

1974

Professional Personnel Evaluation

Wanda M. McGowan
University of Northern Iowa

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©1974 Wanda M. McGowan

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

Recommended Citation

McGowan, Wanda M., "Professional Personnel Evaluation" (1974). *Graduate Research Papers*. 3812.
<https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp/3812>

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.

Professional Personnel Evaluation

Find Additional Related Research in UNI ScholarWorks

To find related research in UNI ScholarWorks, go to the collection of [School Library Studies Graduate Research Papers](#) written by students in the [Division of School Library Studies](#), Department of Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education, at the University of Northern Iowa.

Abstract

The problem this research paper will discuss is: What are the objectives and principles of evaluating professional school personnel? Evaluation is a primary concern to those personnel being evaluated. Many professional personnel when being evaluated do not know whether they have any rights in evaluation.

PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL
EVALUATION

A Research Paper
Presented to the
Faculty of the Library Science Department

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

Wanda M. McGowan
July 1, 1974

Read and Approved by

Charles Adams
Elizabeth Martin

Accepted by Department
Elizabeth Martin

Date June 25, 1974

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Need for the Study	1
Purposes	2
Procedures and Review of Literature	2
Definitions	3
Issues	4
OUTLINE	5
PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL EVALUATION	6
Definition of Evaluation of Professional Personnel	6
Historical Development10
Current Objectives of Evaluation14
Problems of Evaluating15
Principles of Evaluation16
Rights of the Individual in Evaluation22
SUMMARY25
BIBLIOGRAPHY27

INTRODUCTION

The problem this research paper will discuss is: What are the objectives and principles of evaluating professional school personnel? Evaluation is a primary concern to those personnel being evaluated. Many professional personnel when being evaluated do not know whether they have any rights in evaluation.

Currently, evaluation of professional school personnel and the basic principles of evaluation of professional staff members are changing. The principles of evaluation are concerned with the professional person's rights and responsibilities. Today, the whole academic community (teachers, parents, administrators, and students) are involved in evaluation of professional school personnel.

Need for the Study

With the insurgence of accountability in public schools during the past five years, evaluation of professional staff members is of primary importance. Not only are instructional programs being held accountable, the professional staff member is being held accountable for his instruction. Therefore, this research paper will investigate the area of evaluation of professional school personnel in school today.

Purposes

The purposes of this research paper are:

1. To determine the objectives and principles of evaluation of professional school personnel.
2. To trace the historical development of professional school personnel evaluation.
3. To determine the advantages and/or disadvantages of evaluation of professional school personnel by administrators, other teachers, students, and community representatives.
4. To determine the rights of professional school personnel in evaluation.

Procedures and Review of Literature

Information was obtained by using many textbooks on administration of public schools, magazine articles, notes from college classes, and evaluation forms from schools around the Webster City, Iowa, area.

The limitations of the literature were as follows. Much of the material was related only to evaluation of classroom teachers and not of media specialists. For the purposes of this paper, professional school personnel will include all certified personnel below the administration level.

The literature was mostly limited to that which was published from 1960 - 1973 with an emphasis on material from 1967 - 1973. This span of time includes such works as Foundations of Educational Administration (1967) by Williard Lane to Appraising Teacher Performance (1973) by James Lewis, Jr.

which includes information on accountability.

Materials such as The Evaluation of Teaching, Backgrounds and Concepts (1949) by Dwight E. Beecher and Mabel E. Anderson's article entitled "A Scale Rating Teachers" in The Chicago Schools Journal (1931) were used for information on the historical development of evaluation of professional school personnel.

Historically, evaluation of professional staff members has developed from criteria such as how strict of discipline was maintained (1930) to how the instructor is meeting the individual needs of the students (1973).

Currently, evaluation of professional personnel is in a state of flux because of accountability which has become important within the last five years. With accountability, professional personnel are gaining rights in evaluation. This paper will explore the historical development of evaluation of professional staff members, the current objectives and principles of evaluation, the evaluator, and the rights of the individual staff member in evaluation.

