

This dissertation has been 62-5802  
microfilmed exactly as received

LINDLEY, Jesse B., 1926-  
THE DEVELOPMENT OF A TEACHER EVALUA-  
TION PROGRAM.

The University of Oklahoma, Ed.D., 1962  
Education, administration

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA  
GRADUATE COLLEGE

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A TEACHER EVALUATION PROGRAM

A DISSERTATION  
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the  
degree of  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

BY  
JESSE B. LINDLEY  
Norman, Oklahoma  
1962

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A TEACHER EVALUATION PROGRAM

APPROVED BY

*Claude Kelley*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
*W. J. Fulton*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
*[Signature]*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
*William Carmichael*  
\_\_\_\_\_

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

DEDICATION

To my parents

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author wishes to express his appreciation to Dr. Claude Kelley, the chairman of this doctoral committee, for his assistance and encouragement during the writing of the dissertation and throughout the doctoral program; to the other members of the committee, Dr. William R. Carmack, Dr. William Ray Fulton, and Dr. O. D. Johns for their help as members of the committee.

He also wishes to express his thanks and gratitude to Dr. Jack F. Parker, Superintendent of Schools, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma for his interest, encouragement, and for providing the facilities which made this study possible.

A special note of thanks is due to the members of the various subcommittees who have worked during the past year to make this study possible.

Others who contributed to the completion of this study and deserve the thanks of the author are: Dr. and Mrs. Gene Pingleton, Dr. Glen R. Snider, Mrs. Lola Copeland, Mrs. Zeeta Cowan, and Mrs. Carolyn Staton.

And finally to my wife, Jackie, and three children, Bill, Pamela, and Steve, whose understanding, encouragement, and quiet willingness to sacrifice to make this day possible, we shall always be grateful and indebted.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
The Background and Need for the Study	
The Problem	
Delimitation of the Study	
Definition of Terms	
Method of Study	
Procedure	
Organization of the Study	
II. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE.....	15
III. THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE PLANNING BODY AND STUDY GROUPS.....	76
Introduction	
Organizational Structure of the Planning Body	
Identifying Representation of the Interested Groups	
Determination of Individual Membership on the Planning Body	
Identification of the Functions of the Planning Body	
Summary	
IV. THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE GUIDING PRINCIPLES... ..	104
Development of the Principles	
Presentation of the Principles to the Planning Body	
Reaction of the Committees to the Principles	
Utilization of the Principles	
V. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CRITERIA OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS.....	117

Chapter	Page
Introduction	
Organization of the Subcommittee	
Chronological Description of the Subcommittee's Work	
VI. THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN EVALUATION PROGRAM.....	130
Introduction	
Organization of the Subcommittee	
Chronological Description of the Subcommittee's Work	
VII. THE INVESTIGATION OF MERIT RATING.....	152
Introduction	
Organization of the Subcommittee	
Chronological Description of the Subcommittee's Work	
Recommendations of the Steering Committee	
VIII. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	166
Summary	
Findings and Conclusions	
Recommendations	
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	174
APPENDIX.....	184

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Distribution of Oklahoma City Teachers in Respect to Some Selected Factors.....	94
2. Distribution of Committee in Respect to the Selected Factors.....	95



# THE DEVELOPMENT OF A TEACHER EVALUATION PROGRAM

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### The Background and Need for the Study

Instruction is the chief function of the school and what happens to children in the teaching-learning process is all important. The quality of instruction to be found in a school system is directly related to the degree of effectiveness of its teachers. A major responsibility of the administration and the teaching staff is to constantly and energetically strive to improve the overall quality of the professional staff. An evaluation of the teaching performance of the staff members to determine their strengths and weaknesses is necessary before any effective action toward improvement can be taken.

The practice of making teacher appraisals is far from new. In this regard, Dwight E. Beecher has said:

Those who were taught must have evaluated their teachers as they listened to what was said in the temples, in the homes of the teachers, and along the streets and highways. Generations born two thousand years after Jesus and Socrates still evaluate the teaching of those masters. For many years after education became

somewhat more formalized as we know it today, evaluation of teaching continued to be informal. As teaching began to assume the status of a profession, and education developed methods and techniques, evaluation of the work of the school developed along new lines. At the present time, there is a background of experience in evaluation and a growing recognition of its value and significance in the development of more effective teaching.<sup>1</sup>

William C. Bagley advocated a plan for the identification and recognition of superior teaching while recognizing that no way has yet been found that is fully acceptable:

How . . . exceptional teachers may be discovered and suitably recognized and rewarded is a question a satisfactory answer to which would probably do more than any other one thing to advance the status of teaching as a profession.<sup>2</sup>

Mosher, Kingsley, and Stahl state the importance of the problem in this way:

The barriers in the way of an adequate solution to the problem of employee evaluation are prodigious, owing both to its complexities and to the technical difficulties involved. Yet they must be faced, for the only alternative is to rely for personnel purposes upon uncontrolled, subjective evaluations.<sup>3</sup>

In a recent publication, A. S. Barr, one of the most authoritative voices in the field of teacher evaluation, cited the difficulties and the inevitability of evaluating teachers. According to Dr. Barr:

<sup>1</sup>Dwight E. Beecher, The Evaluation of Teaching, (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1949), p. 1.

<sup>2</sup>William C. Bagley, "The Problem of Recognizing and Rewarding Merit in Teaching," School and Society, LIX (April, 1944), p. 260.

<sup>3</sup>William E. Mosher, J. Donald Kingsley, and Glen O. Stahl, Public Personnel Administration (New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1950), p. 364.

The evaluation of human efficiency at whatever level and for whatever purposes is an exceedingly complex necessity which needs to be made with extreme care. To secure accurate evaluations, one must utilize every known check on accuracy, such as multiple criteria until different criteria can be shown to give similar results or other criteria can be chosen because of their presumed validity and coverage, and more than one evaluator who will employ data collected over some period of time. Much of human import depends upon the accuracy of teacher evaluation. Some would not evaluate teachers, but evaluation is inescapable, that is, they are generally made, whether made openly and carefully or made subversively and haphazardly.<sup>1</sup>

Finally, Jack S. Parker, Superintendent of Schools in the Oklahoma City School District, wrote in an issue of the Superintendent's Bulletin about the many complex problems involved in the assessment of teaching effectiveness. He went on to say that:

Even though these things are true, it has always been necessary for someone to make decisions about teachers based on judgments as to their effectiveness. Some are given special assignments, some are placed in leadership positions, some are even dismissed from employment as teachers. How valid some of the judgments have been is open to question, but it has been an unavoidable responsibility.<sup>2</sup>

Thus we might conclude that the evaluation of teaching is not only desirable but quite necessary and even inevitable. Judgments must be rendered when decisions regarding the preparation, employment, assignment, dismissal, and the granting of tenure to teachers are

---

<sup>1</sup>A. S. Barr and others, Wisconsin Studies of the Measurement and Prediction of Teacher Effectiveness, (Madison: Dembar Publications, Inc., 1961), p. 143.

<sup>2</sup>Jack S. Parker, "The Merit Study," Superintendent's Bulletin Oklahoma City Public Schools, XIII (November 10, 1961), p. 1.

reached. These judgments may be the product of vague impressions. Unpleasant incidents tend to be well remembered so that they overshadow extensive but unrecorded evidence of good teaching. Carefully planned evaluation procedures at regular intervals correct this human frailty by directing the attention to every phase of the employee's service.

One purpose of teacher evaluation is to serve as the basis for making administrative decisions about the teaching staff. Other purposes are as a basis for self-improvement, for motivation, and for in-service and supervisory activities. Still another purpose of evaluation, and one which is generally opposed by most organized groups within the teaching profession, is that of providing a basis for giving recognition for superior and effective service especially if the recognition takes the form of a pecuniary reward. This type of reward following a judgment of the effectiveness of the teacher is commonly referred to as merit rating.

Past experiences, as well as limited evidence gleaned from research relative to the merit rating of teaching personnel, are far from encouraging. Failure, frustration, and eventual abandonment have been the results of much of the effort to utilize merit rating in school systems throughout the country. Educational research has only begun to probe into the problem of merit rating within the last few years. Differing points of view regarding the

feasibility of merit rating have been expressed by business interests, school board members, administrators, teachers and parents. The resultant clash between the differing viewpoints and the proponents of these viewpoints has made the consideration of merit one of the most controversial and emotionally charged issues in the field of education.

Regardless of the many problems and complexities associated with merit ratings, public demand for evidence of improvement in teaching efficiency seems to be increasing. This demand has resulted in pressure being applied upon boards of education to keep budgets down without sacrificing the quality of instruction. This in turn has directed attention toward the element of merit in addition to training and experience as factors to be considered in the determination of teachers' salaries.

Grieder expressed the reason for this renewal of interest in the evaluation of teachers and merit rating in the following manner:

I am convinced that pressure for merit rating in salary differentials is going to continue and to become even stronger. Regardless of the cost of living, inflation, taxes, and other factors, boards of education, and the public are going to scrutinize ever more closely demands made for and payment for higher salaries. When teachers' salaries get up into the six and seven thousand dollar range, school boards and the public want assurance that teachers are worth that much.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Calvin Grieder, "A Practical Compromise on Merit Rating: Academic Ranks for Teachers," Education, LXXVIII (March, 1959), p. 426.

An indication of the extent of the concern of the public in regard to this matter is a statement by Richard M. Nixon, the former Vice-President of the United States.

To have better schools, we must begin by having better teachers. Moreover, we must give teachers the salary, prestige and backing to enable us to attract the best minds to this honored profession and to let them know, in turn, that we will back them up.<sup>1</sup>

The concern of at least a part of the lay public regarding the failure of the teaching profession to utilize merit rating was expressed by Leonard E. Best in 1954. Mr. Best, at that time, was the President of the Board of Education, Summit, New Jersey. That school district has, since his statement, experimented quite successfully with the concept of merit salary schedules for teachers. He said:

The principle of paying above the average for outstanding values is well established. Teachers and the public in general accept this principle throughout their daily business transactions. It, therefore, seems strange to many lay persons that teachers are not paid individually on the basis of their professional contributions to the schools and the pupils.<sup>2</sup>

He continued by expressing his belief that such a plan if employed would make it possible to get the better teachers:

---

<sup>1</sup>Richard M. Nixon, "Let's Take a Searching Look at Schools," The Nation's Schools, LXI (February, 1958) Excerpts from a speech made at the twenty-ninth anniversary dinner of Yeshiva University, New York, December 15, 1957.

<sup>2</sup>Leonard E. Best, Incentive Pay for Teachers, Copy of a speech given May 11, 1954, Summit, New Jersey, Board of Education.

Lay people, executives and many others who want to see our public schools used to meet the essential needs of our youth feel that a system of incentive pay and individual recognition would help build up the schools and the teaching profession. They feel that a system of incentive pay would attract larger numbers of good potential teacher material.<sup>1</sup>

Thus, it seems that there is a growing awareness of and interest in the subject of evaluation and merit rating in the United States. Even though strong opposition to merit rating has developed within the profession, the demands still persist that the feasibility of merit rating be considered. This renewal of interest in evaluation and merit rating is evident in the increasing number of articles appearing in print. There has also been an increase in the number of school districts throughout the country which have been experimenting with the evaluation of teacher performance for the purpose of determining salaries. Possibly the most significant aspect of this movement has been the attempt to evaluate or measure more successfully the effectiveness of the classroom teacher.

The impact of the demands for the profession to consider the feasibility of merit rating and the national trends in this direction had been felt in local school districts throughout the country. One such school district was the Oklahoma City School District. In the spring of 1961, the Superintendent of Schools for the City of Oklahoma felt the need to initiate a cooperative group study regarding

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid.

the evaluation of teaching and merit rating.

As Parker explained it:

. . . We all know there is a wide variation between the best and the poorest teacher in our system. It is our responsibility to the children of Oklahoma City to put forth constant and energetic effort to improve the over-all quality of the professional staff.

With all these and other factors in mind, I asked the Board of Education and they agreed to authorize me to appoint a representative committee to work with me during this school year to investigate the possibility of introducing factors of professional merit into decisions about advancement on the salary schedule for some teachers . . . . Our hope is to develop a means of identifying as objectively as possible the clearly superior and the definitely ineffective teachers. Whether or not this can actually be done and what special consideration, if any, these relatively small groups would receive remains to be seen.<sup>1</sup>

A review of the literature showed many studies completed on the status, policies, and the practices of school districts currently employing teacher evaluation and merit pay plans. These studies provided little direction regarding how a school system might conduct a study such as that proposed for the Oklahoma City school system. A dissertation completed by Wiley<sup>2</sup> on the development of a merit salary schedule for the Sarasota County, Florida School District was somewhat similar to the purpose of this study. The study by Wiley was primarily concerned

---

<sup>1</sup>Parker, op. cit., p. 4.

<sup>2</sup>Russell W. Wiley, "The Development of a Merit Salary Schedule for the Teaching Personnel of Sarasota County Public Schools," (unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, School of Education, Syracuse University, 1958).



with the actual program developed while this study also concerned itself with the procedure followed in the attempt to develop a program.

### The Problem

The problem of this study was:

1. To develop a set of guiding principles for use in the establishment and operation of a program for the identification and recognition of the superior and ineffective teachers in a metropolitan school district.

2. To describe the action research process and procedures followed by a metropolitan school district as it attempted to solve the following problems: (a) the improvement of its teacher evaluation program by the development of means for identifying as objectively as possible the clearly superior and the definitely ineffective teachers, and (b) to investigate the possibility of introducing factors of professional merit into decisions about advancement on the salary schedule for some teachers.

### Delimitation of the Study

The study was limited to show how one school district, the Oklahoma City School District, attempted to develop a program for the identification and recognition of the superior and ineffective teachers by use of group processes during the 1961-62 school term.

### Definition of Terms

Criterion. "For a definition of teaching, this is a statement or term which specifies the scope and dimensions of an aspect or function of the job."<sup>1</sup>

The Definition of the Teacher's Job. The specific naming of the roles of a teacher and the duties to be performed by the teacher. This includes classroom teaching and any other activities or expectations of the teacher. There is not a single, generally accepted comprehensive definition.

Description of Teacher Performance. Statements, records, scales, or any other instruments or means which provide information relative to the work of the teacher.

Evaluation. The process of arriving at a judgment based on collected evidence regarding the effectiveness of a teacher.

