

1982

Criteria used in teacher evaluation in selected Northeast Iowa high schools

Meredith C. Miller
University of Northern Iowa

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©1982 Meredith C. Miller

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Miller, Meredith C., "Criteria used in teacher evaluation in selected Northeast Iowa high schools" (1982).
Graduate Research Papers. 2941.

<https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp/2941>

This Open Access Graduate Research Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Work at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Research Papers by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

Offensive Materials Statement: Materials located in UNI ScholarWorks come from a broad range of sources and time periods. Some of these materials may contain offensive stereotypes, ideas, visuals, or language.

Criteria used in teacher evaluation in selected Northeast Iowa high schools

Abstract

A primary responsibility of an administrator is to provide leadership and direction to personnel within the organization in an effort to realize maximum efficiency of operation. Not unlike the endeavors in the business world, educational administrators must accept as a primary responsibility the evaluation of personnel. As reported by Sapone, "The major purpose of an organization must be to coordinate the activities of its personnel toward greater educational efficiency and effectiveness." (34: 44) Ryans suggested that the goodness of an educational program is determined to a large extent by the teaching act. He went on to suggest that the identification of qualified teaching personnel constitutes one of the most important educational concerns. (33: 1) The evaluation of teachers is one function that an administrator can ill-afford to ignore or to perform with little degree of professionalism. To ensure a quality educational program, the administrator must be concerned with the quality of work performed by the instructional staff, and must take a leading role in the process of evaluating that work.

CRITERIA USED IN TEACHER EVALUATION IN SELECTED
NORTHEAST IOWA HIGH SCHOOLS

A Research Paper
Presented to
the Department of School Administration
and Personnel Services
University of Northern Iowa

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts in Education

by
Meredith C. Miller

July 1982

This Research Paper by: Meredith C. Miller

Entitled: Criteria Used in Teacher Evaluation in Selected Northeast
Iowa High Schools

has been approved as meeting the research paper requirement for the
Degree of Master of Arts in Education.

July 9, 1982
Date Approved

Donald L. Hanson

Director of Research Paper

July 9, 1982
Date Received

Donald L. Hanson

Graduate Faculty Adviser

July 19, 1982
Date Received

Robert J. Krajewski

Head, Department of School
Administration and Personnel
Services

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Introduction	1
The Problem	2
Procedure	3
Limitations	3
Definition of Terms	4
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	6
Teacher Traits as Criteria for Teacher Evaluation	6
Teacher Classroom Behavior as Criteria for Teacher Evaluation	8
Student Achievement as Criteria for Teacher Evaluation	14
Teacher Performance Objectives as Criteria for Teacher Evaluation.	17
Summary	21
3. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	22
Analysis of Respondents' Use of Teacher Traits as Criteria	23
Analysis of Respondents' Use of Teacher Behavior as Criteria	24
Analysis of Respondents' Use of Teacher Performance by Objectives as Criteria	26
Summary	27

4. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	29
Summary	29
Conclusions	32
Recommendations	32
Bibliography	34
Appendix	37

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Introduction

A primary responsibility of an administrator is to provide leadership and direction to personnel within the organization in an effort to realize maximum efficiency of operation. Not unlike the endeavors in the business world, educational administrators must accept as a primary responsibility the evaluation of personnel. As reported by Sapone, "The major purpose of an organization must be to coordinate the activities of its personnel toward greater educational efficiency and effectiveness." (34: 44)

Ryans suggested that the goodness of an educational program is determined to a large extent by the teaching act. He went on to suggest that the identification of qualified teaching personnel constitutes one of the most important educational concerns. (33: 1)

The evaluation of teachers is one function that an administrator can ill-afford to ignore or to perform with little degree of professionalism. To ensure a quality educational program, the administrator must be concerned with the quality of work performed by the instructional staff, and must take a leading role in the process of evaluating that work.

The significance of teacher evaluation and its relation to a quality educational program is heightened by a brief explanation of the purpose of evaluation.

Most authorities will agree that the purpose of evaluation is

for the improvement of instruction. Generally, the trend in teacher evaluation has been to move from the negative aspects of identifying poor teachers for dismissal toward the positive aspects of identifying strengths and weaknesses so that the strengths can be reinforced and the weaknesses corrected. (8: 8)

The National Symposium for Professors of Educational Research listed three specific purposes for evaluation:

- 1) Evaluation which produces information for the improvement of an individual teacher's instructional skills.
- 2) Evaluation which produces information for administrative decisions on hiring, firing, promotion, and tenure.
- 3) Evaluation which produces information for the reallocation of resources necessary for the improvement of the teaching-learning process. (11: 4)

Whether the purpose of teacher evaluation is the improvement of instruction by improving a teacher's skills, by dismissing a teacher, or by reallocating instructional resources, the administrator must have at his disposal the necessary means for making such judgements.

The Problem

In making administrative decisions based on teacher evaluation, upon what grounds are those decisions made? When making classroom observations for teacher evaluation, what does an administrator look for? How does an administrator determine that one teacher is more effective than another? What standards does an administrator use?

According to Brighton, how effective the evaluation program is depends on the type of teacher evaluation used, and he offered trait studies, the end product, and performance ratings as suggested criteria. (6: 28) The teacher's role, personality, techniques, and teaching

methods are necessary criteria according to the National Symposium for Professors of Educational Research. (11: 59-60)

Which criteria an administrator determines as necessary for effective teacher evaluation is itself an important consideration in the evaluation procedure. The purpose of this study was to compare the criteria used in teacher evaluation by a selected sample of Iowa secondary schools with those criteria identified in and supported by current research as being most important.

Procedure

In order to obtain the necessary information concerning the criteria used by administrators in the evaluation of teachers, a letter was sent to principals of selected secondary schools requesting the criteria and/or evaluation instrument used to evaluate teachers in their schools (Appendix). The public, secondary schools served by Area Education Agencies II and VII were selected for inclusion in this study. Of the fifty-eight schools contacted, forty-six responded with the requested information.