Definitions

These definitions apply to this research paper.

1. objectives of evaluation - the aims and/or purposes of evaluation.
2. principles of evaluation - the policies by which decisions concerning evaluation are judged in a critical manner.

3. professional school personnel - all certified school personnel below the administrative level.

4. evaluation - "the judgment by one or more persons of the manner in which a member of the professional school staff has been fulfilling his responsibilities to the school district over a period of time."¹

5. accountability - the public schools and their personnel being held responsible for instruction of students to meet a reasonable standard of achievement.

Issues

This paper will discuss the following issues related to school personnel evaluation:

1. Definition of school personnel evaluation.
2. Historical development of evaluation.
3. Objectives of evaluation.
4. Principles of evaluation.
5. Rights of the individual in evaluation.

¹James Lewis Jr., Appraising Teacher Performance (New York: Parker Publishing Co., Inc., 1973), p. 23.

OUTLINE

Evaluation of Professional Personnel

- I. Definition of evaluation of professional personnel
- II. Historical development
 - A. Moral and spiritual values
 - B. Conformity
 - C. Consideration for nature of the learning situation
 - D. Professional status of teachers
- III. Current objectives of evaluation
 - A. To improve instruction in the broadest sense
 - B. To identify and retain effective personnel
 - C. To promote personnel
 - D. To meet legal requirements
 - E. To grant tenure
 - F. To determine salary placement
- IV. Problems in evaluating
- V. Current principles of evaluation
 - A. Evaluation standards and procedures should be developed by personnel
 - B. Praise should be given as freely as criticism
 - C. Standards should be applied to all staff members equally and freely
- VI. Practices and guidelines for choosing the evaluators
 - A. Administrators
 - B. Other teachers
 - C. Students
 - D. Community representatives
- VII. Rights of the individual in evaluation
 - A. Constitutional rights
 - B. State rights
- VIII. Conclusion
- IX. Summary

PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL EVALUATION

Definition of Evaluation of Professional Personnel

Evaluation is the process of determining the success and the effectiveness of the school's professional personnel in carrying out their responsibilities. James Lewis defines evaluation of professional staff members as:

The judgment by one or more persons of the manner in which a member of the professional school staff has been fulfilling his responsibilities to the school district over a period of time.²

Evaluation encompasses the process of communication by which the school board advises its professional personnel of the effectiveness of their services toward the ongoing purposes of the educational system.

Jerry J. Herman states, "One of the basic elements in accountability is staff evaluation."³ Mr. Herman believes that because of the demand for accountability in our nation's schools, today, staff evaluation is the key.⁴

Evaluation of professional staff members is of importance to instructional leaders. Dr. Luther E. Bradfield of Southern Illinois University states, "An important

²Ibid.

³Jerry J. Herman, Developing an Effective School Staff Evaluation Program (New York: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1973), p. 5.

⁴Ibid.

responsibility of instructional leadership is evaluation of the work of the teacher."⁵ Without evaluation, improvements probably would not be made and education might become static.

Evaluation includes elements which are tangible, i. e., performance of a class on a standardized test. Also included are intangible elements of evaluation, such as the influence of the staff members on attitudes of students.

The evaluation process involves consideration of the following variables:

1. Preparation and background of students.
2. Goals and philosophy of the school and the community.
3. Cooperation and attitude of parents.
4. The facilities, i. e., the school plant.
5. Support of the school's administration.
6. Experiential background of the professional personnel.
7. Background and beliefs of the evaluator.

Preparation and background of students is an important variable. In evaluation, the evaluator needs to determine if the professional staff member is meeting the individual needs of the students. In order to meet the students' individual needs, the professional staff member must have knowledge about the background of the students.