Observation. The act of collecting information regarding the observable behaviors and characteristics of the teacher.

Merit. "The idea of deserved reward. In teaching, the meritorious teachers are those whose services are determined to be of special, outstanding, or notable value."<sup>2</sup>

Merit Rating. "A merit rating is an appraisal of

---

<sup>1</sup>Utah School Merit Committee, Report and Recommendations, (Salt Lake City: Utah School Merit Committee, 1960), p. 22.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 23.

efficiency for the purpose of relating the amount of a teacher's salary to his excellence of performance."<sup>1</sup> Merit rating, merit pay, and quality-of-service recognition were used interchangeably in this study.

Merit Salary Program. "A system or plan whereby the evaluation made of a teacher by one or more administrative authorities may be related either completely or partially, to the salary paid."<sup>2</sup>

Single Salary Schedule. A single salary schedule is a pay scale which awards the same salary to all teachers with equal training and experience.

#### Method of Study

The descriptive method of research was used in this study. Descriptive research is defined by Whitney as "fact-finding with adequate interpretation."<sup>3</sup>

#### Procedure

The following specific procedures were followed in the conduct of this study:

<sup>1</sup>Robert C. Gibson, "The Influence of the Planning Processes Upon the Success of Merit Salaries for Teachers," (unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, School of Education, University of Virginia, 1960), p. 3.

<sup>2</sup>Lester B. Ball, "An Evaluation of Teacher Merit Rating Salary Schedules in the Public Schools," (unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, College of Education, Northwestern University, 1949), p. 5.

<sup>3</sup>Frederick L. Whitney, The Elements of Research (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1950), p. 160.

1. Principles most appropriate to the establishment and operation of a program to identify and provide recognition for superior teachers were developed following a review of the literature.

2. A plan was provided for the selection and establishment of the group which attempted to develop the program for the Oklahoma City School System.

3. The literature was surveyed in the areas of teacher evaluation and merit salary schedules.

4. The actions of the committees were reported and summarized as they developed criteria which define superior teaching, the procedure for initiating the evaluation, the steps in the process of evaluation, the records to be made and kept, and the salary plan to be followed in the remuneration of the selected teachers.

5. Conclusions and recommendations in regard to the principles and procedures for the development of a program to identify and provide recognition for superior teaching in a metropolitan school district were made.

#### The Value of the Study

This study is a description of the action research process and procedures followed by the group selected by the Superintendent of Schools for the following task:

1. The improvement of the teacher evaluation program by the development of means for identifying as

objectively as possible the clearly superior and the definitely ineffective teachers in the school system.

2. An investigation of the feasibility of adopting a merit salary program.

This study should be valuable to other school districts contemplating similar investigations. They should profit from the study of the procedures followed by this school district as reported in this study. It should prove valuable to Superintendents and Boards of Education as they make decisions and take action on matters in the area of this study. Finally, other school systems may be encouraged to promote more actively the processes of group action and to study more objectively the ramifications of teacher evaluation and merit rating.

#### Organization of the Study

Following this introductory chapter is the review of related studies in the areas of teacher evaluation and merit rating which comprises Chapter II. It is followed by a chapter which deals with the plan for the establishment of the planning body which is to conduct the investigation in the Oklahoma City School District. Chapter IV explains the procedures followed in the establishment of the guiding principles for the development and operation of the program in a city school district.

This is followed by a chapter concerned with the

development of the criteria for judging teaching effectiveness. The procedure to be followed in the evaluation of the teacher and the development of the various instruments and forms to be utilized in the assessment of teacher effectiveness are the subjects of Chapter VI. Chapter VII reviews the investigation of merit rating and the proposed salary plan to be followed in the remuneration of teachers. The final chapter deals with the outcomes of the investigation and the conclusions and recommendations in regard to the principles and procedures followed in this school district in developing a program to identify and provide recognition for the superior teacher.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

The literature in the field of teaching evaluation and merit pay is voluminous, to say the least. Domas and Tiedeman<sup>1</sup> published an annotated bibliography in 1950 which included over one thousand articles on teaching evaluation alone. Since 1950, many additional articles about the evaluation of teaching have been published. An equally large number of articles have been published regarding merit pay. The unusually large quantity of information and materials concerning these two areas made it impossible for a complete and comprehensive review of the related literature to be included in this study. While an attempt has been made to cover much of the available information, the review of this chapter includes only those articles and studies which seemed to be the most pertinent and significant.

There are many types of sources of information about the evaluation of teaching and merit pay. These

---

<sup>1</sup>Simeon J. Domas and D. V. Tiedeman, "Teacher Competence: An Annotated Bibliography," Journal of Experimental Education, XIX (December, 1950), pp. 101-128.

sources are: doctoral dissertations; studies and pronouncements by professional teachers organizations at the national, state, county, and local levels; reports of state, county, and local school systems; reports of investigations and research which have been financed by such agencies as the United States Office of Education foundations, or through the joint sponsorship of various educational organizations; articles in the periodical literature; and textbooks, especially those in personnel administration.

The contribution of the doctoral dissertations in this area has been significant. But unfortunately, many of them are status studies of teacher evaluation practices and merit pay plans in school districts throughout the United States. While this type of study is needed from time to time, it is doubtful that the preponderance of studies of this type make the kind and quality of contribution so badly needed in these two areas. A number of dissertations have been written in the area of teacher evaluation which are experimental and descriptive in nature. These dissertations may have made a more significant contribution than the status studies. Reference here is to those dissertations which are similar to the ones directed by Dr. A. S. Barr and summarized in his recent publication.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>A. S. Barr and others, Wisconsin Studies of the Measurement and Prediction of Teacher Effectiveness, (Madison: Dembar Publications, Inc., 1961).



There are also dissertations, such as those written by Gibson<sup>1</sup>, McKenna<sup>2</sup>, and Wiley<sup>3</sup>, which are concerned with the methods and techniques which may be utilized by a school district in the development of merit pay plans. These were especially valuable to the persons conducting the cooperative group study in the Oklahoma City School System.

Possibly the most prolific source of information and opinion about teacher evaluation and merit pay is found in the publications of the National Education Association and the various departments of that organization such as the American Association of School Administrators, the Department of Classroom Teachers, and the Educational Research Division. Many of the state teachers' organizations and some local ones have also published reports of investigations and studies in these areas.

The research reports such as those published by the

---

<sup>1</sup>Robert C. Gibson, "The Influence of the Planning Processes Upon the Success of Merit Salaries for Teachers," (unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, School of Education, University of Virginia, 1960).

<sup>2</sup>John J. McKenna, "A Merit Salary Policy for a Public School District," (unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, College of Education, New York University, 1959).

<sup>3</sup>Russell W. Wiley, "The Development of a Merit Salary Schedule for the Teaching Personnel of Sarasota County Public Schools," (unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, College of Education, Syracuse University, 1958).

Educational Research Division of the NEA<sup>1</sup> have considerable value because they provide more extensive information about the status of teaching evaluation and merit plans than that which is provided in most doctoral dissertations. However, many of the publications from this type of source are merely statements of the position or viewpoint of the organization. They include a collection of opinion which supports the viewpoint of the organization but contribute little objective information. The only consideration of the opposing viewpoint is concerned with disproving the claims and statements made by the supporters of that viewpoint. These generalizations apply equally well to publications of organizations that are solid supporters of merit pay and those which are strongly opposed. Needless to say, the bias and the prejudices displayed in these publications limit their value and effectiveness. A recent trend which shows promise of producing more objective and useful information is that of joint sponsorship of an investigation by organizations on both sides of the issue. Such a report of an investigation is Who's a Good Teacher<sup>2</sup>, published by a joint committee of the California School Boards

---

<sup>1</sup>National Education Association, Quality-of-Service Provisions in Salary Schedules, 1958-59, Research Report 1959-R24 Prepared by the Educational Research Division (Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1959).

<sup>2</sup>Robert B. Howsam, Who's a Good Teacher?, (Burlingame: Joint Committee on Personnel Procedures, California School Boards Association and the California Teachers Association, 1960).

Association and the California Teachers Association.

Lucrative sources of information and material concerning teacher evaluation and merit pay are the guides, handbooks, and reports of investigation by state, county, and local school districts. Most of this material may be secured free of charge upon request. The statements of criteria, evaluation instruments, and the evaluation and merit pay plans and policies collected from these sources were quite useful to the committees conducting the Oklahoma City study. Reports of research and studies such as those conducted in Utah<sup>1</sup> are most important and valuable. Some states and counties have produced guides designed to provide assistance and direction to their local school districts as they attempt to develop programs in these areas. An example of this is the guide produced by the County Superintendent in Santa Clara County, California<sup>2</sup>. This type of source provides some of the most valuable and useful information to be found in the literature on teacher evaluation and merit pay.

The reports of research and investigations conducted by organizations not directly connected with teachers

---

<sup>1</sup>M. James MacFarlane and Bernarr S. Furse, An Experimental Study of Teacher Evaluation, (Sandy, Utah: Jordan School District, 1959).

<sup>2</sup>Office of the County Superintendent, "A Plan for the Development of a Teacher Appraisal Program," A Report prepared by the Administrative Advisory Service (Santa Clara County: County Superintendent of Schools, 1957).

organizations or specific school systems constitute another type of source. Typical of this are the cooperative research projects mentioned by Stiles<sup>1</sup> and studies such as the one conducted by the New England School Development Council<sup>2</sup>. While some of these reports are of basic research done in these areas which have not yet been transferred to the operational level, they do contribute to a stockpile of basic knowledge. Teacher evaluation and merit salary programs can be no better than the basic knowledge from which they are created. Thus, this constitutes a most important source of information about the evaluation of teaching and merit pay.

A copious quantity of articles regarding the evaluation of teaching and merit pay is found in the periodical literature. Some of these articles are condensations or summarizations of the findings and conclusions of doctoral dissertations and research projects. The original source in these cases is superior to the article. Another type of article frequently noticed in this type of source is concerned with a description of the program which is being operated successfully in some school district. While more valuable information and

---

<sup>1</sup>Lindley J. Stiles, "The Cooperative Research Program Contribution and Next Steps," Phi Delta Kappan, XLIII (March, 1962), pp. 231-36.

<sup>2</sup>New England School Development Council, Teacher Competence and Its Relation to Salary, (Cambridge: New England School Development Council, 1950).

material may usually be secured directly from that school district, this type of article serves as a source of information as to the identity of the school districts from which further information may be solicited. The type of article most frequently seen in the periodical literature deals with the position or point of view of an organization or individual with respect to merit pay. There is little value to be gained from a perusal of repetitious articles about why some individual or group of individuals either likes or dislikes merit pay. This type of source is not one which can be recommended very highly and is not reviewed extensively in this chapter.

Textbooks, especially in personnel administration, constitute another source of information regarding the evaluation of teaching and merit pay. As might be expected, this type of source supplies an overview of the whole problem area and dwells primarily on the history, philosophy, purposes, principles, and evaluation of past efforts in these areas. This is not a particularly important source of information to the school district which is attempting to develop a program for evaluating teaching or to study merit pay.

A review of specific studies reported in the fields of the evaluation of teaching and merit pay follows. As mentioned previously, this review does not include all studies reported in the literature but only those considered

the most significant and pertinent to this study.

Ackerman<sup>1</sup> reviewed those studies which used measured pupil change as the criterion of teacher competence. In this review, he included only the studies which attempted to relate some measured or observed teacher factor to some measured or observed aspect of pupil change or growth. Those factors were the age of the teacher, the attitude of the teacher to teachers and teaching, the experience of the teacher, the intelligence of the teacher, the professional information of the teacher, the personality of the teacher, teacher-pupil relationships, the training of teachers, and other miscellaneous factors.

He found that "the results of these studies are contradictory and inconsistent."<sup>2</sup> This was illustrated by the reports of two studies which showed a significant relationship between teacher intelligence and pupil gain while another study using the same exam found no relationship between the criterion and the teacher variable.

A proposal was made by Ackerman that the research on teacher competence should encompass three steps:

1. The identification of antecedent variables resident in the person of the teacher.
2. The tracing of their relationship to the classroom

---

<sup>1</sup>Walter I. Ackerman, "Teacher Competence and Pupil Change," Harvard Educational Record, XXIV (Fall, 1954), pp. 273-89.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 284.

- behavior of the teacher.
3. Gauge the effect of the classroom behavior on the pupils.<sup>1</sup>

A process such as this offers the possibility of obviating many of the objections to previous studies and producing more reliable information in the areas of teaching effectiveness and pupil change.

A summary and analysis of research findings concerned with the evaluation of teaching was published in 1961 under the joint sponsorship of the American Association of School Administrators, the Department of Classroom Teachers, and the National School Boards Association.<sup>2</sup> The purpose of this publication was to bring together the important information about teacher competence so that it could be used as a point of departure for any person interested in studying teacher competence. While they acknowledged that previous research in this area has been contradictory, inconclusive, and primitive, they maintain that a positive advance in the direction of dependable knowledge has been made.

The research findings regarding the various criteria which have been used in the assessment of teaching effectiveness were reviewed. Those criteria were pupil-gain, traits and characteristics of teachers, and the behavior or

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 287.

<sup>2</sup>Who's A Good Teacher? (Washington: American Association of School Administrators, Department of Classroom Teachers, and National School Boards Association, 1961).

performance of the teacher.

The pupil-gain criterion involves the measurement of change in student behavior that logically might be attributed to the influence of individual teachers. They found the frequency of these studies to be low with great discrepancies in their findings. The central difficulty in using the pupil-gain approach, as pointed out in this publication, is:

. . . one of establishing sufficient experimental controls to show that certain changes in pupil behavior occur if, and only if, these changes are preceded by the instrumental responding of a given teacher.<sup>1</sup>

The research findings regarding the correlation of characteristics such as intelligence, knowledge of subject matter, age, experience, sex and marital status with teaching success were reported. No single trait or combination of traits was found to be closely enough associated with teacher competence to permit prediction of such competence. The assumption commonly made that certain traits such as intelligence, mastery of subject matter, and age-experience are closely correlated with teaching success was not supported by the research findings reviewed in this study.

