroom practices, in which the plan and the actions are described so that teachers and supervisors can recognize intentions and possible paths to their instructional goals.

Glass, Gene V. "Teacher Effectiveness." In *Evaluating Educational Performance: A Sourcebook of Methods, Instruments, and Examples*, edited by Herbert J. Walberg. 11-32. Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1974.

Glass discusses the reliability of means of evaluating teacher

effectiveness.

Judging teacher performance by looking at student scores on standardized tests is once again shown to be an unreliable, inaccurate test of teaching. Integrating the findings of three hitherto unpublished studies, Glass correlates the residual gain scores over a two-year period for students of specific teachers, drawing stability-reliability coefficients.

The PMM (Popham-McNeil-Millmann) method of assessing teacher effectiveness also fails to provide a useful measurement. In order to be reliable, it must be accurate across topics and pupil groups. Unfortunately, Glass finds, a summary of the stability of teacher performance from various research studies shows only how unsophisticated and flawed the research was that tested PMM in the years after its introduction.

Glass proposes a three-part observational-evaluation approach, using trained observers' ratings, students' evaluations of the learning environment and teacher behaviors, and (as an indicator of minimum competence) evidence from credential requirements.

Haertel, Edward. "The Valid Use of Student Performance Measures for Teacher Evaluation." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 8, 1 (1986): 45-60.

Haertel begins by laying out the weaknesses of standardized achievement tests as measures for teacher evaluation. In short, they measure too little of students' cognitive development and may be skewed by too many factors having nothing to do with teacher performance (such as prior learning, school climate, concurrent instruction by other teachers, and so forth).

In lieu of a simplistic comparison of teachers on the basis of achievement-test scores, Haertel proposes an evaluation approach that uses multiple measures. He aims at isolating influences on student test performance to control for factors unrelated to teacher performance. It is vital, he notes, to take pains to make sure that teachers in an evaluation setting address the same learning objectives, teach comparable students, and have access to comparable school resources.

His plan requires two years of pilot studies and trial implementation in each school before pretests and posttests are used for teacher-evaluation purposes. Pilot studies in the first year would establish norms for typical student development. With input from teachers, administrators, and the public, aided by simulations from pilot data, standards would be set for minimum performance. After baseline standards were agreed upon, they would be monitored for a one-year trial period and revised if necessary.

Test data would be only one element in a larger review of teachers' work. Regardless of students' test performances, portfolios of student achievement evidence would be examined, too. These might include completed practice tests, regular classroom tests, samples of student written work, homework papers, or teachers' observations of students. A teacher would fail an evaluation only if the posttest scores were unsatisfactory for those students who did not show progress during the year but who attended class regularly and received no special assistance.

Huddle, Gene. "Teacher Evaluation--How Important for Effective Schools? Eight Messages from Research." *NASSP Bulletin*, 69, 479 (March 1985): 58-63. EJ 315 243.

The eight messages that Huddle has collected from research range from: research-validated observations of teaching or evaluation to solid suggestions for evaluation reform: (1) Teacher observation occurs infrequently in most schools. (2) Teachers should be actively involved in the development, operation, and periodic revision of the evaluation process. (3) State and local criteria for teaching help establish expectations for effectiveness but are insufficient in themselves to define good teaching, which does not always conform to bureaucratic procedures. (4) Most teachers operate autonomously in determining content and method. (5) Supervision is often not helpful for teachers. (6) A consistent, objective, and fair evaluation process is a prerequisite for any effective incentive or merit plan for teachers. (7) Peer supervision or coaching can provide important feedback and decrease teachers' feelings of isolation. (8) Legally and pedagogically, a sound teacher-evaluation process is vital in identifying, helping, and (if necessary) dismissing ineffective teachers.

Hunter, Madeline, and Russell, Douglas. "How Can I Plan More Effective Lessons?" *Instructor*. 87 (1977): 74-75, 88.