An ERIC Search was completed and, from a review of the applicable sources identified and a review of other appropriate related literature, the criteria used for the evaluation of teachers was categorized in accordance with current research. That categorization, supported by current research, was then compared with the similar categorization of criteria that appeared in the instruments supplied by the respondents in the survey.

Limitations

Information regarding the criteria used by principals to evaluate

teachers was requested of only public, secondary schools in northeast Iowa served by the Area Educational Agencies II and VII. It is possible that the schools in this population would not be representative of all secondary schools and no effort was made to determine such.

It should be recognized that many of the administrators in schools located in Area Education Agency VII had already received in-service on Madeline Hunter's techniques of supervision and evaluation. Therefore, the evaluation criteria and procedures were expected to be more influenced by Hunter than was the case for the schools located in Area Education Agency II.

Finally, the reader is cautioned against over-generalization in the application of criteria since only those applied to secondary schools were included. It is certainly possible, and probable, that alternative criteria would be applied to the evaluative process for other grade levels of a school system and to some whose responsibilities may reside in part or totally in specialized curricular areas.

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of clarity and consistency, the following terms are used in this study as defined below:

- 1) criterion: a standard, norm, or judgement selected as a basis for quantitative and qualitative comparison. (12: 153)
- 2) evaluative criteria: the standards against which a person, a group, a procedure, or an instrument may be checked. (12: 220)
- 3) high school: the school division following the elementary school, comprising most often of grades 9 to 12 or grades 7 to 12 and sometimes including grades 13 and 14. Syn. secondary school. (12: 281)
- 4) teacher evaluation: an estimate or measure of the quality

of a person's teaching based on one or more criteria such as pupil achievement, pupil adjustment, pupil behavior, the judgement of school officials, parents, pupils, or the teacher himself. (12: 221)

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Authorities on the evaluation of teachers have devised numerous methods by which the criteria for evaluation may be classified. Many of these classifications admittedly overlap one another. For the purposes of this study, criteria for teacher evaluation have been classified into the following four areas: 1) teacher traits and characteristics, 2) the teacher's behavior or process by demonstrating certain skills and competencies in the classroom, 3) student achievement, and 4) teacher performance by objectives.

Teacher Traits as Criteria for Teacher Evaluation

A study reported by Beecher in 1949 listed twenty-five traits of an effective teacher. (2: 15) According to the list, a teacher is effective only when he demonstrated such personality traits as attractiveness, neatness, health, refinement, and thrift.

Another approach to identifying teacher characteristics was compiled by Ryans, who referred to his list of significant teacher behaviors as the Classroom Observation Record. (33: 86) The approach by Ryans represented ". . .an effort to determine the bases of value judgements, to objectify descriptions of teacher behavior, and to provide an operational frame of references for the assessment of teacher behavior." (33: 83)

Ryans listed eighteen teacher behavior dimensions with a glossary providing examples of the specific behaviors descriptive of the dimensions.

The eighteen behaviors included such considerations as whether the teacher was partial or fair in dealing with students, whether the teacher was dull or stimulating in lesson presentation, whether the teacher was inflexible or adaptable to change, and whether the teacher was uncertain or confident in himself. (33: 86-92)

Barr maintained that there were three reasons why the qualities of a teacher should be given primary consideration as the criterion of effectiveness:

First, most of the efficiency ratings employed in evaluating teacher effectiveness, almost without exception, include qualities in one form or another, - if not solely, at least in part. Secondly, behaviors, in and of themselves, are not the critical elements of efficiency. There are many alternatives from which one may choose in a particular situation. As a matter of fact there are ordinarily many alternatives for each possible behavior, one being about as effective as another. The quality approach provides a means of getting beyond the incidental to the critical. Finally, many persons consider personal fitness an important consideration in and of itself, completely aside from its effects, at least aside from its primary or direct effects. In this sense personal fitness is an important criterion. (1: 12)

More recently, the use of a set of personality or behavior traits as criteria for teacher evaluation has been called to question. Brighton reported that although most teacher evaluation programs take personality traits (such as sense of humor, creativity, and industriousness) into consideration, research has failed to find a significant cause-and-effect relationship between traits and teaching effectiveness. (6: 28) Furthermore, Brighton concluded that personality traits are extremely difficult to measure accurately. (6: 29) Borich, of the same opinion, suggested that since little research has linked a teacher's attitudes or personality to effective instruction, their usefulness as

criteria was limited. (5: 14)

Thomas acknowledged that educators used to be evaluated on the basis of such traits and attributes as enthusiasm, personality, cooperation, morality, self-confidence, and punctuality. However, according to Thomas, there has been no major research to indicate that effective educators must possess a particular trait or cluster of personality attributes. (38: 12)

Finally, Feldvebel warned of the difficulty with focusing upon teacher traits. He reported

Although in some instances good teachers can be differentiated from poor teachers on the basis of certain traits, these successful traits tend to be very situation specific and not universal in their predictive power. (9: 417)

Teacher Classroom Behavior as Criteria for Teacher Evaluation

In 1960 Mitzel referred to this category of criteria for teacher evaluation as process criteria. He wrote that this set of criteria is most often described and measured in the classroom in terms of conditions, climates, or typical situations involving the social interactions of the students and the teacher. (26: 1483) He suggested that process criteria considers both teacher behavior and student behavior and that neither should be studied in isolation from the other since the interaction between them appears to be the dominant aspect of the whole process of learning. (26: 1484)

Examples of process criteria based on teacher behavior included the effective disciplining of students, maintaining rapport with students, and individualizing instruction consistent with the student's capabilities. Examples based on student behavior included the students' exhibited affection for the teacher, attentive listening, and conformity to the classroom

routines.