The goals and philosophy of the school and the community also affect evaluation. If the philosophy of the school and the community is one of teaching students the traditional subjects only--i. e., arithmetic, reading, social

⁵Dr. Luther E. Bradfield, Supervision for Modern Elementary Schools (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1964), p. 140.

⁶Jay E. Greene, School Personnel Administration (Philadelphia: Chitlon Book, Co., 1971), p. 367.

studies, science, and language--the evaluator must determine if the professional staff member is doing this. If on the other hand, the philosophy of the school and the community is that education should allow students to experience as many areas as possible--such as painting, industrial arts, mini-courses on hiking, playing chess, etc.--the evaluator must determine if the professional staff member is fulfilling this philosophy.

Another variable which influences evaluation of professional school personnel is the cooperation and attitude of parents. It is extremely difficult for a professional staff member to be rated highly if he receives no cooperation from the parents. Parents' attitudes are often conveyed to their children. Thus in some cases, if the parent has an unfavorable attitude about a particular staff member, often their child feels the same way and may cause difficulties in school with that staff member. The evaluator must determine if the professional staff member has good rapport with parents. If he does not, the evaluator should determine why he does not.

The facilities of the school is another variable in evaluation of professional staff members. The evaluator needs to determine if the staff member is using the facilities wisely. For instance, if the media center is well equipped with both print and non-print materials, the evaluator should decide if the professional school staff member is utilizing the materials in his instruction.

Another important variable in evaluation of professional school personnel is the support of the school's administration. If the administration backs the professional staff member in his endeavors toward instruction, this often encourages the professional staff member to do better and to seek better means of instruction. But when the school's administrators do not support a professional staff member, this often leads to resignation and an attitude of why-should-I-try, anything-I-do-won't-please-them.

The experiential background of the professional personnel is another variable for consideration in evaluation of professional school personnel. In evaluating, the evaluator should determine if the staff member is having difficulties because of lack of experience or if the difficulties stem from other reasons.

The last variable that needs to be considered in evaluation of professional personnel is the background and beliefs of the evaluator. If the evaluator believes in "traditional" instruction--i. e., students do not speak unless spoken to, no student leaves his desk without permission, no grouping of students to meet individual needs, etc.--then there is a good probability the evaluator will base the evaluation on this type of criteria. But if the evaluator believes in grouping, individual instruction, a freer movement of students, etc., he will probably base the evaluation on such criteria. In summary, the above seven variables should be considered in all evaluation efforts of professional

staff members.

Historical Development

Historically, professional evaluation has followed a system of centering on the traits and characteristics of the individual being evaluated compared with the superintendent's or the school board's ideas on what the model teacher would be like. This system has made a gradual but steady change from rigid criteria toward a constructive rating. For example, in 1932, one criteria on an evaluation form for teachers was "Good morals,"⁷ which shows strict criteria. The following is an item from a 1973 evaluation form which shows a more constructive rating: "Recognizes and responds to individual differences."⁸

Early evaluations were based on moral and spiritual values of the employee. Next to these qualities was the discipline maintained by the employee. Examples of these ratings include items such as:

- a. "Good citizenship as manifested by loyalty, serious purpose, and orderliness. Good morals."⁹
- b. "20. Authority unquestioned.

⁷Mabel E. Anderson, "A Scale for Rating Teachers," The Chicago Schools Journal, September 1931, p. 33.

⁸Webster City Community Schools, "Personnel Evaluation Form" (unpublished personnel evaluation form, Webster City, Iowa, 1973), (Mimeographed.).

⁹Anderson, loc. cit.