According to Hunter and Russell, effective lessons are guided by seven sets of activities: (1) preparation that focuses students' attention and reminds them of related material that they have already learned; (2) communication of the lesson's objective to students; (3) method of instruction (such as book, film, diagram, demonstration, lecture); (4) modeling of the skill or activity for students, verbally and visually; (5) checking for understanding by sampling, signalling from students, or private responses; (6) guided practice, with teacher circulating among students; and (7) independent practice.

Hyman, Ronald T. *School Administrator's Faculty Supervision*

Handbook. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1986.

Hyman, Ronald T. *School Administrator's Handbook of Teacher Supervision and Evaluation Methods*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1975.

Both of these handbooks are practical approaches to teacher supervision, designed for K-12 supervising administrators. They concentrate on the knowledge and human relations issues raised in supervisors' observations and the postobservation feedback. The earlier version contains exercises and suggestions for use with faculty: simulation games, brainstorming, and helping teachers write performance objectives.

The more recent version concentrates on what the supervisor's role is in preparing for observations, problems in observing, and following up on observations. It covers motivating, organizing, and establishing development programs for teachers and contains detailed chapters on the dynamics of postobservation conferences. Significantly, Hyman emphasizes the importance of organizational metaphors and language uses in discussing teaching. For instance, Hyman avoids the word "improvement" in the second version in describing the goals of supervision because it has negative connotations with teachers. He suggests and uses "develop," "change," "grow," or "progress," instead.

In all, the 1986 version seems to encourage supervisors to be less presumptuous about what teachers need to improve and to lend credence in teachers' own professional judgments. The shift indicates the trends in management theory and the influence (perhaps) of clinical supervision techniques in supervisory practice.

Johnston, Gladys S. and others. "The Relationship between Elementary School Climate and Teachers' Attitudes Toward Evaluation." *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 5,2 (Spring 1985): 89-112. EJ 320 577.

The authors surveyed 936 teachers in 15 elementary schools to investigate the relationship between teachers' attitudes toward evaluation and school climate. Using an organizational climate instrument ("The Organization Climate Description Questionnaire"), they found that teachers feel more positive about an evaluation process when school morale is high and the staff gets along well, when the principal behaves in a personal and informal manner, and when the school staff is sincerely committed to teaching and learning (that is, not just going through the motions). A more "open" climate, then, is more conducive to evaluation.

Joyce, Bruce, and Weil, Marsha. *Models of Teaching*. 3rd ed.

Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1986.

After collecting and analyzing a diverse range of teaching models, the authors divided them into four essential categories, distinguished by the intended classroom outcomes: social interaction models, information processing models, personal models, and behavior modification models. Models in each family consist of guidelines for designing classroom activities and environments. The authors also specify ways of teaching and learning intended to achieve the goals. A theory justifies each model and describes its uses.

McGreal, Thomas L. "Effective Teacher Evaluation Systems." *Educational Leadership*, 39, 4 (January 1982): 303-05. EJ 257 908.

The majority of this article is a crystallization of McGreal's *Successful Teacher Evaluation*, but he addresses one "commonality" not in the larger work. McGreal suggests that different requirements be maintained for tenured and nontenured teachers. Even though the two groups are often evaluated in the same way, they have quite distinctive needs in professional development. McGreal suggests that nontenured teachers identify goals in collaboration with their supervisors, receive regular visits, review student descriptive data at least once each semester, and provide all teaching materials from one two- to three-week period for common review with the supervisor at least once a semester.

In contrast to nontenured teachers, tenured teachers need to be reviewed less frequently--once every two or three years. Tenured teachers set their own instructional goals; supervisors need only ask to see them. Also, multiple sources of data are generally not required for reviewing the work of tenured teachers.

McGreal, Thomas L. *Successful Teacher Evaluation*. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1983. 175 pages. ED 236 776.