Barr also maintained that the criterion of teacher effectiveness could be behaviorally defined and that the behaviors themselves could become the criteria. (1: 12) However, he observed that this approach to teacher evaluation would be too cumbersome because there are just too many behaviors to deal with them individually. He also argued that in most classroom situations there are many alternative forms of behavior. Finally Barr pointed out that specific behaviors in the classroom cannot be said to be good or bad in and of themselves because the appropriateness of any specific behavior depends on the purpose of and the persons in any particular situation. (1: 12)

In regard to the use of teacher behaviors as criteria for the evaluation of teachers, Brighton argued that the assumption is made that learning takes place on the part of the pupil as a result of what the teacher does. He reported that research has not been able to satisfactorily show which specific teaching acts or cluster of acts produce certain learning results. (6: 32) However, Brighton compiled a list of ten behaviors of superior teachers which included 1) changing prepared plans to take advantage of the teaching moments that arise, 2) showing respect for pupils as human beings, 3) praising more than criticizing, and 4) attending to the individual differences of students. (6: 33) He further emphasized that probably the best earmark of an effective teacher may be his ability to change and adapt teaching methods, as well as plans and objectives, and to take advantage of learning opportunities as they emerge in the teaching process. (6: 32)

Flanders recognized the important effect that a teacher's behavior

has on a student's learning in the classroom. He wrote, "Teaching behavior is the most potent, single, controllable factor that can alter learning opportunities in the classroom." (10: 13)

The approach to analyzing effective teaching behavior developed by Flanders was a technique for studying the chain of classroom events in such a fashion that each event was taken into consideration. He referred to his classroom interaction analysis as not just one system, ". . .but to many systems for coding spontaneous verbal communication, arranging the data into a useful display, and then analyzing the results in order to study patterns of teaching and learning." (10: 28) Flanders classified statements into the following ten categories, of which the first seven represented teacher talk, the next two pupil talk, and the last silence: 1) teacher statements which accepted or clarified an attitude or feeling tone of pupil in a nonthreatening manner; 2) teacher statements which praised or encouraged pupil action or behavior; 3) teacher statements which accepted, clarified, built, or developed ideas suggested by students; 4) teacher questions which asked about content or procedure based on teacher ideas; 5) teacher lectures which gave facts or opinions about content or procedure; 6) teacher statements which gave directions, commands, or orders to which a pupil was expected to comply; 7) teacher statements of criticism or authority which intended to change pupil behavior from nonacceptable to acceptable; 8) pupil talk in response to the teacher; 9) pupil talk which the pupil initiated; and 10) silence or confusion in which communication could not be understood. (10: 34)

Flanders noted that after several years of observing, he anticipated

that of all verbal communication in the classroom an average 68 percent was teacher talk, about 20 percent was pupil talk, and 11 or 12 percent was silence and confusion. (10: 101) In regard to teacher behaviors influencing educational outcomes, Flanders wrote

When classroom interaction shifts toward more consideration of pupil ideas, more pupil initiation, and more flexible behavior on the part of the teacher, the present trend of research results would suggest that the pupils will have more positive attitudes toward the teacher and the schoolwork, and measures of subject-matter learning adjusted for initial ability will be higher. (10: 14)

In discussing Mitzel's three categories of criteria (presage, process, and product), Thomas argued that the prime emphasis of teacher evaluation should be placed upon process criteria. (37: 25)

Another attempt to define teacher evaluation criteria in terms of the behavior of the teacher was made by Bolton in 1973. Bolton listed the following four behaviors repeatedly identified as effective teacher behavior: 1) the teacher makes statements that use ideas and opinions previously expressed by students; 2) the teacher uses a cognitive style that is flexible and allows the teacher to adjust strategies to deal with individual differences of students; 3) the teacher uses a complex conceptual framework which enables the teacher to diagnose learning problems and establish remedial procedures; and 4) the teacher provides an advance organizer, a framework by which students can readily process information. (4: 107)

The Michigan Education Association reported that the classroom is one of the three environments in which teachers are most often evaluated. The six criteria considered in the classroom evaluation are 1) planning and organizing in relation to stated goals, 2) knowledge of

subject matter, 3) methodology, 4) classroom control, 5) client relationship, and 6) management and condition of the milieu. (8: 12)

Borich also wrote that the teacher's classroom behavior should be a criteria for teacher evaluation. According to Borich, data about the teacher's ongoing classroom strategies, procedures, and techniques should be gathered for use in the evaluation process. (5: 16)

According to a report by Robinson and Lee of a survey of Connecticut educators, teachers, principals, and other supervisors were given the sixteen most frequently mentioned evaluative concepts in order to see what each group considered important in observing a class. As reported by the authors, the teachers, principals, and other supervisors all ranked atmosphere in the classroom and evidence of teacher preparation first and second in importance. (30: 19) The respondents ranked responsiveness and attitude of students, learning experience of students, presentation of subject matter, motivational factors, and teacher's aim or objective as next in order of importance.

In a study reported by Beecher and completed on his own high school staff, teachers were given a list of criteria typically used in teacher evaluation and asked to rate the items according to their importance. Results of the study showed the following as preferred criteria:

- 1) Teacher has good knowledge of subject matter.
- 2) Teacher uses a variety of instructional techniques.
- 3) Students are attentive and actively participating.
- 4) The teacher is well organized/prepared and material is presented clearly.
- 5) Students show respect for one another and for the teacher.
- 6) Teacher interaction with the students is courteous and

helpful.

- 7) Students are engaged in an activity clearly related to departmental objectives.
- 8) The teacher is interested in and has enthusiasm for subject.
- 9) The teacher uses a variety of evaluation techniques. (3: 516)

Another approach to evaluating teachers based on the extent to which teachers demonstrated particular skills and competencies was made by Thomas. (38: 12) His list of competencies included good classroom climate, appropriate rapport with students, demonstrated abilities to organize, adequate preparation, developing self-direction in students, presenting clear and definite assignments, asking clear and concise questions, listening effectively, and personalizing discipline. However, Thomas reported that although research did indicate the effective teachers tend to have certain competencies, those competencies were very difficult to isolate and measure effectively. (38: 13)

Duhamel, Cyze, Lamacraft, and Larocque reported that the process approach to teacher evaluation has as its foundation an emphasis on organization, comportment, and presentation behaviors. (7: 27) Organization behaviors include the development of lesson plans and objectives. Comportment behavior involves the management of discipline in the classroom, the relationship between the teacher and pupils, and observable pupil behaviors which are taken as evidence of acceptable classroom management. Presentation behaviors are exhibited in the actual teaching situation and include such teacher strategies as stating objectives to the students, relating the lesson to pupil needs, and providing for individual differences.