- 21. Pupils do not 'try to get away with something.'
 - 23. Full control--acceptable pupil conduct without frequent reprimands.
 - 24. Insistence on order and obedience."¹⁰
- c. "Class management and discipline: Is fair and just in maintaining proper learning atmosphere in classroom."¹¹

During the 1940's - 1950's, as a result of the new prominence of administrators in larger school systems, evaluation turned toward a conformity basis.¹² The most successful employees were the ones who most punctiliously carried out the instructions of the school's administrators. In this period evaluations contained items such as:

- a. "Loyalty and cooperation: Is willing and able to take suggestions and criticisms, cooperates with associates and supervisors. . ."¹³
- b. "Is willing to consider and accept suggestions

¹⁰Dwight E. Beecher, The Evaluation of Teaching, Backgrounds and Concepts (New York: Syracuse University Press, 1949), p. 71.

¹¹Webster City Community Schools, "Personnel Evaluation Form" (unpublished personnel evaluation form, Webster City, Iowa, 1951). (Mimeographed.)

¹²Greene, op. cit., p. 371.

¹³South Hamilton Community Schools, "Personnel Evaluation Form" (unpublished personnel evaluation form, Jewell, Iowa, 1959). (Mimeographed.)

from supervisor."¹⁴

One of the major problems encountered during the moral and conformity periods was the focus on who the teacher was rather than what the student learned. The above basic flaw in evaluation procedures was brought before the 1971 Teacher Evaluation Conference of the Iowa State Education Association by Dr. Bernard McKenna of the National Education Association.¹⁵

Following the moral and conformity evaluations, an interest was raised as to the nature of the learning situation. The pupil-teacher relationships became important and the phrase "individual differences" came upon the scene. The recognition of the basic assumption of individual differences and the provisions made by the teacher to provide differing interest materials and increased student participation became of the utmost importance in the evaluation process. Areas concerning individual differences of students were evaluated by items such as:

- a. "Recognizes and responds to individual differences."¹⁶

¹⁴Webster City Community Schools, "Personnel Evaluation Form" (unpublished personnel evaluation form, Webster City, Iowa, 1956). (Mimeographed.)

¹⁵Dr. Bernard McKenna, "Report of the 1971 Teacher Evaluation Conference" (Des Moines: Iowa State Education Association, 1971), p. 5. (Mimeographed.)

¹⁶Webster City Community Schools, "Personnel Evaluation Form" (unpublished personnel evaluation form, Webster City, Iowa, 1973). (Mimeographed.)

- b. "Knowledge of pupils: the teacher knows each pupil as an individual."¹⁷
- c. "Different tasks: where applicable, different pupils work on different tasks. . . , teachers make a variety of assignments, designed to individual requirements."¹⁸

In tandem with the shift in philosophy, the growth of strong teacher organizations pressured the evaluation writers for treatment as professionals, and the right for some voice in the form the evaluation procedures should take. The professional personnel's involvement, coupled with the shift toward evaluation of process, was seen as a positive step toward program improvement. Professional personnel gained the right to challenge evaluations, request hearings on fairness, retain counsel, and file grievances against the evaluating body.¹⁹

Currently, evaluation of professional personnel, while caught in the controversy about accountability,²⁰ is becoming less rigid and more of a constructive rating. The

¹⁷Eagle Grove Community Schools, "Personnel Evaluation Form" (unpublished personnel evaluation form, Eagle Grove, Iowa, 1972). (Mimeographed.)

¹⁸Ibid.

¹⁹Jay E. Greene, School Personnel Administration (Philadelphia: Chilton Book, Co., 1971), p. 367.

²⁰Frank J. Sciara and Richard K. Jantz, Accountability in American Education (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1972), p. 3.

evaluation forms still vary from multi-page forms with extensive subcategories to comparatively brief instruments.

According to Calvin Greider in Public School Administration:

The development of open communication and informal administration in an atmosphere of mutual understanding, thereby reducing the threatening aspects of the evaluation, is one of the most important changes taking place in the field today.²¹

Current Objectives of Evaluation

While the prevailing objective of the evaluation process may be to improve instruction in the school system, there are many subservient objectives involved in the process. The allied objectives can be organized into three major headings: 1.) legal requirements, 2.) professional placement, and 3.) professional processes.