Administrative opinion was reported as being the most widely used single measure of teacher competence. It was indicated that the studies show that teachers can be

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 17.



reliably rated by administrative personnel but that the ratings do not show a high correlation with measures of student gain. The ratings by either administrators or fellow teachers tend to be contaminated by halo effects. The use of student ratings of teaching effectiveness was reported as increasing but with little research evidence that they would improve supervisory ratings. Self-ratings were not advocated because of the tendency of instructors to overrate themselves. Ratings, in general, were said to "emphasize the subjectivity that characterizes broad definitions of behavior, interpretation, or inference of goals from actions."<sup>1</sup>

The conclusion was reached that:

There appears to be no such single person as the universally effective teacher. Teaching is a complex of professions, each with widely differing requirements and activities.<sup>2</sup>

The solution to the problem of how to measure the effectiveness of this most complex professional activity, as recommended in this publication, lies in broadening and increasing the intensity of the research effort in this area.

A report was published in 1950 by the Association for

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 31.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 36.

Supervision and Curriculum Development.<sup>1</sup> The problems and issues in teacher rating were discussed and currently used rating plans were analyzed. The principles listed upon which they would base an appraisal program were:

1. Continuous and comprehensive appraisal
2. Flexible techniques of appraisal
3. Use of objective testing instruments
4. Cooperatively and locally evolved methods and procedures for evaluating teachers.<sup>2</sup>

They proposed what they believe to be a better way to evaluate teaching than the use of rating devices. The identification of certain teachers as successes or failures is not included in their proposal. They would broaden the scope of evaluation to include the degree to which the school was fulfilling its purposes.

The purpose of a monograph by Barr and others<sup>3</sup>, which was published in 1961, was to present a critical overview of some seventy-five doctoral studies that pertain in some respect to the measurement and prediction of teacher effectiveness. In addition, some new observations and hypotheses supported by the data contained in the monograph were offered. The principal purpose of the investigations reported in this monograph was to get some preliminary ideas about the nature of teacher effectiveness and how it might

---

<sup>1</sup>Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Better Than Rating, A Report Prepared by the Commission on Teacher Evaluation (Washington, D. C.: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1950).

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 67-70.

<sup>3</sup>Barr and others, op. cit.

be evaluated and predicted.

Barr listed four approaches to criterion development which were:

1. The study of the personal qualities thought to be essential to teacher efficiency.
2. The study of teacher and pupil behavior.
3. The study of the psychological prerequisites to teacher efficiency such as knowledges, skills, and attitudes.
4. The study of the product, pupil growth and achievement, and other effects.<sup>1</sup>

Each of the several approaches listed has its advantages and disadvantages and its strengths and weaknesses. The more commonly experienced problems concerned with each of these approaches were reviewed. It was suggested that for the time being the several criteria should be considered as complimentary rather than antagonistic. The strengths can possibly be preserved and the weaknesses avoided by a discrete choice from among them according to the demands of the situation. The three most commonly employed criteria were identified as:

1. Ratings of teacher efficiency based upon the observation of teacher behavior made by a single individual or by several individuals.
2. Scores on tests of qualities, abilities, and competencies thought to be associated with teacher efficiency.
3. Products, usually residual pupil gain after the effects of non-teacher effects have been randomized or taken into consideration by regression techniques.<sup>2</sup>

A summary of the various data-gathering devices

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 10.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 21.

employed in the studies was provided. These devices included tests, rating scales, behavior records, check lists, questionnaires, interviews, and physical measurements of various sorts. The data-gathering devices were used in relation to the following seven criteria of teacher effectiveness:

1. Inservice rating
2. Peer rating
3. Pupil gain score
4. Pupil rating
5. Composite of tests scores
6. Practice teaching grades
7. Combination or composites of some or all of the above criteria.<sup>1</sup>

The one hundred and four measures employed had reported correlations with the seven criteria of teaching effectiveness. A correlation of .36 was reported for seventy-four of the measures.

In the concluding chapter of this monograph, Barr made some general observations relative to the various approaches to teacher evaluation made in the investigations summarized in his report. Among these observations, the two which seem to be the most significant are:

1. The investigations summarized in this monograph contributed to progress in clarifying the problem, in indicating some alternative ways of structuring teaching ability, in indicating some of the components of teaching ability, and in indicating some matters that need to be kept in mind in developing designs for future research.
2. The evaluation of human efficiency at whatever level and for whatever purposes is an exceedingly complex

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 30.

necessity which needs to be made with extreme care. To secure accurate evaluations, one must utilize every known check on accuracy, such as multiple criteria until different criteria can be shown to give similar results or other criteria can be shown to be untenable with a variety of data-gathering devices all chosen because of their presumed validity and coverage, and more than one evaluator who will employ data collected over some period of time. Much of human import depends upon the accuracy of teacher evaluation. Some would not evaluate teachers, but evaluation is inescapable, that is, they are generally made, whether made openly and carefully or made subversively and haphazardly.<sup>1</sup>

Barr, in his concluding chapter, made some observations on teacher evaluation programs. Those observations were:

1. Teachers have always been evaluated; they are now evaluated, and they will continue to be evaluated as long as they are teachers. The problem is how to bring these evaluations in the open and improve their accuracy.
2. Teacher evaluation is an exceedingly complex matter and those that engage in such activities should be aware of its complexity, of the possibilities of arriving at erroneous judgments, and of the consequences that follow from such evaluations.
3. Different practitioners observing the same teacher teach, or studying data about her, may arrive at very different evaluations of her.
4. Each school system may prefer to develop its own plan for evaluating teacher effectiveness, taking into consideration local needs, attitudes, and insights. The attitudes and insights of the participants are important items in the success of any plan of teacher evaluation. It is best to start on an experimental basis.
5. For the time being it might be best to attempt to set up only broad categories of teacher effectiveness, such as adequate, superior, and inadequate, and to do this with reference to carefully defined situations.
6. Evaluation programs are made for different purposes such as teacher-certification, employment, improvement in service, and for fixing salary schedules.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 143.

done at different points in the time sequence, and under varying sets of conditions. These different purposes may make a difference in the teacher evaluation program.

7. There are different approaches to evaluation. Some would evaluate in terms of the basic prerequisites to teacher effectiveness: knowledges, skills, and attitudes; some in terms of teacher performance; behaviors and activities; some, in terms of the personal prerequisites to teacher effectiveness; and some in terms of pupil growth and achievement. Each approach has its advantages and disadvantages.
8. There are many sorts of data-gathering devices employed in teacher evaluation: observation of teachers at work, unaided and aided by instrumentation such as recording devices, check lists, rating scales, and the like; tests of qualities thought to be associated with teacher effectiveness; questionnaires and interviews directed to the teacher or others acquainted with the teacher's work; documents and records of various sorts, including data about the foregoing autobiographies, and the like. From these sources one may collect data of varying validity and reliability. The data will not be perfect.
9. Evaluations may be made by many people who frequently have a different perception of teaching and therefore evaluate teachers differently.
10. For the time being, it would seem best, at least until the situation has stabilized, to employ more than one approach to teacher evaluation, and to use a variety of data-gathering devices chosen for their known validity and reliability with data collected over some period of time and assessed by more than one person. Programs for the careful training of evaluators have been shown to be effective.
11. The evaluation of a teacher's effectiveness, when properly done, is a time consuming activity, and when made with due regard to its complexity may better be done not annually, but merely from time to time as a need arises, and at critical points in the teaching cycle.
12. Consideration should be given to the collection of data about such basic prerequisites as:
  - A. Knowledges
    - a. General cultural background
    - b. Knowledge of subject taught or activity directed
    - c. knowledge of child development, behavior, and learning

- B. Attitudes
  - a. Interest in subjects, pupils, and teaching
  - b. Social attitudes and values
  - c. Motivation
- C. Skills
  - a. Skill in communication
  - b. Skill in teacher-pupil relations
- 13. Consideration should be given to:
  - A. Personal fitness
  - B. Professional competency, as inferred from systematic studies of teacher-pupil behavior and conditions in the classroom and from other data gathering devices pertaining to these
- 14. Consideration should be given to the products of teacher leadership:
  - A. As director of learning
    - a. Information learning
    - b. Attitude changes: interest in the subject taught; attitudes
    - c. Special skills peculiar to the subject taught
  - B. As a friend and counselor of pupils
  - C. As a member of the school community
  - D. As a member of groups of professional workers
- 15. In collecting data relative to the foregoing remember that data-gathering devices are highly fallible; the title given to the instrument may be misleading; the notion of teaching effectiveness underlying the instrument may be fallacious; the coverage may be incomplete; key words and terms may not be defined or may be poorly defined; the directions for the use of the instrument may be incomplete or ambiguous; the separation of data gathering and evaluating processes may not be clearly indicated; and the sampling of behavior may be inadequate; to mention only a few of the possible shortcomings that may be found in the data-gathering instruments themselves. But there are other dangers; some instruments, no matter how good in and of themselves, are dangerous in the hands of some people because of the lack of professional sophistication, because of deep-seated preconceived convictions that may be erroneous, and because of willful falsifications of data that may arise out of personal incompatibilities; and because teachers vary in effectiveness from time to time and under different conditions.
- 16. Within and cutting across the foregoing suggestions, there are four major considerations that must be kept in mind:
  - A. Teacher acts are not good or bad in general

- but only in context of purposes, persons, and situations. They may be employed in operational definitions of important constituents of effectiveness and as data for making inferences about personal fitness and professional competencies, but not as a means of distinguishing good teaching from poor teaching in and of themselves.
- B. The constituents of effectiveness are not found in teachers, or in pupils, or in situations, but in the relationships that exist among those at any given time and place. The learning-teaching situation is a dynamic situation and must be so viewed.
  - C. Current attempts to evaluate teacher effectiveness deal with certain types of realities that must be given consideration, such, for example, as the perceptions of teachers, pupils, parents, and administrators of what goes on and under what conditions. It is not enough to know merely what is, but it is equally important to know what people think is.
  - D. Many people have expectancies relative to teaching: other teachers, supervisors, administrators, pupils, parents, board members, etc., and these expectancies must be given careful consideration in each particular learning and teaching situation.<sup>1</sup>

Dwight E. Beecher has been a leader in the area of teacher evaluation in New York State for a number of years.

He wrote:

A thorough evaluation of teaching is an essential and basic function of supervision. Such evaluation should be viewed by teachers, supervisors, and administrators as a constructive, cooperative guidance procedure aimed at the improvement of instruction.<sup>2</sup>

He listed certain principles whose application will make the acceptance of the evaluation program more definite.

Those principles are:

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 150-52.

<sup>2</sup>Dwight E. Beecher, "Judging the Effectiveness of Teaching," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, XXXIV (December, 1950).



1. Active teacher participation in planning and executing the evaluation program.
2. A continuous rather than periodic program of evaluation.
3. A purposeful program with the findings used to diagnose strengths and weaknesses in conference with the teacher.
4. Criteria for judging teacher effectiveness which correspond to the basic objectives of teaching in the local school system.
5. A comprehensive analysis of services rendered with objectively observed evidence of performance.<sup>1</sup>

Boyce<sup>2</sup> surveyed two hundred and forty-two cities in all parts of the United States in 1914 to determine the methods which were used in measuring teacher efficiency. In general, two methods were in use: examination and rating.

Only fourteen cities reported the use of promotional examinations at that time. The rest of the cities used some sort of rating of the value of the teacher by one or more school officers who were in a position to judge her work. The general impression and the analytical were the two main methods used by these cities.

Approximately one hundred cities were using the general impression method. This method did not utilize an outline of factors, definitions, or rules of any kind to control the judgment of teacher effectiveness. Any analysis of the situation was incidental and, if made at all, was made mentally and individually by the judges. The

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 270-281.

<sup>2</sup>Arthur C. Boyce, "Methods of Measuring Teachers Efficiency," Fourteenth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1914).

teachers were rated as good, bad, or indifferent according to the opinion of the one who judged them. While the judges' opinion may have been well grounded, there was no evidence to support the final rating.

Boyce saw many dangers and disadvantages to the general impression method of rating. There was, of course, great opportunity for favoritism, and if partiality was not actually shown, the person making the rating was still in danger of being accused of it because there was not evidence to show as a basis for the rating.

The second of the rating methods described by Boyce, the analytical method, had four general variations:

1. Descriptive reports involving a written statement by the supervisor or the officer. Such a report as this may leave the supervisor free as to the points to note or it may specify the points minutely.
2. A series of questions most of which could be answered by yes or no.
3. The teachers in a building were listed in order of general excellence. Opposite each name is placed some indication of the teacher's general efficiency in her grade and in each of the few specified items.
4. Definite numerical values are given to the various qualities and subtractions made from the maximum value of any quality in proportion to the deficiency.<sup>1</sup>

He believed that there was evidence to show that an administrator's general impression might be modified when the teacher is studied in detail and her qualities analyzed. He did not think that a schedule of qualities in the hand of the non-expert judge of teachers would make him an

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 17-18.

expert, but he did believe that it would make for greater reliability in the rating of teachers.

Bushong<sup>1</sup>, Superintendent of Schools in Grosse Pointe, Michigan, advocated the elimination of the automatic salary increment as the result of experience on the job. However, he did not advocate merit rating either as he saw many faults and hazards involved in that sort of salary plan. He recommended the establishment of a Professional Growth Program in which a teacher would earn increments by attending summer school or workshops, by civic contributions, community work, summer trips, and work experiences. This type of salary program has been used in Grosse Pointe where much teacher satisfaction with the program is reported.

The California Teachers Association<sup>2</sup> formulated a definition of teacher competence in 1957. Their purpose in performing this task was to provide a guide for local groups studying the role of the teacher.

The definition developed by this group described teacher effectiveness operationally, in terms of what the competent teacher should be able to do or the outcomes he should accomplish. They recognized that such a definition

---

<sup>1</sup>James W. Bushong, "Automatic Salary Increases Cannot Be Justified," The Nation's Schools, LXI (February, 1958), pp. 43-45.

<sup>2</sup>California Teachers Association, Teacher Competence Its Nature and Scope, A Report Prepared by the Commission on Teacher Education (Burlingame, California: California Teachers Association, 1957).

evolves from value judgment, rather than empirical research, and that the definition will vary in different communities just as the values of these communities vary. The definition developed by this group identified six roles the teacher is called on to fill, which are differentiated by the group with whom the teacher is working and by the kinds of abilities called for, as well as by the major functions of each role.

These roles were:

1. Director of Learning
2. Counselor and Guidance Worker
3. Mediator of the Culture
4. Link with the Community
5. Member of the School Staff
6. Member of the Profession<sup>1</sup>

This definition has been well received by professional groups who believe that it has the structure and incorporates the procedures desired in developing a definition of teacher competence.