In his discussion of teacher evaluation systems based on process

criteria, Feldvebel noted that there was some research to show that 1) learning is facilitated when learners are told in advance what outcomes are expected as a result of the activity, 2) deliberate attention to stimulating learner interest enhances learning, and 3) feedback and re-enforcement enhance learning. (9: 417)

Travers argued that teacher competencies could not be demonstrated to be related to how much pupils learn. He wrote "The concept of teaching as an assembly of competencies lacks substance at present. It has not led to the development of any defensible and usable set of criteria of teacher effectiveness." (25: 21)

Student Achievement as Criteria for Teacher Evaluation

The use of student achievement or pupil growth has often been considered a valid indicator of teacher effectiveness. As Beecher wrote in 1949, "The only valid criterion of teaching efficiency is pupil change in desired directions." (2: 85) However, Beecher and many others have argued that pupil change is an extremely difficult criterion to apply to appraising teaching efficiency.

Mitzel referred to pupil change, student gains, student growth, or student changes as product criteria, all involving measurement of change in student behavior, a portion of which logically can be attributed to the influence of individual teachers. (26: 1483)

In regard to pupil growth and achievement as criteria for teacher evaluation, Barr noted that product criteria was subject to definite limitations. Barr argued that the tests used to measure student achievement may be valid and reliable in some highly generalized situation but may not be in keeping with the demands of the particular situation or teacher's

purpose. He also argued that the tests used are limited in measuring such areas as problem solving, personality development, mental health, aesthetic learning, and emotional growth. Finally, Barr contended that the teacher effect is only one of many effects that produce changes in pupil growth and the isolation of the teacher effect is a real difficulty. (1: 13)

Brighton maintained that the organization of the school requires the pupil to come under the direction of many teachers, and the pupil's interactions with one teacher may carry over and effect his progress in another teacher's classroom. (6: 30) Brighton also pointed out two limitations of achievement testing programs; 1) achievement tests measure pupil gain adequately only in the mastery of information and skill areas; and 2) the over-reliance on achievement tests may result in teachers being prone to teach the test. (6: 32)

Many authorities have agreed that one problem in using product criteria is that pupil outcomes are often contaminated by the effects of various uncontrollable factors. As reported by Bolton,

The chief disadvantage in the use of products as criterion measures is the difficulty of adequately controlling external factors in order to provide reasonable assurance that the hypothesized product is truly a product of the criterion behavior rather than that of a wide range of uncontrolled conditions occurring prior to and concurrently with the criterion behavior. (4: 118)

The National School Public Relations Association raised the question whether achievement should be determined by standardized or criterion-referenced tests. (8: 12) The Association also warned that using measurement of student growth for teacher evaluation could freeze teaching into a mold.

Borich pointed out three major cautions in using products as criteria for teacher evaluation: 1) the difficulty in determining and controlling the extent to which pupil performance is affected by influences other than the teacher; 2) the unreliability of the difference between the pupils' pre-and posttest achievement; and 3) the teacher's understandable desire to teach to the test when the teacher knows that pupil growth is to be an index of teacher effectiveness. (5: 27)

Because the variables in the cause-and-effect relationship between teaching and learning are so difficult to assess, Hansen warned against using student learning as the singular criterion to judge teaching effectiveness. (16: 12) He also suggested that approaching the task of teacher evaluation in terms of student learning becomes totally untenable.

In addition to previously stated concerns about using student achievement as criteria for teacher evaluation, Levin mentioned two other concerns: 1) there is the danger of the loss of long-range objectives in favor of short-term gains on test scores; and 2) there is the dispute about the extent to which teachers' abilities to produce gains in students' learning is stable. (21: 243)

Haefele suggested that alternatives to the use of standardized testing as an index of teacher effectiveness should be sought. He maintained that standardized tests tend to inhibit curriculum innovation, content and methods are frequently fashioned to fit the tests, and achievement tests measure a limited range of objectives. (14: 349)

According to Millman, the National Educational Association was calling for an end to standardized testing and opposed the use of any

measures of student progress or achievement to evaluate teacher competency. (25: 146) In regard to the use of achievement tests as criteria for teacher evaluation, Millman mentioned three factors beyond the teacher's control:

- 1) student learning is seen to depend upon students' characteristics, the instructional materials and the setting, and the achievement tests used;
- 2) in some situations, there is no teacher control over where and how a course is taught; and 3) the achievement tests used may not be of the teacher's making and therefore may not assess the teacher's objectives within the class. (25: 156)

Teacher Performance Objectives as Criteria for Teacher Evaluation

The use of teacher performance objectives or performance goals as criteria for teacher evaluation has received considerable attention in recent years. Numerous approaches to this method of evaluation have been established by various authorities in the form of models which incorporate both the administrative functions of evaluation and supervision. Generally, all approaches use some method of establishing specific behavioral objectives or goals for the individual teacher which become the criteria upon which that teacher is to be evaluated. As reported by Quinn, Urich, and Aiken, "The use of performance goals as criteria for evaluation joins administrator and teacher together in an effort to identify, improve, and measure specific educational objectives." (28: 192)

Roy noted, "Uniform teacher evaluation instruments which attempt to measure the classroom teacher against prescribed performance standards have not been effective in terms of actually improving instruction."

(32: 276) McGreal reported that even when districts claim the improvement of instruction is the purpose of evaluation, their actual methods

were often counter-productive because of high supervisor-low teacher involvement. (23: 303)

The performance objective or job target approach to teacher evaluation is individualized. The teacher works with the evaluation through a process that diagnoses areas of weakness, develops strategies for overcoming weaknesses, and evaluates the degree to which the weaknesses have been overcome. As described by McGreal, the setting of goals is a way of establishing individual criteria and forms the basis of a working relationship between the evaluator and the teacher. (24: 416)

Reavis described a five step approach typical of performance objective evaluation which he referred to as clinical supervision. (29: 10) The first step is the preobservation conference in which the teacher and supervisor or evaluator establish mutually agreed-upon goals or objectives for the year. Not all objectives or goals need to be areas of weakness and therefore remedial in nature. McGreal pointed out that the supervisor and the teacher have the option of setting a goal that is not a weakness or problem for the teacher, but a skill or area of interest that might be useful. (24: 418)

The second step in the process is the actual observation(s) of the teacher in the classroom. More than one observation may be necessary to observe to what extent the goals or objective have been met.