The first allied objective, legal requirements, is an attempt by the evaluating body to meet the requirements set forth by the Iowa Department of Public Instruction or the state legislature. The legal requirement objective may be subdivided to include the process of qualifying or maintaining qualifications for federal grants, federal guidelines, or maintaining the regulations set forth by the county or area superintendents.

In the area of professional placement, evaluation is

²¹ Calvin Greider, Truman M. Pierce, and K. Forbis Jordon, Public School Administration (New York: Macmillian Co., 1969), p. 178.

used as a tool to retain or to dismiss personnel, to promote personnel, to advance on the local salary schedule, to grant tenure, or to meet the purposes of merit pay.

Professional processes--the professional staff member's effectiveness with instructional programs, innovative procedures, etc.--are evaluated for a variety of reasons. The evaluation may be used as a means of inter-system communication about new or innovative programs. The evaluation may be used as part of an accountability measure, i. e. "the means that public schools must prove that students at various levels meet some reasonable standard of achievement.." ²² Or, the evaluation may be a subjective measure of the teacher's effectiveness on rapport or discipline in the classroom.

Problems of Evaluating

No matter what the objectives, evaluation of professional school personnel is a complex undertaking. Appraising any human behavior is difficult, especially when the appraisal is trying to determine the effect of individuals (professional personnel) upon other individuals (students).

The difficulty of establishing agreed upon criteria is another major problem in evaluation. Harold Mitzel in research on evaluation states: "More than half a century of

²²Sciara, loc. cit.

research effort has not yielded meaningful criteria around which the majority of the nation's educators can rally."²³

Evaluation is further hampered by evaluative procedures. Such procedures include observations, evaluation based on student achievements or work skills, students' attitudes, a checklist evaluation, etc. Any evaluation procedure probably will have some degree of subjectiveness.

Principles of Evaluation

There are three major principles of evaluation. First, evaluation standards and procedures should be developed by professional personnel. Secondly, praise should be given as freely as criticism. And thirdly, standards should be applied to all staff members equally and freely.

Professional school personnel should be given information about the school's standards of evaluation. The staff members should know at the beginning of contractual obligation the procedures and criteria by which they will be evaluated. Professional staff members should be informed of how evidence is gathered for evaluation, whether it is gathered by visits, handling of student problems, observations of relationships with students and other teachers. The individual staff members should be informed of the major objectives of

²³Harold Mitzel, "Teacher Effectiveness," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, ed. Chester W. Harris (3d ed.; New York: Macmillian Co., 1960), p. 1481.

the evaluation, be it to improve instruction, to encourage discussion, to establish communication, or to resolve little problems before they become large. The professional staff member should be told the procedures followed to discuss the evaluation with the evaluator: if he will be able to respond to the evaluation in writing; if he must sign the evaluation form; if he will be given a copy of it; and if the evaluation form states that signing it does not necessarily mean agreement with the items.²⁴

Evaluators

The question of who should evaluate is of paramount importance. The prevailing practice is to have the immediate supervisor, usually the principal, evaluate the professional staff member. There are four other basic methods of evaluating in education today: 1.) pupil evaluation, 2.) peer evaluation, 3.) self-evaluation, and 4.) outside evaluation.

According to Jay E. Greene in School Personnel Administration, society pays for and supports the schools; it is beginning to demand accountability and a participating role in the evaluation of professional staff members. It has been stated that since the objective of education is to help students, they should have a voice in the evaluation of professional staff members.²⁵ There are dangers in having

²⁴Jay E. Greene, School Personnel Administration (Philadelphia: Chitlon Book, Co., 1971), pp. 375-376.

²⁵Greene, op. cit., p. 380.

students evaluate professional personnel as stated by Greene.