A major reason for teacher opposition to merit pay is the belief that its utilization will be deleterious to the morale of the school faculty. Chandler<sup>2</sup> completed a study in which no significant difference in the average morale scores of merit salary schools and single salary schools was found. Differences in morale existed between schools, but these differences were not dispersed in a

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 20-21.

<sup>2</sup>B. J. Chandler, "Study Shows that Merit Rating is Not Detrimental to Teacher Morale," The Nation's Schools, LXI (April, 1958), pp. 58-59.

predictable direction relative to merit versus single salary schools. Morale appeared to be a function of many interrelated variables rather than a function of one or more isolated variables.

The evaluation of teachers is based upon some assumptions. Chandler and Petty listed several of the assumptions upon which the evaluation plan rests:

1. That the quality and characteristics of an ideal teacher are known.
2. That teaching conditions are approximately the same in different situations or that the differences in conditions are accurately known and adjustment can be made for them in the evaluation process.
3. That the instrument used is equally reliable when used by different individuals and applied under different conditions.<sup>1</sup>

Cooke<sup>2</sup>, in 1939, reviewed the studies which had been done in the area of teacher evaluation. He found no study of consequence concerning teacher evaluation which was made prior to 1905. The evaluation scheme proposed by Elliott in 1912 was the first carefully devised evaluation scheme discovered by Cooke. Superintendents had evaluated teachers for a number of years before this date, but they had not attempted to analyze teaching success.

The questionnaire method, which characterized most of the early studies, threw some light on the factors

---

<sup>1</sup>B. J. Chandler and Paul V. Petty, Personnel Management in School Administration. (New York: World Book Company, 1955), p. 279.

<sup>2</sup>Dennis H. Cooke, Administering the Teaching Personnel, (Chicago: Benjamin H. Sanborn and Company, 1939), pp. 183-227.

essential to success in teaching. Cooke felt that the statistical treatment of much of the data collected in the early studies was good, and that the results were of some value in that they tended to confirm previous general impressions. They were, in his opinion, negative in their approach and did not add greatly to the knowledge of the real factors in teaching success and in teaching efficiency.

Superintendent Davidson<sup>1</sup> of Washington, D. C. addressed the convention of the National Education Association regarding teaching evaluation in 1913. He reduced the total problem of evaluating teachers into three sub-problems. These three sub-problems were: the meaning of the term "the efficiency of a teacher," the effects of a rating system upon the teaching staff, and the type of system to be devised to record and measure the efficiency of teachers.

Reference was made in his speech to two of the criteria which are still commonly utilized in the measurement of teacher effectiveness. Those criteria were: the effects upon the pupils by the teacher and the multifarious qualities in the teacher which enable her to bring about the effects. It is worthy of noting that as long ago as 1913, there was an awareness of and concern for the difficulties involved in the use of these two

---

<sup>1</sup>National Education Association, Addresses and Proceedings, LI, 1913, pp. 286-90.

criteria. In concluding the address, Davidson suggested that ratings may do much in the direction of stimulating cultural and professional growth.

Various devices have been reported from time to time for relating teacher salaries to merit. Davis<sup>1</sup> reported several of the devices in current use.

In the case of teachers judged to be below average in quality such devices as the withholding of annual increments normally paid, the giving of smaller than normal increments, and the reducing of the annual salary of the teacher were found to exist. The two most commonly used devices for rewarding superior teaching were acceleration and the superior-service maximums. Acceleration refers to the giving of larger increments in advancing the teacher toward the maximum salary while the superior service maximum advances the superior teacher to a higher final salary than that paid to the average teacher.

She singled out four devices used in the identification of the superior teachers. They were:

1. The formal evaluation procedure with a weighted point scale.
2. The formal evaluation procedure with an unweighted point scale.
3. The formal evaluation procedure without a point scale.
4. Recommendation by the superintendent with no formal evaluation procedure.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Hazel Davis, "Where We Stand on Merit Rating," NEA Journal, XLVI (November, 1957), pp. 535-36.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

Edward C. Elliott, a professor of Education at the University of Wisconsin, participated in a survey of instructional practices in New York City schools in 1914. His treatise<sup>1</sup> on merit rating was one of the first important ones on this subject.

A considerable degree of foresight was exhibited by Dr. Elliott when he stated in 1914 that:

The relation of compensation to quality of service has been and will continue to be one of the perplexing issues confronting those immediately responsible for the improvement of the teaching corps.<sup>2</sup>

He went on to state that ". . . it is within the reasonable province of this study to express unqualified approval of the fundamental principle involved in the superior merit provisions . . ."<sup>3</sup> However, his unqualified approval did not extend to the criteria used in the determination of teacher efficiency. He said, in relation to those criteria:

. . . the existing methods and standards for determining fit and meritorious service are that there is no method other than that of the personal idiosyncrasy of supervisors, and that there are no standards that bear intimate and valid relation to the quality of service rendered.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Edward C. Elliott, City School Supervision, (New York: World Book Company, 1914).

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 116.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 131.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 130.



The Educational Research Service<sup>1</sup> published a report in 1956 which summarized the appraisal procedures of urban school districts in the United States. The report indicated the members of the professional staff who were rated regularly on quality of service, the identity of the rater, the kind of rating form used, and the use made of the ratings.

No regular formal ratings of any of the districts' personnel were reported by 28% of the school districts. The remaining 72% reported formal ratings with 27% rating only probationary teachers, 23% rating all classroom teachers but no others, 14% rating all professional employees, and the remaining 8% reporting other practices.

Of the districts which rated classroom teachers, 41% indicated that the principal alone is responsible for rating a teacher, 25% reported that the principal and a supervisor submitted separate ratings on each teacher, and 12% of the districts reported that the principal and the supervisor jointly prepared the ratings. The remaining 12% checked both the principal and supervisor but did not indicate whether the ratings were joint or separate. While self-appraisal was not raised in the survey, several

---

<sup>1</sup>National Education Association, Appraisal and Promotion Procedures in Urban School Districts, 1955-56, A Report Prepared by the American Association of School Administrations and the Research Division (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1956), pp. 1-36.

districts reported that individual teachers in their school system participated in the determination of their own ratings.

Some variation was reported by the school districts with regard to the type of rating forms used. Forty-nine per cent of the districts indicated their form evaluated each teacher on a number of different qualities, with no additive score for comparative purposes; 36% used a comparative scale, setting up several levels of efficiency (e.g., excellent, good, fair, poor); 10% had a scale with only two levels of efficiency (e.g., satisfactory and unsatisfactory); and the remaining 5% described forms which did not fit into any of the above categories. More than one-half of the school districts reported that the teacher was given a copy of the rating form after it had been filled out. One-third of the districts indicated that the teacher did not receive a copy of his rating.

A variety of uses of the ratings was reported by the urban school districts covered in this report. For instance, 77% used the rating as a basis for the decision on the reappointment of teachers not on tenure; 77% used them as an aid to teachers in improving instruction; 71% used them in making recommendations of probationary teachers for permanent status; 51% used the ratings in the selection of teachers for promotion; and 14% used them for determining the payment of regular increments on their salary schedule.

It can be safely stated, without fear of contradiction, that much confusion exists in the area of judging teacher effectiveness. Fattu<sup>1</sup> pointed out that much of this confusion is due to the clash between the local and professional requirements. Local requirements are designed to perpetuate the local values, customs, and traditions, while professional requirements are designed to insure that those who perform in an essential public service are qualified and that requirements remain constant over the entire nation.

He indicated that the teacher's job must be defined before a decision can be made as to how well a particular teacher has performed. The local school officials are responsible for making this judgment as to the effectiveness of the teacher. Since these officials are responsible to the local community, it necessarily follows that the assessment of teacher effectiveness must be related to the locally defined functions of the teacher.

His conclusion about the significance of the research effort in this area was that:

More than half a century of research effort has not yielded meaningful, measurable, criteria of teacher effectiveness around which the majority of the nation's educators can rally. What past research has done is to indicate some pitfalls that should be avoided.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Nicholas A. Fattu, "What Research Says About Teacher Effectiveness," NEA Journal, L (October, 1961), pp. 55-56.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

The county school districts of Florida were instructed by the state legislature to develop a career increment salary plan. These plans are a variation of merit pay. The Florida State Teachers' Association has made the following distinctions between merit rating and career increment plans:

1. Merit rating is compulsory for all and requires that each teacher submit to the rating program, while a career increment is on a voluntary basis and does not apply to an individual without his consent.
2. Merit rating is an instrument of administration, which provides a means of placing each individual in the salary schedule, while a career increment is an opportunity for the career teacher and gives him a means of earning additional income without leaving the classroom.
3. Merit rating provides individual salaries based on rating, while the career increment provides a good salary schedule for all but permits increments over and above this schedule for exceptionally meritorious individuals.<sup>1</sup>

Grieder<sup>2</sup> has stated his belief that the principle of merit rating--that is, relating teacher salaries to the quality of teaching performance--commands almost universal acceptance. He indicated that even the die-hard opponents of merit rating concede that merit rating would work if the application of suitable criteria could be made objective. They fear that the administrators will abuse

---

<sup>1</sup>Florida Education Association, Guideposts for Developing Career Increment Programs for Florida's Teachers (Tallahassee: Florida Education, 1958), p. 3.

<sup>2</sup>Calvin Grieder, "A Practical Compromise on Merit Rating: Academic Ranks for Teachers," Education, LXXVIII (March, 1959), pp. 426-429.

their rating authority.

In his opinion, the pressure for merit rating in salary differentials will continue and grow even stronger. He recommended the use of academic ranks, similar to those used in higher education, to designate various categories of teachers. Each rank would have its own criteria by which it is judged and its own salary bracket. This same recommendation has been made by numerous other persons.

A most useful and significant doctoral dissertation was completed by Gibson<sup>1</sup> in 1960. It was concerned with the effect of the planning processes upon the success of merit salaries for teachers. He concluded his study with sequential directions for planning a merit salary system, based upon the findings of his study. The directions were categorized under four headings.

The first category or heading was entitled "The Impetus and Support for Merit Salaries." The following directions were included:

1. Local groups should provide the initial stimulus for the adoption of merit salary systems within a permissive framework established by official, controlling state-level groups.
2. The group which promotes the establishment of merit pay should actively seek support from the local school administrators, school board members, teachers, and laymen.
3. Overt promotion and support of the merit salary

---

<sup>1</sup>Robert C. Gibson, "The Influence of the Planning Processes Upon the Success of Merit Salaries for Teachers," (unpublished Doctoral Dissertation School of Education, University of Virginia, 1960).

movement should rest with local groups, all of which provide strong influence toward successful operation of merit salary programs.

4. A merit salary program should not be put into operation until provision has been made for school funds which are adequate to cover increased costs of the new system.
5. Opposition by teachers should be considered as a strong factor in the predisposition of merit salary programs to failure.
6. For greatest opportunity for success, a merit pay plan should not be introduced until all individuals worthy of appointment as teachers receive a salary which provides a reasonable standard of living.
7. Teacher opinion should be consulted both prior to and concurrent with the planning of merit salaries in order to determine the course which has the widest acceptance and thus the greatest chances of success.<sup>1</sup>

The second of the categories suggested by Gibson involved the initial planning for merit salaries and included the following directions:

1. Teachers should be given the privilege of selecting their own representatives on the committee which plans the merit salary system.
2. The local teachers' association should be actively involved throughout the planning for teacher merit salaries.<sup>2</sup>

The concern of the third category was with devising a plan for merit salaries with these directions given:

1. Provision should be made for variations in the evaluations of specialized personnel.
2. Teachers should be given a voice in accepting the final plan for merit salaries.
3. The planning group should identify the personnel who will have the responsibility for evaluating staff members for the purposes of merit pay.
4. Teachers should participate in devising the plan of teacher evaluation.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 216-24.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 224-36.

5. Teacher evaluation should be followed by a conference between the teacher and the evaluator.
6. The planning group should develop both qualitative and quantitative standards for teachers' work.
7. Planning for merit salaries should include provision for the evaluation of administrators and supervisors for salary purposes.
8. In planning merit salaries, provision should be made for community approval of the merit salary plan for teachers.
9. Teachers should have a voice in intermediate decisions as plans develop for teacher evaluation.
10. The planning group should have clearly defined goals and should constantly identify specific objectives as planning progresses.
11. A period of at least two years should be spent in planning the merit salary system.
12. In the evaluation of teachers, comparisons among teachers should be avoided.<sup>1</sup>

The fourth category dealt with what Gibson termed on-going planning. These directions were given:

1. Provision should be made for teachers to appeal their ratings and their placement on the merit salary scale.
2. Constructive counsel for teachers should be provided as a natural concomitant of their evaluations.
3. A committee should be established to conduct continuing study of the success of the merit pay plan.
4. New teachers should be fully informed of the merit pay provisions.
5. All information about evaluations and salaries of individual teachers should be held in confidence among the personnel directly affected.
6. A trial period should be established at the time merit salaries are adopted.
7. Planning should include provision for discontinuation of merit salaries, if and when that is considered wise.<sup>2</sup>

Howsam, in a publication sponsored by the California Teachers' Association, defined evaluation as "judging

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 236-45.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

whether something which we know measures up to what we expect of it."<sup>1</sup> In his opinion, evaluation takes all factors into account and tends to be diffuse and subjective in contrast to rating which tries to be precise and objective.

People may have quite different reasons for the evaluation of teaching. The reasons suggested by Howsam were:

1. To determine achievement of the objectives held by the school.
2. To provide the basis for giving recognition for superior and effective service.
3. To provide the basis for self-improvement.
4. To provide the basis for motivation.
5. To provide the basis for in-service and supervisory activities.
6. To provide the basis for administrative decision.
7. To provide the basis for judgments.<sup>2</sup>

The extent to which the teacher produced desired changes in pupils was thought by Howsam to be the ultimate criterion of teaching effectiveness. However, he did not recommend this criterion because of the many serious difficulties and limitations associated with it. Unable to use the ultimate criterion, he turned to the other criteria referred to as proximate. Those criteria are: teacher behavior and teacher characteristics. Definite progress was reported in using the behavior approach. While failure and frustration have generally resulted from the efforts to use teacher characteristics as a criterion,

---

<sup>1</sup>Robert B. Howsam, Who's A Good Teacher? (Burlington: California Teachers Association, 1960).

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 8-9.



further progress is expected as the result of more refined techniques.