In this important work, McGreal reviews the major schools of thought on evaluation and setting out eight "commonalities" he has discovered in successful evaluation programs. The book is succinctly organized around these common features of programs: (1) an appropriate attitude toward evaluation, noting its limitations and teacher indifference to many evaluation campaigns; (2) an evaluation model suitable for the school and the purpose; (3) the separation of administrative and supervisory evaluations; (4) the use of goal-setting as the major activity of evaluation; (5) a focus on teaching activities as the material for evaluation; (6) a commitment to providing skilled classroom observers; (7) the use of multiple sources of data (not just classroom observation); (8) and a training program to follow up the evaluation system, affecting both evaluators and teachers. McGreal ends by

extrapolating and proposing an ideal evaluation system that reflects all the successful features he identifies.

McLaughlin, Milbrey Wallin. "Teacher Evaluation and School Improvement." *Teachers College Record*, 86, 1 (Fall 1984): 193-207. EJ 309 301.

McLaughlin holds that evaluation is the core of other school improvement strategies, affecting four vital areas in instructional effectiveness: (1) teacher motivation and sense of efficacy, (2) effective communication and shared instructional goals, (3) principal's instructional leadership, and (4) teacher learning and development. The author also draws on the Rand Corporation study of evaluation practices (see Wise and others, "Teacher Evaluation") for suggestions about improving evaluation practices.

Medley, Donald M.; Coker, Homer; and Soar, Robert S. *Measurement-Based Evaluation of Teacher Performance: An Empirical Approach*. New York: Longman, 1984.

Because rating scales, competency testing, and pupil-gain measurements are inadequate instruments for judging overall effectiveness in teachers, the authors propose an alternative based on structured observations. This process involves four necessary steps: defining the tasks to be performed, getting a permanent record of the teacher's classroom behavior, scoring the record, and comparing scores with a set of standards.

Medley and his colleagues discuss in informative detail the issues surrounding each of these steps, including what behaviors are relevant to teaching and thus should be recorded, types of recording systems available, selection and training of observers, and procedures used in scoring. The final chapter provides a practical application for the previous discussion.

Meyer, John W., and Rowan, Brian. "The Structure of Educational Organizations." In *Environments and Organizations*, edited by Marshall W. Meyer. 78-109. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Modern education is organized in large scale, public bureaucracies. In this setting, evaluation of instructional performance is not highly systematic. Schools maintain a stable place in society, the authors contend, by avoiding inspection of schooling's outcomes. Within the schools, interactions between teachers and administrators are characterized at best by the assumption of good faith. The authors call this the "logic of confidence." The loose--or "decoupled"--relation between school and society is maintained also in the relationships of workers in

the schools.

"These multiple realities," Meyer and Rowan observe, "conflict so little because they are buffered from each other by the logic of confidence that runs through the system." In this way, schools can weather the pressures from outside (communities, government, or interest groups) and from inside (conflicting philosophies, practices, or politics).

Natriello, Gary. *Evaluation Frequency, Teacher Influence, and the Internalization of Evaluation Processes: A Review of Six Studies Using the Theory of Evaluation and Authority. Final Report.* Eugene, Oregon: Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon, November 1983. 54 pages. ED 242 050.

The author compiled statistics from six studies of teacher responses to evaluation procedures in an effort to determine the importance of two controversial factors in teacher evaluations: the frequency of evaluations and the degree of influence teachers have over evaluation activities. The data show that teachers' acceptance of evaluations increases markedly when evaluations are more frequent and when teachers have some influence over the evaluation process.

This is true only up to a certain point, however. Both evaluation frequency and degree of teachers' influence must be moderate or the evaluation system will lose credibility in teachers' eyes. In other words, too-frequent evaluations are as unhelpful as evaluations that are too rare. Similarly, too much teacher influence over the process (approaching exclusive use of self-evaluation) is as useless to teachers as their having no control at all over the content or methods of the evaluative process.