A wise faculty and administration will do well to try to find out what student opinions about teachers are. But they had better conduct the canvass informally and discreetly. Teaching is a professional relationship, not a popularity contest.²⁶

Other dangers of having students evaluate as stated in the "Report of the 1971 Teacher Evaluation Conference" are as follows:

Student judgments may be based on false or questionable criteria; professional staff members may attempt to gain favor with students; students may "blackmail" the teachers; and students may not have insights into what constitutes good instruction.²⁷

Peer evaluation is being considered more and more. Jay E. Greene states that "when fellow professional staff members evaluate each other, instruction is improved."²⁸ He also feels that the relationship between teachers and administrators will also be improved.²⁹ Peer evaluation has become more popular, because it is a reaction to supervisory evaluation, according to the "Report of the 1971 Teacher Evaluation Conference."³⁰ With peer evaluation, a distinction needs to be made to differentiate between the evaluator and the decision maker who uses the evaluation

²⁶Greene, op. cit., p. 381.

²⁷Dr. Bernard McKenna, Report of the 1971 Teacher Evaluation Conference (Des Moines: Iowa State Education Association, 1971), p. 18. (Mimeographed.)

²⁸Greene, op. cit., p. 382. ²⁹Greene, loc. cit.

³⁰McKenna, op. cit. pp. 18-19.

results. It must be determined if the peer evaluator will simply compile the results or if the peer evaluator will make decisions concerning corrective measures, termination, or retention.

The local educational association should decide if it wants to create a situation in which peers evaluate and then make decisions which will determine the fellow staff member's status. In doing so, the association may find that peers are responsible for deciding termination, retention, or promotion, and at the same time have the responsibility to carry out a grievance which results from the decision.³¹

All professional personnel should be given an opportunity for self-evaluation. Hagen and Thorndike state:

The trend toward self-evaluation may produce desirable educational outcomes in terms of sensitizing school personnel to deficiencies in their present procedures and encouraging them to make innovations and improvements.³²

Self-evaluation checklists or observations such as:

- a. In what ways do you show that you are really interested in your students?
- b. Do you try new approaches?
- c. Do you praise good work?
- d. Do you know the students as individuals?
- e. Do you work hard? Is your instruction planned carefully?
- f. Are your decisions fair? Do you keep your word?

³¹Ibid.

³²Elizabeth P. Hagen and Robert L. Thorndike, "Evaluation," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, ed. Chester W. Harris (3d ed.; New York: Macmillian Co., 1960), p. 485.

- g. Can students talk to you?
- h. Do you motivate students?
- i. Do students respect you? Do you respect them?
- j. Do you set an example?
- k. Do you inspire students to have enthusiasm?³³

are examples of self-evaluation questions a professional may ask himself. One advantage of self-evaluation is that it is non-threatening. The obvious disadvantage of self-evaluation is that it may not be accurate or objective. If self-evaluation is to be most useful, the professional staff member should be free to use them without revealing his own ratings to the supervisor.

A phenomenon of the emphasis on program evaluation and accountability in recent years has been the increased use of outside evaluation specialists. The advantage of this is that objectivity can be achieved. When the evaluation is complete, it is left to the school to determine what will be done with the information. The disadvantage of utilizing outside evaluators is the expense.

Dr. Bernard McKenna of the National Education Association, has concluded that since no single system of choosing the evaluator is without flaws, a combination of them would provide the most adequate evaluation.³⁴

³³Ray H. Simpson, Teacher Self-Evaluation (New York: The Macmillian Co., 1966), p. 59.

³⁴McKenna, op. cit., p. 19.

Stoops and Rafferty summarize the principles of evaluation as follows:

Evaluation should be based on established principles . . .