Howsam concluded his report with some suggestions for teacher evaluation. Those suggestions were:

1. In all teacher evaluation activities where policy is being made or where procedures are being developed there should be genuine cooperative participation by those concerned to the greatest extent possible.
2. Teacher evaluation should always be seen as only a part of the total evaluation procedures in the district.
3. The first step in the evaluation process should be the formulation of the education objectives of the school system.
4. The objectives should be translated into desired behavior changes in boys and girls, citizens and community.
5. An educational program to bring about the desired behavior should be planned.
6. Criteria of effective teacher behavior should be established and clearly understood by both rater and teacher.
7. The purposes of teacher evaluation should be determined.
8. The possible effects of the rating purposes and approaches should be considered.
9. The criteria of effective teaching should be translated into appropriate rating instruments.
10. The procedures to be followed in teacher evaluation should be clearly established and each person should become aware of his role and the role of each other person involved.
11. The procedures should be put into effect, always on a trial basis.
12. The procedures should be evaluated and revised periodically.
13. There should not be any procedure or report of which the teacher is unaware.
14. There should be some form of appeal procedures for teachers who feel that their ratings do them an injustice.
15. Consideration should be given to using a variety of approaches to teacher rating.
16. Attention should be given to possible conflicts of function.
17. Raters should be trained in observational techniques and in the use of specific instruments.

18. More than one person should rate each teacher; such ratings should be done independently.
19. There should be adequate opportunity for observation.
20. Rating devices should include attention to at least the three areas of competence: the relations with pupils, control and management, and the quality of instruction.
21. In setting up instruments for rating, consideration should be given to differences in expectations of teachers.
22. Leniency tendencies should be avoided.
23. All concerned should be aware of the operation of the "halo" effect and should strive to counteract it.
24. The use of test results for teacher evaluation purposes should be approached with great caution.
25. Those of the professional staff who participate in evaluation activities as part of their duties should expect to be evaluated on how well they do it.<sup>1</sup>

The cumulative personnel folder as a source of evidence for evaluative procedure was indicated as a major device in operating a successful and functional merit policy. Huggett and Stinnett recommended that such a cumulative folder contain the following items:

1. College transcripts
2. Employment interviews
3. Letters of recommendation
4. Intelligence, aptitude, personality and social attitude test scores
5. Teaching assignment for each year
6. Results of class achievement tests
7. Record of community participation
8. Professional participation
9. Official annual rating
10. Annual self-rating<sup>2</sup>

Irvin A. Karam conducted a survey of the merit pay plans in sixty-nine school districts while completing his

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 41-46.

<sup>2</sup>Albert J. Huggett and T. M. Stinnett, Professional Problems of Teachers (New York: Macmillan Company, 1956), p. 350.

doctoral dissertation in 1959. He categorized the plans in this manner:

1. Supermaximum plans
2. Accelerated increment plans
3. Bonus plans
4. Multiple track plans
5. Periodic merit evaluation plans
6. Summer merit teacher projects program
7. Annual outstanding teacher projects program<sup>1</sup>

He found that the supermaximum plan was the most prevalent type, with the accelerated increment plan being the second most commonly used type of merit plan. A substantial number of the school districts utilized both the supermaximum and the accelerated increment plans. Only a small number of districts employed the other types of merit plans.

The typical merit plan described by Karam was developed cooperatively by teachers and administrators as the result of pressure from the school board. The majority of the merit plans have been developed since 1946 in school districts where teachers' salaries were above the national mean. The current expenditures per pupil in these districts were also above the national mean of expenditures per pupil. The population of the districts with merit plans was not large, with most of the districts having fewer than two hundred fifty teachers.

---

<sup>1</sup>Irvin A. Karam, "Merit Rating Salary Plans in Public School Systems of the United States, 1955-56," Journal of Educational Research, LIII (December, 1959), pp. 144-148.

The majority of the merit pay plans included formal written criteria for measuring teaching performance.

Those criteria common to most of the plans were:

1. Personal qualities of teachers
2. Ability or effectiveness of teachers
3. Pupil-teacher relationships
4. Relationships with staff members
5. Contributions to the community
6. Contributions to the total school program<sup>1</sup>

The merit plans did not usually have the evaluation policies and procedures reduced to a written form. The principal was most commonly used as an evaluator and the classroom observational visit was the technique for determining teacher effectiveness. The evidence was deposited in a cumulative record folder under the jurisdiction of the building principal. The majority of the plans contained some means whereby the teacher might appeal the decision of the evaluators.

Karam concluded that there was a positive relationship between the amount of money spent and the success of the merit plan. He also saw this same positive relationship between the basic salaries paid to teachers and the involvement of those directly concerned with the success of the merit plan.

Macfarlane and Furse<sup>2</sup> reported the results of the

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid.

<sup>2</sup>M. James Macfarlane and Bernarr S. Furse, An Experimental Study of Teacher Evaluation (Sandy, Utah: Jordan School District, 1959).

study of teacher evaluation made by the Jordan School District in the state of Utah. This study was made in an attempt to answer three questions. The first of these questions was: Can teaching be defined and described? Their findings indicated that the teaching function can be described. It was suggested that the description of teaching could not be universal, nor could it be established without change. The second question was: Can teaching be evaluated? Their trial evaluation program indicated to them that teaching performance can be evaluated with accuracy and fairness. The third question which this study attempted to answer was: Can evaluation be related to the salary program? They recommended additional salary reward to teachers after the problems connected with the first two questions had been resolved.

The study included some basic policies which should be adhered to in considering merit pay. Those policies were:

1. Evaluation for merit pay should be by voluntary application by the teacher.
2. The way to the top of the salary schedule should be open to everyone.
3. The standards for obtaining merit salary should be known and understood by every teacher.
4. Merit pay should be over and above a good, sound basic salary schedule.
5. The basic schedule should be based upon training and experience.
6. The merit payments should be substantial.
7. In no way should evaluations for merit pay be used to penalize a teacher or decrease his salary.
8. The person or persons working with the teacher on an improvement program should not determine whether the

- teacher is qualified to receive merit pay.
9. Destructive competition for merit increases must be avoided.
  10. The merit salary program should encourage master teachers to stay in the classroom without financial sacrifice.
  11. A merit pay program should be abandoned if it detracts from the improvement of instruction.<sup>1</sup>

The North Carolina General Assembly, in the early 1950's, established a Commission to study the feasibility of merit rating for salary purposes. This commission retained William A. McCall and others to conduct this investigation. The report of this study, written by McCall, was published in 1952.<sup>2</sup>

The general plan of the study was to measure comprehensively the growth produced in each class by the teacher of that class and to correlate a large number of measures of the teacher's traits with this criterion of teacher worth. Other variables which affect pupil growth such as IQ, pupil drive, home environment, and class size were measured and allowance made for each.

The correlations reported in this study between the measures of teacher worth and pupil growth were not generally very high. Principal's ratings correlated negatively with the criterion, experience showed but little relationship with the criterion, and the correlation between

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 187.

<sup>2</sup>William A. McCall, Measurement of Teacher Merit, Publication No. 284, (Raleigh: North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, 1952).

the amount of training and the criterion was also quite low. Pupil ratings of their teachers on a social behavior scale showed a high degree of correlation with the criterion, but the highest degree of correlation with the criterion was registered by teacher self-ratings.

The North Carolina study reached several conclusions with respect to evaluating teachers. One of their major conclusions was that the existing system of rewarding teachers is of little value if salaries should be paid on merit. As a result of this conclusion, they recommended the gradual replacement of experience by a more defensible criterion. Possibly the major conclusion of the study was:

All things considered, this research failed to find any system of measuring teacher merit which the writer is willing to recommend be adopted as a basis for paying the salaries of all teachers.<sup>1</sup>

McKenna<sup>2</sup>, in his doctoral dissertation, developed a guide for the organization and administration of a merit salary policy for a public school district. His guide was divided into three phases: a preparatory phase, a developmental phase, and a program evaluative phase.

In the preparative phase of merit salary development, he recommended that a joint committee of teachers, administrators, and board members be appointed to study the

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 36-38.

<sup>2</sup>John J. McKenna, "A Merit Salary Policy for a Public School District" (unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, School of Education, New York University, 1959).

advisability of adopting a merit policy for the local district. Only if the consensus of the joint committee was favorable toward merit would the second or developmental phase commence.

The second phase consisted of three basic steps. The first of the steps was the development of a basic plan. This plan would include the mechanics of placement on the salary schedule and a recommended salary scale. The second step was to develop evaluative criteria and methods for the measurement of these criteria. The criteria would be in accord with the following principles:

1. The criteria should be realistic and attainable by most teachers.
2. The criteria should be observable.
3. The criteria should be defined and should be illustrated to avoid too great a leeway in interpretation.
4. The criteria should be such that it is within the power of the teacher to modify and control the situation leading to the satisfaction of the criteria.
5. The criteria for advanced salary phases and rank differentials should be progressively more professional.<sup>1</sup>

He recommended that the scope of the criteria be broad enough to include personal characteristics, professional qualifications, teaching efficiency, and personal interaction. The third step of this phase was the development of methods of implementation. This involved four very important and difficult tasks which were:

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 122.



1. Establishing the rules and regulations for the selection and operation of an evaluation committee.
2. Designing a cumulative record folder that will meet the requirements established.
3. Designing a rating instrument for classroom observation.
4. Establishing the rules for classroom observation and name the rating officials.<sup>1</sup>

The program evaluative phase in McKenna's guide to the development of merit salary plans was the final phase. Its primary concern was with providing for annual evaluation of the plan by a joint committee of teachers, administrators, and board members.

Miller<sup>2</sup> proposed a plan for merit salary increments which depends on the initiative of the individual teacher. The teacher should be required to submit a request for additional compensation if she so desired. This request would have to be justified by the teacher with evidence regarding her teaching performance.

Possibly the most highly publicized experiment with merit salary programs was conducted in New York State. Morrison<sup>3</sup> described the history of this experiment which commenced with the passage of the Feinberg law of 1947.

This law provided that the first increments would be

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 123.

<sup>2</sup>Van Miller, "The Advantages of Paying for Quality in Teaching," The American School Board Journal, CXVIII (April, 1949), pp. 21-23.

<sup>3</sup>J. Cayce Morrison, "History of New York State's Approach to Problems of Relating Salaries to the Quality of Teaching Service," Harvard Educational Review, XXII (Spring, 1952), pp. 124-131.

automatic and the rest would be promotional and dependent upon satisfactory teaching service and at least one of four types of exceptional service. The most controversial subdivision of the law provided that certain minimum percentages of the teachers would be assigned to specified salary levels. The teachers of New York State did not take kindly to the merit principle and sponsored legislation to remove the percentage features of the law. This was done by the New York State Legislature in March, 1951.

The Research Division of the National Education Association<sup>1</sup> published a research report on quality-of-service provisions in teachers' salary schedules in 1959. This report summarized the results of a survey of teacher evaluation and merit salary policies and practices in school districts of over 2500 population throughout the United States.

Various methods of evaluating teaching were reported by these school districts. In order of frequency used, they were:

1. Informal evaluation based on opinion of the evaluator
2. Rating scales
3. Interviews
4. Check lists
5. Teacher-to-teacher comparison
6. Ranking in order of merit<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>National Education Association, Quality-of-Service Provisions in Salary Schedules, 1958-59, A Report Prepared by the Educational Research Division (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1959).

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 22.

The majority of the school districts, 77%, reported the use of two or more evaluators while the rest of the districts used only one evaluator. The principal served as the evaluator most frequently, followed by the supervisor, department chairman, and superintendent in that order. Less than one-fourth of the school districts reported some kind of formal preparation for the evaluation of teaching. Yearly evaluations were reported by 43% of the districts with the other districts evaluating teachers either more than once a year or at irregular intervals of more than one year. The evaluation of the teacher was discussed with that teacher in approximately one-half of the districts. A review of the evaluation was provided for in 80% of the districts and over 90% of the districts had made provision for the teacher to appeal the judgment of the evaluator. Although many of the districts had an appeals procedure, it was seldom used.

As mentioned previously, this study by the Research Division was also concerned with quality-of-service provisions in teachers' salary schedules. They found that most of the presently existing provisions had been adopted within the last five years. The classroom teachers had participated in the development of these provisions in 47% of the districts. These teachers also had a responsibility in administering the provision in 13% of the districts. The provisions for recognizing quality-of-service in the

teachers' salary schedule was employed in 17% of the school districts. Of those districts employing quality-of-service provisions, 44% provided both reward and penalty, 24% provided for reward only, and 33% provided for penalty only. The reward provisions were found most frequently in the schedules of sparsely populated districts, while penalty provisions were found most frequently in heavily populated districts. Five different devices were reported for rewarding superior teachers. They were:

1. Acceleration of the teacher in progress toward the salary maximum.
2. An additional step or steps beyond the normal maximum which is referred to as a supermaximum.
3. Superimposition of a series of tracks based on merit rating of the traditional single salary schedule.
4. Granting of a one-year bonus for outstanding service.
5. Establishment of barriers on the salary schedule beyond which successively fewer teachers may pass.<sup>1</sup>

The most commonly used of these devices were supermaximums and acceleration. Only a relatively few of the districts reported the use of devices for penalizing unsatisfactory service, with the device most frequently used being the withholding of increments.

The New England School Development Council<sup>2</sup> completed a significant and comprehensive investigation and study of merit salary plans and their relation to teacher

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid.

<sup>2</sup>New England School Development Council, Teacher Competence and Its Relation to Salary (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Spaulding House, 1956).

competence. Their report of this investigation marked the end of a nine year study of the complex problems revolving around this subject.

The first area of concentration for this group involved a review and evaluation of the various types of salary schedules already in existence. The findings of research in relation to teacher competence were also reviewed and studied. They came to the conclusion that, with the exception of certain highly technical areas, the training of the teacher is not a matter of great importance and that there is a somewhat variable but generally low relationship between experience and teaching efficiency. They went on to say that:

If we hold that teachers should be paid for the proficiency with which they educate youngsters, it is apparent that neither the preparational - nor the positional - types of salary schedule accomplishes this objective to any great degree. The only way we can be sure that we are paying different salaries to teachers of different proficiency is to define levels of proficiency, attach salaries to them, and pay teachers the promised salary when they attain the stated degree of proficiency.<sup>1</sup>

An attempt was made to determine the attitudes of teachers and groups of teachers about teaching evaluation and merit salary plans. This was partially done by reviewing reports of the New York State experiment and of such organizations as the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. A conclusion of the Lt. Governor's Advisory Committee in New York State was:

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 7.