Natriello speculates that the appropriate frequency and involvement in the evaluation process depend on the predictability of the pedagogical tasks that teachers are engaged in. Some tasks, for instance, are less complex and thus more predictable both in terms of the strategies they use and the outcomes they produce; these more predictable tasks are more suitable to the occasional observations and evaluative analyses that teachers undergo. For example, it would be easier to evaluate a teacher's performance in teaching students trigonometric ratios than in giving them a moral education or enhancing their self-confidence. Understandably, teachers' acceptance of evaluations significantly decreases--regardless of the number of observations performed--when the task predictability is low. On the other hand, teachers' views of evaluations improve even with low task-predictability when they have a hand in forming evaluations.

Peterson, Clara Hamilton. *A Century's Growth in Teacher Evaluation in the United States.* New York: Vantage, 1982.

The author sketches the development of teacher evaluation processes from the last three decades of the nineteenth century into the mid-1970s.

Peterson, Donovan. "Legal and Ethical Issues of Teacher Evaluation: A Research-Based Approach." *Educational Research Quarterly*, 7,4 (Winter 1983): 6-16. EJ 284 820.

This article covers the major considerations that research studies have dealt with in nine areas relating to teacher evaluation. Donovan distills information on due process, for instance, and validity of observational data. He summarizes current consensus on some topics (for instance, that recent research demonstrates a positive correlation between teacher behaviors and student outcomes) and offers a three-level evaluation structure that covers experienced, new, and marginal teachers. Finally, he lists six points essential to appropriate teacher evaluations, each extrapolated from current research.

Raths, James, and Preskill, Hallie. "Research Synthesis on Summative Evaluation of Teaching." *Educational Leadership*, 39, 4 (January 1982): 310-313. EJ 257 910.

Most research in evaluation assumes that reducing the *judgments* in evaluation is salutary. But summative evaluation, whether we like it or not, fulfills a need for judgments in a school district: in teacher selection, promotion, termination, and tenure decisions, as well as in determining who most needs intensive formative evaluation.

Although summative evaluations are most often conducted according to some arithmetic or checklist approach, they actually require that supervisors render holistic judgments--impressions of teachers' abilities. Some techniques are helpful in organizing those holistic judgments, making them more consistent and defensible. Paired comparisons of teachers, for instance, might be useful for ranking teachers by comparing a manageable number at once. Or a five-level sorting would divide teachers more precisely into a sort of bell-curve array. Flexibility in applying evaluation criteria, then, is the key to fitting summative evaluation instruments to a district's purposes.

Reyes, Donald J. "Bringing Together Teacher Evaluation, Observation, and Improvement of Instruction." *The Clearing House*, 59, 6 (February 1986): 256-58. EJ 331 123.

Presupposing that effective evaluation is an ongoing analysis rather than a grading activity, Reyes offers four suggestions for making evaluation more helpful to teachers. First, he advocates separating the tasks of teacher accountability (the "grading" of teachers) and supervision (the analysis and improvement procedure). Next, he provides lucid examples of how effective-schools research can be used to make evaluations practical for teachers.

Reyes also notes the importance of making clear the criteria for evaluation (the instructional goals) to reach for, so teachers and supervisors speak the same language. Finally, he stresses that form follows function in constructing evaluation systems; it is usually better to develop ad hoc criteria for evaluating particular teachers than to fit one set of criteria to all.

Reyes, Donald J., and others. "Applying Teacher Effectiveness Research in the Classroom." Northern Illinois University. 1986.

The authors concentrate on three vital teacher-improvement areas: management strategies for the classroom, instructional strategies, and academic learning time. Their model clearly relates the most important areas of teacher performance to student achievement. The paper contains numerous handouts--including a variety of observation forms--and annotated bibliographies on research in teacher effectiveness, classroom management, time-factors in learning, systematic methods of observation, and teacher evaluation.