1. Genuinely democratic procedures should be applied.
 - a. The evaluation should demonstrate fairness to the employees.
 - b. The employee should know what is expected of him, and he should be fully acquainted with the appraisal technique.
 - c. The employee should state the exact nature and degree of dissatisfaction with his service and be given time and aid for correction of deficiencies.
 - d. Employees desiring a review of their evaluations should feel free to contact the principal and superintendent.
 - e. Age, sex, marital status, and religion and other personal matters which do not affect the employee's performance should not be considered in the evaluation.
 - f. Ratings, though necessarily subjective, should be based upon as many positive evidences as possible.
2. The first step in setting up an evaluation program should be development of a set of performance standards.
3. The community and the school system should be informed about the evaluation program and given a chance to improve it.
4. An evaluation program should be studied critically and always subject to revision.
5. Evaluation should be a professional improvement and guidance device.
6. Evaluation is of little value unless there is an attempt to correct weaknesses discovered.
7. Appraisal should be a continuous process.

8. Each employee should be given a copy of evaluation policies when first hired; evaluation policies should be set forth in detail in the district handbook or similar publication.

9. The evaluation should demonstrate impartiality to all employees.

10. Self-appraisal by teachers and others should be encouraged.

11. The primary factor in the success of an evaluation program is the quality of human relations governing use of the evaluation instruments rather than the quality of the instruments themselves.

12. The evaluator should rate only those aspects with which he is most familiar and omit comment on the other items.

13. Evaluation programs should discourage comparisons of one employee with another.

14. The latest rating of an employee should be the major one to be considered rather than an average of all ratings.

15. The evaluator should be alert for symptoms of beginning mental, social, and physical maladjustments and prescribe preventive activities.

16. Follow-up conferences should accompany the written evaluation.

17. Purposes of the evaluating program should be both administrative and supervisory in nature, the emphasis being placed on the improvement of instruction.³⁵

Rights of the Individual in Evaluation

As Stoops and Rafferty imply, professional personnel have definite rights in the evaluation process. Mr. Ronald Thompson, Iowa State Evaluator Association Staff Specialist

³⁵Emery Stoops and M. L. Rafferty, Jr., Practices and Trends in School Administration (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1961), p. 441.

for Professional Rights and Responsibilities has stated that:

The U. S. Constitution guarantees in the First Amendment freedom of expression and association. The due process and equal protection clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment also reflect three basic propositions:

1) No teacher may be dismissed, reduced in rank or compensation, or otherwise deprived of any professional advantage because of the exercise of constitutionally protected rights.

2) No teacher may be dismissed, reduced in rank or compensation, or otherwise deprived of any professional advantage for arbitrary or discriminatory reasons.

3) No teacher may be dismissed, reduced in rank or compensation, or otherwise deprived of any professional advantage unless he is given notice of the charges against him, a fair hearing, and related procedural safeguards.

While these refer to dismissal, reduction in rank, or compensation, or other deprivation of any professional advantage, not infrequently the only cases cited in support, involve a dismissal.

Iowa law also has provided the notice of charges, a private conference, and an appeal at a public hearing. It is required that written reasons be provided a teacher when a school board is considering termination or non-renewal of contract.³⁶

In conclusion, the statement of Mr. Thompson concerning due process is reflected in all areas of evaluation. The process of evaluation has continually grown, historically, toward less arbitrary and more equitable considerations. The procedures allow the professional personnel due process in the handling of grievances. The courts are increasingly looking at evaluation problems. Professional school personnel are being allowed to participate

³⁶ Ronald Thompson, Report of the 1971 Teacher Evaluation Conference (Des Moines: Iowa State Education Association, 1971), p. 24. (Mimeographed.)

in the writing of the evaluation instruments, and there is an increasing awareness to their rights.

Evaluation has made great gains since the days of moral considerations and is approaching its true basis in the improvement of the instructional program.

SUMMARY

In summary, the primary objective of evaluation of professional personnel is to improve instruction in the broadest sense. The other objectives of evaluation are clearly defined as to identify and retain effective personnel, to promote personnel, to meet legal requirements of the state, etc.

Evaluation of professional personnel has changed over the years. At first, personnel were evaluated according to the discipline they maintained. Slowly evaluation has evolved into consideration of the individual differences of students and of professional personnel. Professional personnel are evaluated according to principles of evaluation.