The principle of merit as a basis for rewarding superior service is generally accepted. Differences of opinion in this connection are confined almost entirely to the problem of applying the principle.<sup>1</sup>

A questionnaire was sent to the teachers in the member school systems of the New England Development Council to determine their attitude toward teacher evaluation and merit pay. This survey revealed that a large majority of the teachers were willing to submit to evaluation and approximately one-half or more were willing to allow the evaluation to affect their salary. A difference of opinion was detected among the teachers in regard to these questions. The male, married, and less experienced teachers located in a community presently employing a merit salary schedule were more favorably inclined toward evaluation and merit pay than were the teachers of opposite characteristics from the communities which did not have a merit salary plan. The Council recommended that the administration of a school district considering a merit salary plan keep the following general attitudes of teachers in mind:

1. There is a deep-seated fear in the minds of teachers that a merit clause in the salary policy would be just one more handicap to an already overburdened person, because:
  - A. The evaluation involved seems to them some new, strange thing based on one or two observations and having no relation to the conclusions concerning their work presently arrived at by supervisors and the principal.
  - B. They fear that the merit-clause would be used as a means of keeping salaries at a lower level

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 21.

- despite a published high maximum.
2. The supervisors play a most important part in the morale of the teaching staff. Supervision of a constructive nature which helps the teacher to overcome weaknesses or deal successfully with difficult situations, and which gives appreciation for work well done is of inestimable value.
  3. The attitude of the community toward the schools and the teachers will have an important effect on the morale of the teachers.
  4. The evaluating instrument or the basis of evaluation should be thoroughly understood and accepted by both evaluators and evaluatees.
  5. Evaluation should be a continuing process and the teacher should be encouraged by the recognition of strength, not merely made conscious of weakness.<sup>1</sup>

The plan for evaluating teaching recommended by the Council was a subjective one, as they believe all evaluation ultimately is. They believed that their plan was consistent with observations of teacher development and made a definite distinction between observing, reporting, and evaluating. The services of the teachers, supervisors, and principals would be utilized in all phases of the process. They advocated that the teacher be evaluated in respect to the fulfillment of three different roles:

1. Classroom role
2. School role
3. Professional role<sup>2</sup>

They felt that a teacher's satisfaction with the societal modified definition of each of these roles leads to his recognition as an outstanding teacher, although it is not necessary for the teacher to fulfill the roles simultaneously.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 45.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 85-90.

It was recommended that during the first three years the evaluation of the teacher should center entirely around the classroom role, and the teacher would be dismissed if inadequate in this role or given a contract for the fourth year if judged adequate. The evaluation during the next five years would be primarily concerned with the teacher's fulfillment of the school role, and the next five year period would be devoted to the determination of the teacher's success in fulfilling the professional role of the teacher.

The responsibility for making the judgment as to the degree or extent to which the teacher has fulfilled each of these roles was delegated to an ad hoc committee consisting of a board of education member, a representative of the superintendent, the building principal, the teacher's supervisor or department head, and three teachers. It was suggested that the evidence regarding the teacher's fulfillment of one of these roles should be collected from various sources and a cumulative personnel file built and maintained on each teacher. This evidence could be secured from the classroom observations by the building principal and the supervisors and from the testimony of the teacher's colleagues, a random sample of the pupils of the teacher and the parents of those pupils. The evidence collected would then be analyzed and evaluated by the ad hoc committee and a decision made as to whether



the teacher had satisfactorily fulfilled the role being evaluated.

A salary schedule was recommended by the Council which provided a progressively higher salary for the teacher who had achieved each of the four levels. It consisted of an eighteen step schedule with a large differential between the first four steps of the schedule and a smaller increment for the remaining fourteen steps of the salary schedule.

The procedures advocated by the Council in respect to evaluation and salary scheduling were quite similar in many ways to other plans and procedures. They did present a rather unique hypothesis of teacher development. Both the evaluation program and the salary schedule promulgated by the group were quite appropriate to this hypothesis.

Peterson listed five basic steps for establishing a practical merit pay plan. Those steps were:

1. Evaluate the School Committee-if the school board is interested in merit rating as a money-saving device, forget the whole idea.
2. Enlist the Aid of the Teachers-since teachers are most directly affected by any form of merit, they must have a major role in shaping the plan.
3. Provide a Face-Saving Device-merit schedules I and II will do away with the idea that not to be judged superior means that one is inferior.
4. Provide More Than One Evaluator-a combination of evaluators will help to reduce the subjective evaluator charge by the teacher evaluated.
5. Evaluate Basic Teaching Techniques-judge teacher competence in seven areas; preparation and planning, recognition of and provision for individual differences, motivation, command of subject matter, teaching techniques, classroom control, and

classroom atmosphere.<sup>1</sup>

He thought it advisable to limit the rating categories to three: below average, average, and above average. This is in line with his belief that rating systems have tended to superfluosness and that the simpler they are the better they are.

Reavis and Cooper<sup>2</sup> analyzed the teacher evaluation procedures used in one hundred and four city school systems. They concluded that the best method for evaluating teacher merit was by utilizing a teacher personnel record system. The cumulative record folders for teachers were found to be highly reliable sources of information for making valid evaluations of teacher merit.

In 1943, the Committee on Criteria of Teacher Effectivenss of the American Educational Research Association reported that:

The present condition of research on teacher effectiveness holds little promise of yielding results commensurate with the needs of American education . . . After forty years of research on teacher effectiveness . . . one can point to few outcomes that a superintendent of schools can safely employ inhiring a teacher or granting him tenure.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Carl H. Peterson, "Five Basic Steps to a Practical Merit Plan," The American School Board Journal, CXXXV (November, 1957), pp. 26-28.

<sup>2</sup>William C. Reavis and Dan H. Cooper, Evaluation of Teacher Merit in City School Systems (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945).

<sup>3</sup>H. H. Remmers, "Second Report of the Committee on Teacher Effectiveness," Journal of Educational Research, XLVI (May, 1953), p. 657.

Rose proposed a plan for merit rating as the result of his experience as the director of the Utah School Merit Study Committee. In summarizing the findings which came out of the work of the committee, he concluded that:

Merit programing involves two major elements: the decision-making process to determine who is eligible and qualified for merit pay, and the coordination of actual merit payments into the actual salary program and budget.<sup>1</sup>

He suggested three aspects as being related to the identification of effectiveness in teaching. These three aspects were: the effects of the teacher on the pupils and others in the school, which he identified as the ultimate criterion, the personal traits of teachers, and the professional performance of teachers, which he identified as the proximate criteria. A broad approach to teacher evaluation was recommended which would prohibit the choice of only a single evaluation focus or technique.

The application of the evaluative criteria to the teaching-learning situation has always demanded the collection of considerable data by observation in the live teaching situation. To collect this data, the plan proposed by Rose utilized observation record forms, behavior profiles and other devices as the needed organizing guides for efficient classroom observation. He recommended a regular evaluation of each staff member every three years with supplemental

---

<sup>1</sup>Gale W. Rose, "A Plan for Merit Rating," Administrator's Notebook, IX (May, 1961), p. 1.

evaluations in between the formal evaluations. These evaluations would serve to improve instruction and the educational program and were independent of any salary plan. They would also provide a method of weeding out the incompetent and of providing help for those teachers who needed time to overcome inadequacies.

His plan allowed the competent teachers in the system, who believed that they might qualify for merit status and reward, to submit an application for consideration. Provision was also made for the principals and supervisors to nominate qualified teachers for this consideration with that teacher's permission. The application would be filed with the person in the school district office who was charged with the maintenance of the teacher evaluation records. This person would prepare an analysis of the material contained therein and then convene a district wide merit review committee to study the file and the evaluation. This review committee would submit a recommendation to the superintendent who would make the final determination.

According to Rose, "When a well-developed program for collecting and organizing relevant data has evolved and when teachers have been provided with as much feedback and assistance for improvement as possible, the district has the professional basis for making merit pay decisions."<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 2.

It is after this point has been reached by a school district that Rose believed it possible to examine the whole matter of general salary policy and program. He recommended that the following elements be included in the structure of a good salary program:

1. An entrance salary high enough to compete in the market for the kind of people the district wants as beginning teachers.
2. An allowance for experience or special field so that the district can compete for those people it wants who are not rank beginners or who have some scarcity value for the school program.
3. A salary range which will permit the satisfactory professional teacher to about double the entrance salary within ten years.
4. An increment pattern from entrance salary to normal maximum which recognizes some of the facts about teacher career patterns--namely, (a) that the first two or three years are typically probationary for new teachers who are proving themselves, and (b) that these years are marked by a high turnover as young teachers leave the profession either temporarily or permanently.
5. A pattern of extended longevity increments for those devoted teachers who give fifteen, twenty, or even thirty years of good school service.
6. A particular school district may want to put other factors in the salary program too, such as dependency allowances, sex differences, and advanced degree differentials.
7. When a total salary structure has been formulated based on criteria that the district accepts as important, it is then time to consider how merit may be properly introduced into the general pattern.<sup>1</sup>

The merit plan promulgated by Rose provided for merit recognition in the form of extra salary. Other forms of merit recognition were also advocated such as modifications in time commitments, special recognition, a new assignment, or a promotion. He concluded the article by saying that:

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 3.

The merit concept is one of quality and there is nothing more important for professional educators to be concerned about than the improvement of the quality of teaching service. Differential rewards based on demonstrated differential teaching service will affirm that good teaching is worth more than poor teaching and that excellent teaching has a high community value.<sup>1</sup>

Two procedures for the rating of teacher performance were recommended by Ryans.<sup>2</sup> Those two procedures were: the forced-choice performance report and the classroom observation scale. The forced-choice performance report consisted of several equally popular behavior descriptions. One of these descriptions is known on the basis of empirical validation to discriminate between criterion groups, while the other does not so discriminate. The classroom observation scale was a refinement of instruments previously used. Both of these techniques objectify the rating process sufficiently, in Ryan's opinion.

Shane reported seven types of evaluation as being used in thirty-five outstanding school districts throughout the United States. Those types were:

1. Rating scale or check-list
2. Written reports following classroom visits
3. No formal rating plan
4. Self-appraisal form prepared by the teacher
5. Verbal reports, principal to central office
6. Subjective appraisal by superintendent

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 4.

<sup>2</sup>David G. Ryans, "Notes on the Rating of Teacher Performance," Journal of Educational Research, XLVII (May, 1954), pp. 695-704.

7. Group evaluations by teacher's fellow workers.<sup>1</sup>

There is little justification for the assumption that the contribution of one teacher is the same as another and that both should be paid alike. Because of their unwillingness to accept that assumption, Stoops and Rafferty<sup>2</sup> favored some sort of financial differentiation which more amply rewarded the superior teacher. Consequently, they did not recommend the outlawing of merit as an element in salary schedules nor did they believe it necessary to overcome all of the objections which can conceivably be raised to the merit type of salary schedule before consideration is given to it. Instead of waiting another thirty years or so to give the superior teacher extra pay, they recommended that we pay on the basis of what we can detect, not on the basis of what we cannot. In their opinion, it is possible at the present time to detect and identify the top, middle, and lowest categories of merit. They listed several of the most difficult problems confronting the establishment of merit salary schedules:

1. The lack of agreed criteria of teacher effectiveness.
2. The impossibility of devising a merit salary schedule which will operate automatically.
3. The reluctance of the teacher to submit his salary placement to the subjective estimate of one or more

---

<sup>1</sup>Harold G. Shane, "Seven Types of Teacher Appraisal," The Nation's Schools, L (July, 1952), pp. 58-59.

<sup>2</sup>Emery Stoops and M. L. Rafferty, Practices and Trends in School Administration, (New York: Ginn and Company, 1961), pp. 400-03.

- raters.
4. A tendency of teachers to regard merit salary schedules as impractical because of its effect on<sup>1</sup> teacher morale and the whole educational program.<sup>1</sup>

The Wichita City Teachers Association<sup>2</sup> sent representatives to West Hartford, Connecticut to interview teachers, board members, and parents to determine their reaction to the merit salary program employed in that school district. Nine out of every ten teachers interviewed thought that the merit rating system was a good idea and a step in the right direction. The teachers felt that the merit rating plan had furnished them with a desire to improve their work. The West Hartford teachers also expressed the opinions that all teachers receiving merit ratings deserved them although some deserving teachers did not receive them, that the program had not been unfair to them personally, and that they held no resentment if rejected by the rating board.

A salary plan which would reduce the tensions caused by both the single salary plan and merit pay plans was proposed by Lloyd K. Wood.<sup>3</sup> His plan consisted of the identification of two categories of teachers. The first category included those who have other interests and

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 402.

<sup>2</sup>Wichita City Teacher Association, A Study of Merit Rating Programs for Teachers, (Wichita: Wichita City Teachers Association, 1956).

<sup>3</sup>Lloyd K. Wood, "To Attract Good Teachers," The Nation's Schools, LXII (October, 1958), p. 83.



duties so that teaching is not their full time job. The second category consisted of those to whom teaching was a full time job, a lifetime career, and their major source of satisfaction. The teachers in the second category would be provided with extra compensation, since the extra time devoted to teaching by the members of this category justified their extra compensation and made it possible for them to remain as classroom teachers rather than moving into administrative positions.

Worth suggested a simple and obvious test of the assumption "that administrators can and should rate the performance of teachers."<sup>1</sup> This test was to have a number of administrators rate the performance of a single teaching situation so that their ratings could be compared. He made a kinescope of fifteen minutes duration in which a first grade teacher taught one complete lesson. Sixty-five elementary principals were shown this kinescope and then asked to rate the effectiveness of the teacher.

The teacher was rated satisfactory by 69% of the principals, while 26% of the principals appraised the performance as weak, doubtful, and barely satisfactory. He concluded that the wide variation in the ratings assigned to the teacher and the discrepancies in the description of her strengths and weaknesses raised some

---

<sup>1</sup>Walter W. Worth, "Can Administrators Rate Teacher?" *The Canadian Administrator*, I (October, 1961), p. 1.

doubt concerning the ability of administrators to evaluate teachers and teaching. A large part of the variation was attributed to the lack of a common definition of good teaching, and he recommended the establishment of a criterion to measure teacher effectiveness as a possible point of departure.