Ross, Doris, and Solomon, Lester. *Evaluating Teachers, with Lessons from Georgia's Performance-Based Certification Program.* Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States, July 1985.

Although concentrating on the features of the Georgia certification plan, this survey includes an overview of the general terms and goals of evaluation programs and a synopsis of recent initiatives by the states in teacher evaluation proposals.

Ruck, Carolyn L. *Creating a School Context for Collegial Supervision: The Principal's Role as Contractor.* Eugene, Oregon: Oregon School Study Council, Bulletin Series, November 1986, 32 pages.

Stimulated by new research on collegiality and school climate and by the movement to professionalize teaching, the idea of peer supervision is being reborn and redefined--this time with attention paid to the principal's role. Collegial supervision can be the answer to providing effective staff development while allowing the principal to pursue other tasks as well as teacher

supervision. Moreover, improving the collegiality of the faculty can improve morale and establish a schoolwide norm of continuous improvement.

Principals have the responsibility of establishing a climate of collegiality that can also be used for supervision. They also oversee the process of creating a structure for collegial observations and feedback. To fulfill these tasks Ruck proposes that the principals' role be redefined to perform a function similar to that of a building contractor--one who is in charge of the total project but who coordinates others' efforts and guides their decisions without controlling them.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J., ed. *Supervision of Teaching*. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1982. ED 213 075.

A collection of essays on supervision, this book covers five dimensions of supervision, with each essay written by a recognized expert in supervision of teaching. Clarence Karier traces the history of supervision from the common-school era of the nineteenth century to the trends of the post-World War II period. Picking up from that point, the second section presents three reigning theories of supervision. John McNeil summarizes the scientific-management approach to teacher supervision; Noreen Garman synthesizes the multiple approaches to clinical supervision; and Elliott Eisner presents his view of an artistic approach to supervision. Thomas Sergiovanni then integrates the three views into a proto-theory of supervisory practice.

A third dimension--the human factor in supervision--is addressed by four essays. Supervisors' professional development is the subject of Leonard Valverde's "The Self-Evolving Supervisors." Ethel Greene discusses issues of race and sex in supervision. The possibilities of peer supervision and collegiality among teachers are brought out by Robert Alfonso and Lee Goldsberry. Thomas Sergiovanni then explains how the contexts of supervision affect individuals.

The fourth part of the book, called the "Hidden Dimensions in Supervision," includes articles by Paul Pohland and James Cross on the impact of curriculum on supervisory practices, Gerald Firth and Keith Eiken on influences of bureaucratic structures on supervision, and Louis Rubin on outside influences on supervision. A fifth part, on the future of supervision, contains Robert Anderson's view of trends in the field.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J., and Starratt, Robert J. *Supervision: Human Perspectives*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1983.

Focusing on using human resources in effective supervision, the authors cover a wide range of supervisory considerations, organizational culture, working theories of supervision, common concerns of staff, and staff development and evaluation. Evaluation, they hold, commonly requires reform both in its ideology and technology. Its ideology has been based primarily on scientific management assumptions, its technology on a scientific model with few human variations taken into account.

Sergiovanni and Starratt propose substituting a human-based ideology and a working knowledge of the complex art of teaching. Using teacher-effectiveness research as a base, they propose matching teaching and evaluation strategies. They draft workable suggestions for both summative and formative evaluations from elements of clinical supervision and artistic evaluation strategies. Finally, they equate supervision with the oversight of staff development--a systematic and conscious program.

Smyth, W. John. "Toward a 'Critical Consciousness' in the Instructional Supervision of Experienced Teachers." *Curriculum Inquiry* 14, 4 (Winter 1984): 425-36. EJ 310 000.

Instructional supervision has adopted the metaphor of "control" from an old association with the scientific management theories of the early twentieth century. This approach, characterized by very limited standard curricula, was replaced by a psychological/behavioristic view of schooling and teaching, which attempted to control teaching practices in less obvious but equally potent ways.