Evaluation of professional personnel should be based on the seventeen principles of Stoops and Rafferty. These principles could be considered for adoption by all public school systems for evaluation of professional personnel. These basic principles are very comprehensive and they guarantee professional personnel their rights in evaluation.

Teachers, pupils, parents, and administrators should be involved in evaluation. After all, those whom you serve should be allowed to evaluate your services. Self-evaluation

should be an integral part of the total evaluation process.

Evaluation is needed to determine if the educational aims are being met. Evaluation of professional personnel is an integral part of today's education. Professional personnel are taking a more active part in their evaluation. Without evaluation, today's education for students would probably be chaos.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, Mabel E. "A Scale for Rating Teachers," The Chicago Schools Journal. September 1931, p. 28-33.
- Beecher, Dwight E. The Evaluation of Teaching, Backgrounds and Concepts. New York: Syracuse University Press, 1949.
- Bradfield, Dr. Luther E. Supervision for Modern Elementary Schools. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1964.
- Eagle Grove Community Schools. "Personnel Evaluation Form." Eagle Grove, Iowa, 1972. (Mimeographed.)
- Forster, Fred. "How to Push Through Better Evaluation Programs," Nations School, July 1971. pp. 27-28.
- Greene, Jay E. School Personnel Administration. Philadelphia: Chilton Books Co., 1971.
- Greider, Calvin, Truman M. Pierce, and K. Forbis Jordon. Public School Administration. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1969.
- Harris, Chester W. (ed.). Encyclopedia of Educational Research. 3d ed. New York: Macmillian Co., 1960.
- Herman, Jerry J. Developing an Effective School Staff Evaluation Program. New York: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1973.
- Krause, Carroll. "Person-centered Evaluation Builds Positive Concepts," Peabody Journal of Education. July 1972. pp. 290-294.
- Kult, L. E. "Alternatives to Teacher Evaluation," Clearing House, January 1973. pp. 277-279.
- Lane, Williard R., and others. Foundations of Educational Administration - A Behavior Analysis. New York: Macmillian Co., 1967.
- Lewis, James Jr. Appraising Teacher Performance. New York: Parker Publishing Co., Inc., 1973.

- Marks, James R., Emery Stoops, and Joyce King Stoops. Handbook of Educational Supervision. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.
- Marshall, Max S. "Analyzing Evaluation," Educational Forum, May, 1971, pp. 487-490.
- McKenna, Dr. Bernard. "Report of the 1971 Teacher Evaluation Conference." Des Moines: Iowa State Education Association, 1971. (Mimeographed.)
- McNally, H. J. "Teacher Evaluation that Makes a Difference," Educational Leadership, January 1972. pp. 353-359.
- Morphet, Edgar L., Roe L. Johns, and Theodore L. Reller. Educational Organization and Administration, Concepts, Practices, and Issues. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1967.
- Person, Neville. "Report Card Time," Audio Visual Instruction, May 1970. pp. 74-75.
- Reeder, Ward G. The Fundamentals of Public School Administration. New York: The Macmillian Co., 1958.
- Sciara, Frank J. and Richard K. Jantz. Accountability in American Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1972.
- Simpson, Ray H. Teacher Self-Evaluation. New York: The Macmillian Co., 1966.
- South Hamilton Community Schools. "Personnel Evaluation Form." Jewell, Iowa, 1959. (Mimeographed.)
- Stoops, Emery, and M. L. Rafferty, Jr. Practices and Trends in School Administration. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1961.
- Thompson, Ronald. "Report of the 1971 Teacher Evaluation Conference." Des Moines: Iowa State Education Association, 1971. (Mimeographed.)
- Webster City Community Schools. "Personnel Evaluation Form." Webster City, Iowa, 1951, 1956, 1973. (Mimeographed.)