The third step is an intermediate one in which the supervisor or evaluator analyzes the observation and develops the strategies for the conference with the teacher.

The fourth step in the process is the supervisory conference in which the supervisor or evaluator and the teacher discuss the extent to

which the objectives or goals have been met. Hunter referred to this step as an instructional conference for which there are five possible purposes:

- 1) To identify, label, and explain the teacher's effective instructional behaviors, giving research-based reasons for the effectiveness so the teacher knows what he/she has done and why it worked, and in the future can do it on purpose;
- 2) To stimulate the development of a repertoire of effective teaching responses so the teacher is not limited to those most frequently used;
- 3) To encourage teachers to identify those parts of a teaching episode with which they were not satisfied so that, in collaboration with the observer, strategies for reducing or eliminating future unsatisfactory outcomes will be developed;
- 4) To identify and label those less effective aspects of teaching that were not evident to the teacher and to develop alternative procedures that have potential for effectiveness;
- 5) To promote continuing growth of excellent teachers. (18: 409)

The final step in the clinical supervision process is the post-conference analysis in which the supervisor or evaluator reviews the conference just completed and evaluates its strengths and weaknesses. The supervisor or evaluator should make such determinations as the extent to which the agreed-upon objectives were met in light of the teacher's feedback, whether or not the analysis of the teacher's performance was adequate in light of the teacher's interpretation, and whether or not there was agreement between the teacher and the supervisor or evaluator.

The use of behavioral objectives or performance goals as criteria for teacher evaluation in a clinical supervision situation has some favorable characteristics. Herman listed the following five advantages

of behavioral objectives for staff evaluation:

- 1) Items to be evaluated are stated in clear terms that are measurable.
- 2) Items to be evaluated are specific and behavioral, have a minimal level of acceptability, have a terminal date, and possess a delineated means of measurement.
- 3) Behavioral objectives enhance the degree of objectivity present in the evaluations.
- 4) Behavioral objectives, when applied to the teaching act, permit evaluations by means of student achievement.
- 5) Behavioral objectives permit the evaluation of the total task, sub-tasks, individual objectives, and interim objectives.
(17: 63)

Concluding his discussion on behavioral objectives, Herman listed the following four disadvantages in their use for staff evaluation:

- 1) A large amount of money and time need to be devoted to staff training in order that they become proficient in stating their objectives in behavioral terms that are measurable.
- 2) Many individuals overemphasize the cognitive objectives and give very little thought to those which are affective and psychomotor in nature.
- 3) It is very difficult and time consuming for an employer or supervisor to develop a comprehensive list of behavioral objectives.
- 4) Many complex duties are very difficult, if not impossible, to state in behavioral terms. (17: 64)

In his comparison of various teacher evaluation techniques, Haeefele was optimistic about the use behavioral objectives and performance goals as criteria for teacher evaluation. He wrote that the goal-setting approach was a preferable though demanding route to instructional improvement because it was the only approach based on mutual trust. (14: 352)

Summary

The research available on the criteria for the evaluation of teachers is voluminous. Although the research refers to all aspects of evaluation, the concern here was for only the criteria used in the evaluation process. An attempt has been made to identify the highlights of evaluative criteria suggested and proposed by various authorities. Research does not support any one set of criteria to be used in teacher evaluation, nor does it support any one approach to the evaluation of teachers.

A survey was conducted to determine the criteria used in the evaluation of teachers by administrators from selected secondary schools in Iowa. The results of that survey appear in Chapter Three.

CHAPTER THREE
ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The public, secondary schools in northeastern Iowa served by Area Education Agencies II and VII were selected for inclusion in this study. To obtain the desired information concerning the criteria used by administrators to evaluate teachers, a letter was sent to the principals of those selected secondary schools requesting the criteria and/or evaluation instrument used to evaluate teachers in their schools. Of the fifty-eight schools contacted, forty-six responded with the requested information.

The information received from the secondary schools participating in this study was reviewed and the criteria used for the evaluation of teachers was determined. For the purposes of this study, the criteria for teacher evaluation were classified into the following four areas (previously described and discussed in Chapter Two): 1) teacher traits and characteristics, 2) the teacher's behavior or process by demonstrating certain skills and competencies in the classroom, 3) student achievement, and 4) teacher performance by objectives.

Of the forty-six respondents, only twenty-two administrators employed teacher evaluation criteria that fell into the strict confinement of only one category or another. A study of the information indicated that twenty respondents (43.5%) employed only evaluative criteria which dealt with the second category of the teacher's behavior or process by demonstration of certain skills and competencies in the classroom. Only

two respondents used the fourth category of teacher performance by objectives as the sole criteria for teacher evaluation. A review of the information indicated that none of the respondents employed the first category of teacher traits and characteristics or the third category of student achievement as the only criteria for teacher evaluation.

An analysis of the information received from the remaining twenty-four respondents indicated that those administrators employed evaluative criteria that was of a combination of two categories of criteria. Twenty-two respondents (47.8%) employed a combination of criteria that included criteria from the first category of teacher traits and characteristics and the second category of the teacher's classroom behavior. Two respondents used criteria that were a combination of the teacher's classroom behavior and teacher performance by objectives.

Finally, a general analysis of the information provided by the respondents indicated that teacher traits and characteristics, the teacher's classroom behavior, and teacher performance by objectives were used solely, or at least in part, as criteria for the evaluation of teachers. However, the analysis also indicated that student achievement was not employed by any of the respondents as criteria for teacher evaluation.