Clinical supervision, when practiced for teachers' improvement rather than as a control strategy, can be more realistic, practical, and fair than previous methods of evaluation. However, going through the motions of clinical supervision will not be sufficient. The philosophy of clinical supervision is based on teacher self-improvement. This rationale must have priority over the methodology of supervision if the clinical approach is to offer real help to teachers, instead of just another form of control.

Stiggins, Richard J. "Teacher Evaluation: Accountability and Growth Systems--Different Purposes." *NASSP Bulletin*, 70, 490 (May 1986): 51-58.

Stiggins compares evaluations designed for accountability (summative models) with those designed for growth (formative models). On the three bases for comparison--purposes, impact, and type of mechanism required for administration--he concludes that accountability systems cannot improve teaching for the great majority of teachers. Thus, school improvement requires growth

systems rather than accountability models.

Stiggins, Richard J., and Bridgeford, Nancy J. "Performance Assessment for Teacher Development." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 7, 1 (Spring 1985): 85-97.

The authors focus attention on formative evaluations of teachers: evaluations intended to help teachers identify their relative strengths and weaknesses and, consequently, improve their teaching performance. In reviewing the research, they find that, although the formative evaluation can be one of the keys to improved teaching, the evaluation practices actually employed in most schools fail to accomplish that goal.

That failure can be attributed primarily to a lack of understanding by principals and teachers alike about what formative evaluations can accomplish and how such evaluations should be conducted. In a survey of seventeen administrators and thirty-six teachers, the authors found that many principals are too poorly trained to conduct such evaluations effectively (and are uncomfortable conducting them); teachers usually are not involved in developing evaluation procedures and frequently feel that such evaluations are a waste of time; and many evaluation procedures lack a clear focus geared to teacher improvement. Consequently, such evaluations--intended to provide constructive criticism--all too often lead to nothing but "vague generalities that hide mediocre teaching."

Stiggins and Bridgeford offer a number of guidelines for remedying the situation. These include involving teachers in developing evaluation procedures, focusing on criteria that directly relate to classroom teaching, and providing principals and prospective principals with more training in conducting evaluations.

Stodolsky, Susan S. "Teacher Evaluation: The Limits of Looking." *Educational Researcher*, 13, 9 (November 1984): 11-18. EJ 309 391.

Stodolsky challenges the validity of classroom observations as a method of gathering data for evaluation. In particular, she objects to observations directed only to certain teacher behaviors, ignoring the intent of the lessons, the nature of the subject matter, or the physical context of teaching. Most evaluators expect to be able to consistently match a teacher's actions with guidelines for instruction. But there is danger in applying rigid expectations without understanding the problems or idiosyncrasies of various content and classes. In fact, Stodolsky holds, "one should expect systematic variation in teaching and instructional arrangements, not consistency." This is because teachers vary their approaches according to their purposes,

balancing ordered planning with spontaneity.

She urges supervisors to be aware of "activity segments" that structure most teachers' lessons, perhaps unconsciously. Lessons have particular instructional formats, goals, behavioral expectations, time constraints, and materials. Consequently, observers can use these informal activity segments to guide their observations.

Other ways to appreciate teachers' flexibility of approach might include increasing the number of observations and selecting occasions to observe various instructional forms, goals, or subjects. In some instances, a "showcase" lesson, worked up by a teacher who knows that it will be observed, can also provide useful information about the teacher's approach. Direct observations can be of value, then, if too much is not made of any particular observation and if they serve as a stimulus for discussion.

Sweeney, Jim, and Manatt, Dick. "A Team Approach to Supervising the Marginal Teacher." *Educational Leadership*, 41, 7 (April 1984): 25-27. EJ 299 430.