One of the first and most significant dissertations on the topic of merit pay was written by Young<sup>1</sup> in 1933. It was a status study of the practices of some fifty-nine cities employing merit salary schedules in 1927-28. He developed thirteen criteria governing the administration of merit-rating plans:

1. The rating plan should be specified and definite part of the salary schedule.
2. Superior merit should be rewarded.
3. Continued incompetence should be penalized.
4. Merit should be only one of the factors considered in granting salary increments.
5. Teacher accomplishments should be the basis of the rating plan.
6. The rating scale should be documentary, with a uniform system of scoring.
7. The rating scale should define, set up standards, and make mutually exclusive all the factors entering into the rating.
8. The teacher's final score should be computed from at least four independent ratings.
9. Teachers should be classified into not more than five merit groups.
10. The number of teachers rated in each merit group should approach the curve of normal distribution.
11. Only administrative officers should rate a teacher for salary purposes.
12. Rating plans and procedures should be a cooperative enterprise.

---

<sup>1</sup>Lloyd P. Young, The Administration of Merit-Type Teacher's Salary Schedules, (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1933).

13. One official should be responsible for the final rating.<sup>1</sup>

Young evaluated the practices of the fifty-nine school systems covered in his study and determined their procedures to be "justifiable" or "unjustifiable" according to their degree of conformance to his criteria. He found that 91% of these cities based the amount of the annual increment upon merit rating; 27% supplemented merit rating with other factors such as additional training, travel, experimentation, and research; and, 65% of the cities provided a smaller increment for the average teacher than the average teacher was receiving in comparable communities using automatic salary schedules. He concluded his study with recommendations for the administration of a merit-type salary schedule, advocating, among other things, that the amount of annual increments be determined by the amount paid teachers in comparable communities, that each level of efficiency should receive a proportional amount of salary, that the rating scale should be based on pupil results rather than upon personal traits and factors, and that the cooperation and approval of the teaching personnel should be secured prior to the attempt to implement the schedule.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 94-95.

## CHAPTER III

### THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE PLANNING BODY AND STUDY GROUPS

#### Introduction

The establishment of the planning body as described in this chapter includes the provision of an organizational structure, the identification of representation of the interested groups, the determination of individual membership, and the identification of the functions of the planning body. The establishment of such a body in Oklahoma City was authorized by the Board of Education as a result of a recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools at their regular meeting on August 7, 1961. The recommendation of the superintendent was that he be allowed to establish a representative group of teachers and administrators to study the feasibility of developing a plan for identifying and recognizing the superior and the ineffective teachers in the Oklahoma City School System.

At first, the superintendent planned to have his administrative assistant assume the major responsibility for the establishment of the planning body. However, the employment of an administrative intern at a later date

provided an alternative for the superintendent in that this task could be made the major job responsibility of this individual. Therefore, the administrative intern was assigned the task of reviewing the literature and making recommendations to the superintendent for the establishment of the planning body. The final decisions which were the basis of the formation of this body were made by the superintendent in consultation with the administrative assistant and the intern.

This chapter will first describe what was done in Oklahoma City in respect to the establishment of the planning body and then cite support for the adopted procedure from one or more of the following:

1. The recommendations of the authorities as reported in the literature.
2. The experience of other school districts in establishing similar groups.
3. Established developmental principles.
4. A strong belief, held by the persons responsible for the establishment of the planning body, in the rationality and appropriateness of some procedures although they vary with the recommendations reported in the literature.

#### Organizational Structure of the Planning Body

As previously mentioned, the decision to have a representative group of teachers and administrators study the possibilities of merit salary programs was made by the Board of Education of the Oklahoma City School District as a result of the recommendation by the superintendent of schools. The utilization of the cooperative group approach rather than reliance upon a plan devised by the administration

or the board of education was in keeping with the best practices as recommended by the vast majority of the authorities in the literature.

The Pennsylvania State Education Association stated that "A successful study of merit rating will involve many people. These people should represent all groups that will be affected."<sup>1</sup>

The booklet developed in Florida to assist the counties in developing career increment programs stated that:

It is recommended that a steering committee be appointed by each county superintendent of public instruction, with approval of the county school board, which would guide the development of a plan for use in each of the counties. This steering committee should include membership from each level of the profession, with a numerical majority of classroom teachers. The levels of the profession which should be included are classroom teachers, principals, supervisors, and administrators.<sup>2</sup>

In 1952 William L. Gragg, who was then Superintendent of Schools in Ithaca, New York, asserted that "The success or failure of a promotional plan will be affected directly by the degree of participation of the teachers to whom

---

<sup>1</sup>Pennsylvania State Education Association, Merit Rating, A Guide for Study, A Report Prepared by the State Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State Education Association), p. 7.

<sup>2</sup>Florida Education Association, Guideposts for Developing Career Increment Programs for Florida's Teachers, A Report Prepared by the Florida Education Association, (Tallahassee, Florida: Florida Education Association), p. 6.

promotional standards are applied."<sup>1</sup>

Beecher, Cocking, McKenna, Morrison, Peterson, Reavis and Cooper, and the New Jersey Education Association are others who are representative of the vast majority of the authorities in the literature stressing the superiority of the group approach.<sup>2</sup>

The decision to utilize the cooperative group approach in the Oklahoma City study can also be supported by reference to the experience of other school systems. The cooperative approach was utilized in a state wide study in Utah as reported by Orton in 1955.<sup>3</sup> Other school systems which have employed the cooperative study approach to the consideration of merit salary programs are Alton and

<sup>1</sup>William L. Gragg, "Ithaca's Revised Teacher Rating Plan," American School Board Journal, CXIX (July, 1949), pp. 23-25.

<sup>2</sup>D. E. Beecher, "New York Plan for Rewarding Good Teaching," American School Board Journal, CXIX (October, 1949), 35-37; W. D. Cocking, "Judging Merit in Teaching," School Executive, LXVII (September, 1947), p. 5; John J. McKenna, "A Merit Salary Policy for a Public School District," (unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, College of Education, New York University, 1959), p. 113; J. C. Morrison, "New York State is Now Testing Promotion for Merit," Nation's Schools, XLII (October, 1948), 20; Carl H. Peterson, "Five Basic Steps to a Practical Merit Plan," American School Board Journal, CXXVII (November, 1957), pp. 26-28; W. C. Reavis and D. H. Cooper, Evaluation of Teacher Merit in City School Systems, (Supplementary Education Monographs No. 59, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, January, 1945), p. 80; Research Division, New Jersey Education Association, Information on Merit Rating, Bulletin 57-1 (Trenton, New Jersey: New Jersey Education Association, July, 1957), p. 8.

<sup>3</sup>Don A. Orton, "A New Approach to Merit Rating," The Nation's Schools, LVI (July, 1955), pp. 53-56.

Barrington, Illinois; New Canaan and West Hartford, Connecticut; Ladue, Missouri; Sarasota County, Florida; and Weber County School District, Utah.

Gibson<sup>1</sup> found that the respondents from the school systems which included classroom teachers in the planning group evaluated the practice as being very important. The respondents from the school systems in which the planning was done entirely by professional leaders evaluated the practice as having a negative effect upon the success of the program. He found that 81.8% of the school districts had included teachers on their planning body while only 19.2% of the school districts had limited the planning to administrative leaders. He indicated that the smaller school systems tended to rely more on their administrative leaders without assistance from other personnel than did the large systems.

The decision of the Board of Education to utilize the cooperative study approach for the development of the program to identify and reward superior teachers in Oklahoma City was supported by the guiding principles of that program. The second of these principles, developed as a part of this study, states that the program should grow

---

<sup>1</sup>Robert C. Gibson, "The Influence of the Planning Processes Upon the Success of Merit Salaries for Teachers," (unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, School of Education, University of Virginia, 1960), p. 116.



out of a cooperative study by a representative group of teachers and administrators.

Once the decision had been made to employ the cooperative study approach in Oklahoma City, the next major problem was to decide on the organization of the effort and the optimum number of people who could be efficiently involved in the study. A recommendation was made to the superintendent by the intern that a general steering committee of fifteen persons, representative of the professional staff, be given the responsibility of developing the plan to identify and give recognition to superior teachers. However, the task of developing the total plan seemed to be too difficult and time-consuming to assign to one committee of fifteen persons each of whom were already occupied in full time jobs. Therefore, it was recommended that the general steering committee delegate the developmental work and responsibility to three subcommittees of fifteen members each. The task of each of the three subcommittees was to consider its specific problem area, assigned by the general steering committee, and to recommend a solution for that problem. The general steering committee, upon receiving the recommendations of the three subcommittees, was to advise the superintendent regarding the feasibility of the total plan. The final decision on the adoption of a plan rested with the board of education following a recommendation from the superintendent

of schools.

Support for this organizational structure may be found in the recommendations to the county school districts of Florida<sup>1</sup> who were assigned the responsibility for developing career increment programs. The state study group advised each county superintendent of schools to appoint a steering committee to guide the development of the program. In addition, they suggested that where necessary subcommittees should be appointed under the leadership of the steering committee to make recommendations to the steering committee. They also recommended that the steering committee members should serve as a member of one of the subcommittees.

The Florida counties were advised to limit the membership of their steering committees to ten persons.<sup>2</sup> Gibson<sup>3</sup> found, in the school districts responding to his questionnaire, that the membership of the planning body varied from six to seven hundred and seventy-seven persons. The mean number of persons serving on these bodies for the districts involved in his study was thirteen.

The adopted organizational pattern for the planning body in Oklahoma City was also consistent with the

---

<sup>1</sup>Florida Education Association, op. cit., p. 6.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 7.

<sup>3</sup>Gibson, op.cit., p. 115.

developmental principles established in the study. The involvement of as many as forty-five persons in small group situations increased the likelihood that the program recommended would be acceptable to a majority of the teaching staff and that it would be based on locally felt needs and conditions as the principles state.

This organizational plan was also defended on a rational basis because of the advantages it made possible. The division of the responsibility and the work load among more people, thereby requiring less time and effort of each of the persons, was one advantage. Another advantage was the reduction in the total time required for the study as the different subcommittees were doing much of their work simultaneously. Finally, the provision for the involvement of a fairly large group of teachers but in small group situations was a distinct advantage, since they could more effectively express themselves and become more directly involved in and committed to the developmental work of the study.

A major difficulty with this organizational plan was that problems such as the coordination of activities and decision-making became much more complicated. To partially remedy this difficulty, it was recommended that each of the steering committee members in Oklahoma City also serve on one of the subcommittees. Thus each member of the steering committee, having served as an active participant

in the deliberations of one of the subcommittees, was more able to make the needed decisions to facilitate and coordinate the work of the subcommittees.

#### Identifying Representation of the Interested Groups

A survey of the literature revealed the following interested groups which might be represented on the planning body:

1. lay groups
2. the board of education
3. the central administrative staff
4. the principals
5. the classroom teachers

The superintendent of schools in Oklahoma City, following the recommendation of the administrative intern, arranged for the central administrative staff, the principals, and the classroom teachers to be represented on the planning body. He did not provide for representation from lay groups and the board of education.

The inclusion of central administrative staff personnel on the planning body was supported by the recommendations of authorities as reported in the literature. In fact, Gibson<sup>1</sup> found that the evaluation of the central administrative staff participation on the planning body was higher than all other groups represented.

McKenna, Misner, Swain, and the Florida Education Association all recommended, as did the vast majority of

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 117.

the sources reporting in the literature, that the principals should be represented on the planning body.<sup>1</sup>

The inclusion of the classroom teachers on the planning body was almost a unanimous recommendation of the authorities as reported in the literature. No recommendation to the contrary was found in the literature. The Florida Education Association not only concurred in this recommendation but insisted that the teachers should constitute a numerical majority of the group.<sup>2</sup>

The decision of the superintendent of schools in Oklahoma City not to provide for representation on the planning body from lay groups and the board of education did not conform to the recommendations of many of the authorities. That the inclusion of lay and board of education members on the planning body was not a unanimous recommendation of the literature was evidenced by the failure of the Florida state committee<sup>3</sup> to recommend the inclusion of these two groups. However, many authorities such as Misner<sup>4</sup> recommended that the program be a cooperative

---

<sup>1</sup>McKenna, op. cit., p. 117; Paul J. Misner, "The Merit Rating Issue," Seven Studies (Chicago: National School Boards Association, August, 1958), p. 41; Lorna Swain, "Merit Rating for Teachers," (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, College of Education, Stanford University, 1960), p. 123; Florida Education Association, op. cit., p. 6.

<sup>2</sup>Florida Education Association, op. cit., p. 6.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 7.

<sup>4</sup>Misner, op. cit., p. 41.

group development on the part of the board of education, the school administration, and the teachers. Gibson<sup>1</sup> noted the recommendation of many of the authorities in the literature that the lay public and the board of education be represented on the planning body. He found that the majority of the school systems included in his survey followed this recommendation. The participation by school board members on the planning body was evaluated very highly by the respondents in his study. The evaluation of lay participation on the planning body, while still positive, was much lower than the evaluation of the participation of the other groups.

Two major difficulties of a practical nature led to the superintendent's decision not to include lay members on the planning body in Oklahoma City. They were in locating competent individuals who had the motivation and the necessary time required by such a project and in acquiring a semblance of representation from the entire community. The chief reason that members of the board of education were not included on the planning body was that their presence might tend to inhibit the other members and prevent full participation and involvement.

Determination of Individual Membership on the  
Planning Body

The Central Administrative Staff - The superintendent

---

<sup>1</sup>Gibson, op. cit., p. 229.

designated himself, the personnel director, the administrative assistant, the administrative intern, and a supervisor as the representatives of the central administrative staff on the planning body.

While the presence of the superintendent may tend to inhibit teacher members and cause undue influence on the decisions of the group, the advantages of his presence on the planning body were such that he was designated to serve in an ex-officio capacity. The administrative assistant was selected for membership on the steering committee because of the impossibility of the superintendent attending every meeting. The assistant was able to serve as the superintendent's representative in his absence and also kept him informed as to the progress of the study. The designation of the personnel director for membership on the steering committee was due to the probability that the implementation of any program developed as a result of the study would be the responsibility of his department. The administrative intern was appointed to serve as the resource person for the planning body. In addition to the above mentioned central administrative staff persons serving on the planning body in an ex-officio capacity, a supervisor from the instructional department was selected to serve as a regular member of one of the subcommittees.

Advocacy of a specific role for the superintendent on the planning body was not frequent in the literature.