Analysis of Respondents' Use of Teacher Traits as Criteria

An analysis indicated that twenty-two of the respondents employed teacher traits and characteristics as part of the criteria for the evaluation of teachers. The emphasis placed on teacher traits as evaluative criteria by those respondents varied to some degree. The one teacher trait

most often employed by those respondents was the teacher's personal appearance or attractiveness, cited by Beecher as one of the traits of an effective teacher. (2: 15) Of the twenty-two respondents in this category, eighteen indicated that the teacher's personal appearance was a criteria for teacher evaluation. The second most frequently employed trait was punctuality or promptness, indicated by fourteen of the respondents. Self-confidence, indicated by fourteen of the twenty-two respondents, was mentioned by Ryans in his Classroom Observation Record as an important criterion for teacher evaluation. (33: 86) One half of the respondents employing teacher traits as evaluative criteria indicated that the use of the English language was an important trait to be considered.

Other teacher traits, ranked by their frequency, employed by the respondents in this category included the teacher's voice quality, health, emotional stability, humor, and leadership ability. The two traits or characteristics least indicated by the respondents were the teacher's sense of fairness and the teacher's professionalism.

Analysis of Respondents' Use of Teacher Behavior as Criteria

An analysis of the criteria provided by the respondents showed that the teacher's behavior or process by demonstrating certain skills and competencies in the classroom was the criteria most often employed by the respondents in this study. Twenty-two of the forty-six respondents employed this factor as part of the criteria for the evaluation of teachers. Another twenty respondents used the teacher's behavior as the sole criteria for teacher evaluation. In all, forty-two of the forty-six respondents in the study utilized the teacher's behavior or process in the classroom as criteria for the evaluation of teachers.

The teacher behavior most often utilized by the forty-two respondents in this category was the teacher's use of a variety of instructional techniques, listed by Beecher as one of the preferred criterion for teacher evaluation. (3: 516) Of the forty-two respondents in this category, thirty-two employed the teacher's use of a variety of instructional techniques as a criterion for the evaluation of teachers. A majority of the respondents included with this behavior the teacher's use of a variety of resource materials.

Two teacher behaviors were cited thirty-one times each by the respondents. The analysis showed that the majority of the respondents employed as a criterion the teacher's recognition of and provisions for individual student differences, one of Brighton's ten behaviors of superior teachers. (6: 33) The analysis also showed that thirty-one of the respondents in this category indicated that the teacher's rapport with students was an important factor, as suggested by Thomas in his list of teacher competencies. (38: 12)

Evidence of lesson planning, cited twenty-eight times in the analysis, was the fourth most frequently employed teacher behavior as a criterion for teacher evaluation. In their study, Robinson and Lee reported that evidence of lesson planning was the second most important teacher behavior. (30: 19)

The analysis of teacher behavior criteria provided by the respondents indicated that the teacher's use of stated lesson objectives and whether or not those objectives were met was employed by twenty-seven of the respondents in this category. Twenty-six of the forty-two respondents indicated the use of the teacher's motivation and stimulation of students

as behavior criteria for teacher evaluation. A majority of the respondents indicated the employment of maintaining good discipline, knowledge of subject matter, and cooperative relations with parents as teacher behaviors for evaluative criteria. Teacher behaviors utilized by approximately one half the respondents in this category included the teacher's management of the classroom, providing for an environment conducive to learning, positive working relationship with other staff members, proper evaluation of student learning, and providing clear explanations and directions to students.

One teacher behavior used as criteria for teacher evaluation but cited by less than one-third of the forty-two respondents was the teacher's acceptance and use of ideas suggested by students, a behavior supported by Flanders in his interaction analysis. (10: 34) Other behaviors indicated by relatively few respondents included the teacher's use of class time, fostering creative thinking, empathy with students, adopting plans to the changing needs of the class, individualizing instruction, making students aware of the class objectives, and encouraging good study habits. Only two respondents in this category indicated that the teacher's dedication was used as a criterion for the evaluation of teachers.

Analysis of Respondents' Use of Teacher Performance by Objectives as Criteria

An analysis of the criteria information provided by the respondents showed that four of the forty-six participating administrators employed teacher performance by objectives as criteria for the evaluation of teachers. Two respondents indicated the use of performance objectives as part of the evaluative criteria. The other two respondents indicated the use of performance objectives as the sole criteria for the evaluation

of teachers.

The two respondents indicating their use of teacher performance by objectives as a part of the evaluative criteria included on their evaluation instruments a provision for the teacher to list future performance objectives. There was no indication in either instance that the performance objectives were mutually agreed-upon objectives established in a pre-observation conference as described by Reavis. (29: 10) However, both respondents indicated that the objectives were to be prioritized and that target dates were to be established by the teacher.

The two respondents indicating their use of teacher performance by objectives as the sole criteria for the evaluation of teachers followed a five step approach which Reavis referred to as clinical supervision. (29: 10) Both of the respondents in this category indicated the influence of Hunter on the procedures they employed in the evaluation of teachers.

Summary

An analysis of the criteria provided by the respondents indicated that the teacher's behavior in the classroom and teacher traits and characteristics were the two most frequently employed criteria for teacher evaluation. The analysis also indicated that only a few respondents employed teacher performance by objectives as evaluative criteria and none of the respondents employed student achievement as criteria for the evaluation of teachers.

While most research has been completed in the area of teacher trait or characteristics and teaching effectiveness, several authorities, cited in Chapter Two, agreed that the research has not shown that teachers possessing certain traits or characteristics are, in fact, more effective

teachers. Yet twenty-two of the respondents in this survey indicated that teacher traits and characteristics are used as criteria for teacher evaluation.

Similarly, much research has been attempted to link the teacher's performance in specific skills and competencies with teacher effectiveness. While some authorities agreed that effective teachers tend to have specific behaviors in terms of skills and competencies, other authorities believed that there were too many behaviors to isolate and that the establishment of a specific set of behaviors was impractical. In this study forty-two of the forty-six respondents indicated the use of the teacher's behavior in the classroom as evaluative criteria.

Many authorities agreed that student achievement was the most valid criteria for the evaluation of teachers. Many of those same authorities also agreed that there was no adequate way in which to measure student achievement as a result of a specific teacher's effectiveness and that such an attempt was not stable. The respondents in this survey indicated no use of student achievement as criteria for teacher evaluation.