The authors propose a team effort to bring marginal teachers up to standard, using an approach called the "intensive assistance process." They define a *marginal teacher* as "one who appears to have sufficient command of subject matter but whose lack of classroom management skills gets in the way of student learning." After several observations, supervisors are ready to determine whether a teacher is marginal--a process aided by six questions posed by Sweeney and Manatt. If the teacher is marginal, the intensive assistance program begins by providing frequent formal observations; if the teacher does not respond to the plans developed from the observations, a support team is assembled to provide the teacher with reliable, knowledgeable teaching assistance.

A four-part improvement plan includes a problem statement that clearly specifies the deficient areas and objectives; the procedures for improvement; the methods of appraisal; and the timetable, review date, and target date for the improvement strategies. Although principals have the final decision in personnel matters, the intensive assistance team brings the school's (or district's) best effort to helping marginal teachers.

Wise, Arthur E., and Darling-Hammond, Linda. "Teacher Evaluation and Teacher Professionalism." *Educational Leadership*, 42, 4, (December 1984/January 1985): 28-33. EJ 311 588.

Performance-based rewards, such as merit pay, master teacher,

or career ladder proposals, depend on the credibility of evaluation procedures and on the value that teachers themselves place on the rewards. Wise and Darling-Hammond find that valued rewards and credible evaluation come from a professional, school-wide commitment to teacher evaluation. Such an approach regards teachers as professionals rather than bureaucrats. It recognizes that teachers plan, conduct, and evaluate their own work, instead of simply performing a curriculum set by others. The professional conception involves teachers in developing and operating the evaluation process, bases evaluations on teacher-oriented standards, and recognizes teacher initiatives in varied teaching strategies and learning outcomes.

This recognition of teachers' professionalism and autonomy results in treating teachers differently according to their teaching assignments, stages of experience, and classroom goals. That is, there is really no one-size-fits-all evaluation strategy. This professional evaluation process has more to do with development than with uniformity: "It is designed to assess the appropriateness of strategies and decisions," according to Wise and Darling-Hammond, who draw this article from their Rand Corporation report reviewed elsewhere in this bibliography.

Wise, Arthur E., and others. "Teacher Evaluation: A Study of Effective Practices." *The Elementary School Journal*, 86, 1 (September 1985): 61-121. EJ 324 222.

Teacher evaluation, if it is to be successful, must balance standardization and responsiveness, centralization and flexibility, personnel decisions (such as promotion or dismissal) and teacher-improvement purposes. A survey of thirty-two school districts found that evaluation practices were remarkably similar among school districts known for effective evaluation programs. These districts' practices were characterized by similar categories of teacher competence, similar evaluation processes, similar responsible agencies or divisions of the districts, and similar sorts of information admitted as part of evaluations. However, the districts differed widely on other related areas: type and amount of training given evaluators, frequency of evaluation, instruments used to gather and interpret observational data, level of integration with other district activities, and cooperation between administrators and teachers.

Common problems also afflicted these districts. Principals lacked the resolve or competence for accurate evaluations, and teachers were resistant or apathetic to improvement. The lack of a uniform and consistent evaluation method also detracted from the efficacy of evaluations, as did problems in credibility. Evaluators were often inadequately trained; researchers found generalist administrators evaluating specialist teachers, with little or no background knowledge of the teachers' subject matter

or objectives.

A closer look at five particularly successful districts revealed their balance between personnel decisions and staff development in their evaluation programs. From these examples, it is clear that evaluation systems must fit the situation of the school. Not every system will work for a school; the process and instrument must match the purpose. Moreover, administrators' commitment to the process, usefulness and efficiency in the process, and teachers' involvement all improve the quality of teacher evaluations, helping to balance the summative/formative conflict in purposes.



ERIC Clearinghouse
on Educational Management
College of Education
University of Oregon
1787 Agate Street
Eugene OR 97403
(503) 686-5043

NCREL

North Central Regional
Educational Laboratory
295 Emroy Avenue
Elmhurst IL 60126
(312) 941-7677