More recent authorities in the field of teacher evaluation have applauded the use of teacher performance objectives as criteria for evaluation. Although a demanding technique, many authorities have agreed that it was an effective way to enhance the teacher-administrator relationship and improve instruction. Yet only four of the respondents in this survey indicated the use of teacher performance objectives as criteria for the evaluation of teachers.

CHAPTER FOUR

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The evaluation of teachers is a primary responsibility of an educational administrator, and the criteria upon which those evaluations are made is a major consideration. The purpose of this study was to compare the criteria used in the evaluation of teachers by a selected sample of Iowa secondary schools with the criteria identified and supported by current research.

To obtain the desired information concerning the criteria used by administrators in the evaluation of teachers, a letter was sent to the principals of selected secondary schools in northeast Iowa requesting the criteria and/or evaluation instruments used to evaluate teachers in their schools. The public, secondary schools served by Area Education Agencies II and VII were selected for inclusion in this study. Fifty-eight schools were contacted, and forty-six of the schools responded with the requested information.

An ERIC Search was completed and, from a review of the sources identified and other related literature, the criteria used in the evaluation of teachers were categorized and compared with a similar categorization of criteria that appeared in the information requested of the respondents in the survey. For the purposes of this study, the criteria for teacher evaluation were classified into the following four categories: 1) teacher traits and characteristics, 2) the teacher's behavior or process by demonstrating certain skills and competencies in the classroom, 3) student

achievement, and 4) teacher performance by objectives.

An analysis of the information received from the forty-six participating respondents indicated that the teacher's behavior or process in the classroom and teacher traits and characteristics were the two most frequently used criteria for teacher evaluation. The analysis also indicated that only a few of the respondents used teacher performance by objectives as criteria and none of the respondents used student achievement as criteria for the evaluation of teachers.

None of the respondents in the survey employed the teacher's traits and characteristics as the sole criteria for teacher evaluation. Although much research in the area of teacher traits or characteristics and teacher effectiveness has not shown that teachers possessing certain traits or characteristics are more effective teachers, the analysis of the information from the respondents indicated that twenty-two schools employed the teacher's traits and characteristics as a part of the criteria for teacher evaluation. The teacher traits and characteristics most frequently employed by the respondents, in order of their frequency, were the teacher's personal appearance or attractiveness, punctuality or promptness, self-confidence, and the use of the English language.

The teacher's behavior or process by demonstrating certain skills and competencies in the classroom was the most frequently employed criteria by the respondents in the evaluation of teachers. Of the forty-six participating in the survey, forty-two used the teacher's behavior as, at least, a part of the criteria for evaluation. Researchers linking the teacher's performance in specific skills and competencies with teacher effectiveness have disagreed in their findings. While some authorities have argued that

there were too many behaviors to isolate and attempting to list a specific set of effective behaviors was impractical, other authorities have agreed that effective teachers tend to have specific behaviors which can be observed. Twenty of the forty-six respondents in this survey employed the teacher's behavior as the sole criteria for teacher evaluation, and twenty-two respondents employed the teacher's behavior as part of the evaluative criteria. The behavior most often cited by respondents as criteria were, in order of their frequency, the teacher's use of a variety of instructional techniques and resource materials, the teacher's recognition of and provisions for individual student differences, the teacher's rapport with the students, evidence of lesson planning, the teacher's use of stated objectives and whether or not those objectives were met, the teacher's motivation and stimulation of the students, maintaining good discipline, knowledge of subject matter, and maintaining cooperative relations with parents.

None of the respondents in this survey indicated any use of student achievement as criteria for the evaluation of teachers. While many authorities have agreed that student achievement was the most valid criteria for teacher evaluation, many of those same authorities have agreed that no adequate way to measure student achievement as a result of a specific teacher's effectiveness has yet been developed.

Only four of the forty-six respondents in the survey indicated the use of teacher performance by objectives as criteria for the evaluation of teachers. Two respondents used teacher performance by objectives as the sole criteria while the other two respondents indicated the use of performance objectives as part of the evaluative criteria. Although some authorities have admitted that it is a demanding technique, many authorities

have agreed that it was an effective way to strengthen the teacher-administrator relationship and improve instruction. More recent authorities have supported the use of teacher performance by objectives as the criteria for the evaluation of teachers.

Conclusions

Although a considerable amount of research has suggested caution of the use of teacher traits and characteristics as evaluative criteria, there was still considerable use of traits as criteria. Nearly one half of the respondents in this survey indicated the employment of teacher traits as criteria for teacher evaluation in spite of their questionable usefulness.

The teacher's behavior or process by demonstrating certain skills and competencies in the classroom was the most highly utilized criteria by the respondents for the evaluation of teachers. The heavy emphasis on the use of such criteria might be due, in part, to the disagreement among authorities concerning the usefulness of teacher behaviors as criteria for teacher evaluation.

Student achievement was not used by any of the respondents as a criteria for the evaluation of teachers. This result might have been due to the lack of an effective way of measuring student achievement resulting from a specific teacher's efforts.

The use of teacher performance by objectives as criteria for teacher evaluation was very minimal. Teacher evaluation based on performance objectives is relatively new and has received attention only in recent years.

Recommendations

Further study is needed in the area of student achievement as a

criterion for the evaluation of teachers. While few authorities have questioned the validity of student achievement as an indicator of teacher effectiveness, most authorities have agreed that there is no effective way achievement can be measured as the result of a particular effort. Further study is needed to determine if teacher effectiveness can be measured accurately in terms of student achievement.

The use of teacher performance objectives as criteria for teacher evaluation is still in the adolescent stage and deserves more attention. It is a demanding technique that is not fully understood by many educators. Further study is needed to demonstrate the effectiveness of teacher performance objectives as criteria for the evaluation of teachers.

Finally, the purpose(s) of teacher evaluation are not clearly stated, and there exists a problem in comparing the criteria used. If evaluation is for the improvement of instruction, there is more latitude allowed in the criteria used. If evaluation is for retention or dismissal, the criteria used must be much more objective. In the literature reviewed for this study, there was no clear statement of purpose of evaluation. The lack of a stated purpose caused considerable problems in the analysis of the criteria. It is recommended that future research conducted relative to teacher evaluation should always be preceded by a statement(s) of purpose of the evaluation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Barr, A.S., et al. Wisconsin Studies of the Measurement and Prediction of Teacher Effectiveness. Madison, Wis.: Dembar Publications, 1961.
2. Beecher, Dwight E. The Evaluation of Teaching. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1949.
3. Beecher, Russell S. "Staff Evaluation: The Essential Administrative Task." Phi Delta Kappan, 60, March 1979, pp. 515-517.
4. Bolton, Dale L. Selection and Evaluation of Teachers. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan Publishing, 1973.
5. Borich, Gary D. The Appraisal of Teaching: Concepts and Process. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing, 1977.
6. Brighton, Stayner F. Increasing Your Accuracy in Teacher Evaluation. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965.
7. Duhamel, Ronald, et al. "Teacher Evaluation." Education Canada, 19, Winter 1979, pp. 27-31, 46.
8. Evaluating Teachers for Professional Growth. Arlington, Va.: National School Public Relations Association, 1974.
9. Feldvebel, Alexander M. "Teacher Evaluation: Ingredients of a Credible Model." Clearing House, 53, May 1980, pp. 415-420.
10. Flanders, Ned A. Analyzing Teacher Behavior. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing, 1970.
11. Gephart, William J., Robert B. Ingle, and Gary Saretsky. The Evaluation of Teaching. National Symposium for Professors of Educational Research, 1974.
12. Good, Carter V., ed. Dictionary of Education. 3rd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.
13. Grobe, Robert P. "Evaluation - What's It All About?" National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 62, December 1978, pp. 1-13.
14. Haefele, Donald L. "How to Evaluate Thee, Teacher - Let Me Count the Ways." Phi Delta Kappan, 61, January 1980, pp. 349-352.

15. Hall, W. Dianne. "Improving Instruction Through Positive Performance Evaluation." Physical Educator, 37, March 1980, pp. 7-10.
16. Hansen, J. Merrell. "The Evaluation of Teaching: No Guppies or Goldfish in My Classroom." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 62, March 1978, pp. 11-15.
17. Herman, Jerry J. Developing an Effective School Staff Evaluation Program. West Nyack, N.Y.: Parker Publishing, 1973.
18. Hunter, Madeline. "Six Types of Supervisory Conferences." Educational Leadership, 37, February 1980, pp. 408-410, 412.
19. Johnson, James A., and Byron F. Radebaugh. "Excellent Teachers: What Makes Them Outstanding?" Clearing House, 44, November 1969, pp. 152-156.
20. King, Richard A. "Reliable Rating Sheets: A Key to Effective Teacher Evaluation." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 62, December 1978, pp. 21-26.
21. Levin, Benjy. "Teacher Evaluation -- A Review of Research." Educational Leadership, 37, December 1979, pp. 240-244.
22. Marsh, Richard L. "Management by Objectives: A Multifaceted Faculty Evaluation Model." Educational Technology, 19, November 1979, pp. 44-48.
23. McGreal, Thomas L. "Effective Teacher Evaluation Systems." Educational Leadership, 39, January 1982, pp. 303-305.
24. ----- . "Helping Teachers Set Goals." Educational Leadership, 37, February 1980, pp. 414-416, 418-419.
25. Millman, Jason, ed. Handbook of Teacher Evaluation. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1981.
26. Mitzel, Harold E. "Teacher Effectiveness - Criteria." Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 3rd ed. New York: Macmillan, 1960.
27. Popham, W. James. Evaluating Instruction. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1973.
28. Quinn, Peter C., Ted R. Urich, and James Aiken. "A Study of Evaluation Instruments and Techniques in the Connecticut Public School Systems." High School Journal, 58, February 1975, pp. 187-194.
29. Reavis, Charles A. Teacher Improvement Through Clinical Supervision. Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1978.

30. Robinson, John J., and John H. Lee, Jr. "Evaluation: Can We Agree?" National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 62, December 1978, pp. 15-20.
31. Ross, Victor J. "Here's How Teachers Should Be Evaluated." American School Board Journal, 168, August 1981, pp. 25-27.
32. Roy, Joseph J. "Teacher Evaluation in an Era of Educational Change." Clearing House, 52, February 1979, pp. 275-276.
33. Ryans, David G. Characteristics of Teachers. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960.
34. Sapone, Carmelo V. "An Appraisal and Evaluation System of Teachers and Administrators." Educational Technology, 20, May 1980, pp. 44-49.
35. Snyder, Karolyn J. "Clinical Supervision in the 1980's." Educational Leadership, 38, April 1981, pp. 521-524.
36. Sweeney, Jim, and Shirley Stow. "Performance Improvement - A People Program." Education, 101, Spring 1981, pp. 267-269.
37. Thomas, E. Barrington. "Criteria Employed by High School Principals in Evaluating Teachers in Victoria." Journal of Educational Administration, 10, May 1972, pp. 19-33.
38. Thomas, M. Donald. Performance Evaluation of Educational Personnel. Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1979.

APPENDIX

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

Dear Administrator:

Evaluating teachers is certainly one of the primary functions of the secondary school principal, and the criteria upon which those evaluations are based is a major consideration in the evaluation procedure. I am currently gathering information on the criteria by which secondary school teachers are being evaluated by their building principals. This is the topic selected for a research paper being written to fulfill the requirements for a Master's Degree in Secondary School Administration at the University of Northern Iowa.

Secondary schools served by Area Education Agencies II and VII have been selected for inclusion in this study. You are being requested to return by mail the criteria and/or instrument used to evaluate teachers in your building. This information would be greatly appreciated as soon as possible. Neither schools nor individuals will be identified in the study. A self-addressed, stamped envelope is enclosed for the prompt return of the requested information.

If you would like a summary of the results of this study, please include your name and school address on a separate sheet of paper with the return of the evaluation criteria.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Meredith C. Miller
RR 1
New Hartford, Iowa 50660

Enclosure