Hamstra<sup>1</sup> recommended that the superintendent serve on the planning body in an ex-officio capacity. Gibson's<sup>2</sup> study revealed that in 42 per cent of the large school systems the superintendent served on the planning body in an ex-officio capacity and that this role was regarded as a positive contributing factor to the success of the program. Specific recommendations of other central administrative staff members to serve on the planning body were not found in the literature.

Principals - When it was decided that the principals should be represented on the planning body, an arbitrary decision was made to limit the number of elementary principals to two on each committee and the number of secondary principals to one. This was done to prevent their domination of the committees at least in voting power.

The procedure recommended and followed in the selection of the specific principals to serve on the committees involved their appointment by the superintendent from a list of nominations supplied by the president of the Administrators' Council, a local professional organization of administrators. This procedure seemed to offer the best possibility for securing interested and capable members while still retaining an element of the democratic process.

---

<sup>1</sup>R. H. Hamstra, "Merit Rating of School Personnel," American School Board Journal, CXVII (December, 1948), p. 21.

<sup>2</sup>Gibson, op. cit., p. 232.



While it was impossible to support this procedure with any specific recommendation from the authorities in the literature, its selection was defended on rational grounds.

Classroom Teachers - The classroom teacher representatives on the planning body were appointed by the superintendent from a list of nominations submitted by the president of each of two local teachers' organizations. These "at large" representatives were selected in such a manner that they represented the total teaching staff of the Oklahoma City school system in respect to the factors of sex, age, experience, marital status, and teaching level.

The invitations to the selected teachers were made in a personal letter from the superintendent.<sup>1</sup> With only two exceptions, all persons who were asked to serve on the committee consented to do so. One of the teachers who asked to be excused from service on the committee had been seriously ill only shortly before, while the other was enrolled in evening classes at the University of Oklahoma. A third member of one of the committees was replaced at a later date when it became necessary for her to take a leave of absence from her teaching position.

The selection of the members of the planning body by the superintendent did not follow many of the recommendations

---

<sup>1</sup>See Appendix D.

of authorities in the literature. Beecher and McKenna<sup>1</sup> recommended that the teacher representatives to the planning body should either be elected by the teachers or appointed by the local teachers' organizations. Gibson<sup>2</sup> found that 86 per cent of the school systems included in his survey had allowed the teachers to select their own representatives, but also that the selection of representatives by the teachers themselves was thought to be less important by the respondents from large school systems than the respondents from the smaller school systems.

The selection of the teacher representatives on the planning body by the teachers themselves was almost precluded in Oklahoma City by the basis of teacher representation used. That basis was "at large" representation of the total teaching staff.

While the basis of teacher representation on the planning body was usually not indicated in the literature, Gibson<sup>3</sup> did report the basis of teacher representation used in the school systems which he surveyed. The most frequently listed basis was by schools, followed by "at large"

---

<sup>1</sup>D. E. Beecher, "Salary Law in New York Produces Tangible Benefits," Nation's Schools, LXI (April, 1948), p. 56; McKenna, op. cit., p. 117.

<sup>2</sup>Gibson, op. cit., pp. 133-134.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., pp. 134-138.

representation, and by grade and subject taught. The respondents from the larger school systems indicated that the basis of representation was not as influential upon the success of their program as did the respondents from the smaller school systems.

The selection of the members of the planning body on the basis of schools was not possible in Oklahoma City. The presence of ninety-nine schools in the system with only forty-five members on the planning body made it impossible to have each school represented. For this reason, the "at large" basis of representation on the planning body was selected.

The results of a survey of teacher attitude toward merit salary schedules conducted by the New England School Development Council<sup>1</sup> was responsible for the selection of the "at large" representatives on the basis of sex, age, experience, marital status, and teaching level. The questionnaires, returned by three thousand two hundred and nine teachers, inquired as to the willingness of the teachers to submit to evaluation and allow the evaluation to affect their salary. A higher percentage of men than women responded as being willing to submit to evaluation and a higher percentage of men than women of those opposed to evaluation were willing to allow

---

<sup>1</sup>New England School Development Council, Teacher Competence and Its Relation to Salary, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: New England School Development Council, 1950), pp. 35-46.

their salaries to be affected by the evaluation. A higher percentage of married persons of both sexes were willing to be evaluated and have the evaluation affect their salary than were single persons. A differential in the willingness to submit to evaluation was found between elementary and secondary teachers with the secondary teachers being more agreeable to it. A willingness to submit to evaluation was expressed by the teachers with the least number of years of experience and it became less acceptable as the number of years of experience increased. In contrast to these findings, however, of the teachers who were willing to submit to evaluation the ones with the least experience were less favorably inclined to allow the evaluation to affect their salaries than were the more experienced teachers. It was apparent that the findings of this survey had significance for the selection of teachers to serve on the planning body in Oklahoma City. To have the committees composed entirely of persons in favor of or opposed to the evaluation of teachers and merit pay seemed inadvisable. That the program to identify and reward superior teachers should be acceptable to a majority of those involved was one of the guiding principles established for this study. The possibilities of developing a program acceptable to the majority of the teaching staff seemed to be greater if the distribution of persons on the committee in respect to the factors of age, sex,

experience, marital status, and teaching level was similar to the distribution of the entire teaching staff in respect to those same factors.

The distribution of the total teaching staff of the Oklahoma City school system was secured by first compiling the number of teachers throughout the system in each of the categories and then computing the percentage of teachers in each category as compared with the total number of teachers. Table I shows the distribution of the teaching staff of the Oklahoma City school system according to the selected factors.

A model distribution of the teacher members of the planning body in respect to the selected factors was devised by multiplying the percentage of Oklahoma City teachers in each category by the number of teacher-members on each of the four committees. The selection of teachers for membership on the committees so that the membership corresponded to the model distribution insured a similarity between the distribution of the membership of the committees and that of the total teaching staff. Table 2 shows a comparison between the model and the membership of the four committees. It may be noted that while there is some variance, such as is the case with subcommittee A in respect to the marital status of the secondary teacher members, the distributions of the committees tend to resemble that of the model.

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF OKLAHOMA CITY TEACHERS  
IN RESPECT TO SOME SELECTED FACTORS

AGE

Age	<u>Elementary Teachers</u>		<u>Secondary Teachers</u>	
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total
20-29	297	23.7%	298	29.6%
30-39	184	14.7%	227	22.6%
40-49	279	22.2%	208	20.7%
50-up	494	39.4%	273	27.1%
Total	<u>1255</u>	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>1006</u>	<u>100.0%</u>

EXPERIENCE

No. of Years Experience	Elementary Teachers		Secondary Teachers	
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total
None	88	7.0%	75	7.4%
1-3	226	18.0%	175	17.4%
4-10	271	21.6%	265	26.4%
11-20	431	34.4%	317	31.5%
21-30	142	11.3%	109	10.8%
31-up	97	7.7%	65	6.5%
Total	<u>1255</u>	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>1006</u>	<u>100.0%</u>

SEX

	Female	% of Total	Male	% of Total
Elementary Teachers	1167	93.0%	88	7.0%
Secondary Teachers	554	55.1%	452	44.9%
Total	<u>1721</u>	<u>76.1%</u>	<u>540</u>	<u>23.9%</u>

MARITAL STATUS

	Single	% of Total	Married	% of Total
Elementary Teachers	223	18.6%	1032	81.4%
Secondary Teachers	222	22.1%	784	77.9%
Total	<u>445</u>	<u>19.7%</u>	<u>1816</u>	<u>80.3%</u>

GRADE LEVEL

	Number	% of Total
Secondary	1006	44.5%
Elementary	1255	55.5%
Total	<u>2261</u>	<u>100.0%</u>

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF COMMITTEES IN RESPECT TO  
THE SELECTED FACTORS

Factors	Ratio of model	Ratio of committees			
		steering	A	B	C
1. Teaching level					
Elementary	7	7	7	7	7
Secondary	5	5	5	4	5
2. Sex					
Elementary					
Male	1	1	2	2	1
Female	6	6	5	5	6
Secondary					
Male	2	2	2	2	3
Female	3	3	3	3	2
3. Marital Status					
Elementary					
Single	1	2	2	2	2
Married	6	5	5	5	5
Secondary					
Single	1	3	4	1	1
Married	4	2	1	3	4
4. Age					
Elementary					
20-29	2	2	2	2	2
30-39	1	1	2	1	1
40-49	1	1	2	2	1
50-up	3	3	1	2	3
Secondary					
20-29	2	2	2	2	2
30-39	1	1	1	0	1
40-49	1	1	0	1	1
50-up	1	1	2	1	1
5. Experience					
Elementary					
0 - 4	2	2	2	1	2
4 -10	1	0	3	1	2
11-20	3	2	0	2	1
20-up	1	3	2	3	2
Secondary					
0 - 4	1	1	2	2	1
4 -10	1	1	0	0	2
11-20	2	1	1	1	0
20-up	1	2	2	1	2

The role of the local teachers' organizations in Oklahoma City in the selection of the teacher members of the planning body was limited to that of nominating a list of interested and capable persons for service on the committees. A total of sixty-eight persons were nominated, of which forty-five were selected. The administrative intern selected the members of the planning body from the list of nominations according to the procedure described above.

Teacher participation in the planning process of a study such as the one in Oklahoma City was widely recommended, however the literature identified this participation officially with the teachers' organizations in only a few instances. Some of the examples cited were: Champaign, Illinois, where the teachers' organizations elected a planning committee which developed a plan for evaluating teachers; Lexington, Massachusetts, where the teachers' organization appointed the committee and later approved the plan formulated by the committee; and in West Hartford, Connecticut, where the teachers' organization formally approved of the plan and later made recommendations for alterations in it.<sup>1</sup> Gibson stated that "whether or not

---

<sup>1</sup>A. T. Barlow, "Teachers Rate Their Professional Growth as Basis for Salary Increases," Nation's Schools, XLII (March, 1952), p. 63; J. B. Smith, "Lexington Moves Toward Merit Rating," American School Board Journal, CXXXIII (November, 1956), p. 27; E. H. Thorne, "West Hartford's Career Salary Plan," Nation's Schools, LV (March, 1955), p. 52.



teacher participation is officially under the jurisdiction of the teachers' organizations has not seemed to be an issue as reported in the literature."<sup>1</sup>

Selection of the chairmen of the committees - The chairman of each of the four committees comprising the planning body was appointed by the superintendent in consultation with the resource person, the president of the Classroom Teachers' Association, and the directors of elementary and secondary education. The rationale behind the employment of this procedure in the selection of a chairman was that a group of persons previously unacquainted meeting together for the first time could not be expected to make an intelligent selection of a chairman. The superintendent, with a knowledge of the capabilities of the various members of the committees, should be able to make a more intelligent selection of a chairman.

The procedure for selecting the chairmen of committees for studies such as the one in Oklahoma City were not widely reported in the literature, with the opinion as to the best procedure somewhat divided. McKenna<sup>2</sup> recommended that the board of education appoint the chairman of the planning body. On the other hand,

---

<sup>1</sup>Gibson, op. cit., p. 46.

<sup>2</sup>McKenna, op. cit., p. 117.

Gragg<sup>1</sup> reported that the chairman of the planning body was elected in Ithaca, New York. According to Gibson,<sup>2</sup> "If democracy is to prevail, as recommended prevalently, the chairman would be elected by the planning body." He stated that 84% of the planning bodies in the school systems covered in his survey elected their chairman.

#### Identification of the Functions of the Planning Body

The possibilities for success of any planning or study group is partly dependent upon the careful definition of its functions. The functions of the planning body for the Oklahoma City study were formulated by the resource person following a review of the functions of planning bodies as reported in the literature. The following functions were recommended to the general steering committee, which agreed to accept them at least tentatively:

1. To identify the problem area for each of the three research subcommittees.
2. To stimulate and encourage the subcommittees as they proceed with their appointed tasks.
3. To make the necessary decisions to facilitate and coordinate the work of the subcommittees.
4. To become familiar with the research and experience of other school systems regarding the evaluation of teaching and the provision of merit increments.
5. To develop and recommend to the superintendent and the board of education for their adoption, a plan for evaluating and recognizing superior teachers in the Oklahoma City school system.

---

<sup>1</sup>W. L. Gragg, "A City in New York State Reports Experience with Merit Salary Promotions," American School Board Journal, CXIX (July, 1949), p. 23.

<sup>2</sup>Gibson, op. cit., pp. 44-45.

The general steering committee assigned the following problem areas to the three subcommittees upon the recommendation of the resource person:

1. The identification of criteria to be used in the definition of good teaching.
2. The development of a plan and instrument to quantitatively measure the degree to which the individual teacher meets the criteria identified above.
3. The development of a plan for recognizing the teachers selected by the plan as developed above.

The functions of the three subcommittees were defined by the general steering committee as follows:

1. To become familiar with the research and the experience of other school systems in respect to the particular problem area assigned to that subcommittee.
2. To develop that part of the total plan for which they are responsible and recommend it to the general steering committee.

The functions adopted by the planning body in Oklahoma City were supported by recommendations of authorities as reported in the literature. Gibson<sup>1</sup> found that the functions of the planning bodies had been well defined in the school systems which he surveyed. Approximately 83% of the school systems indicated that the functions had been well defined and were of the opinion that this careful definition had made a significant contribution to the success of their study.

A frequently identified function of the planning

---

<sup>1</sup>Gibson, op. cit., pp. 140-42.

body, recommended by Ball and the New Jersey Education Association,<sup>1</sup> was a study of the experience of other school systems with merit salary programs. McKenna's<sup>2</sup> recommendation was that a study be made of the basic philosophy and principles of a merit salary policy in the light of the local situation. The New York State Citizens Committee for Public Schools recommended that the study should include:

1. What citizens' attitudes are on the subject.
2. What industrialists really feel concerning payment of the same salary to all teachers assigned to the same teaching post in a school.
3. What industry is doing.
4. How parents feel about merit rating of teachers.
5. How teachers are now being judged.<sup>3</sup>

Other functions of the planning body as recommended in the literature included that of developing a plan for the evaluation of teachers and a merit salary schedule. Both the Florida Education Association and McKenna made this recommendation.<sup>4</sup> Gibson<sup>5</sup> found this to be the most

<sup>1</sup>Lester B. Ball, "An Evaluation of a Teacher Merit Rating Salary Schedule in the Public Schools" (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, College of Education, Northwestern University, 1949), p. 201; New Jersey Education Association, op. cit., p. 8.

<sup>2</sup>McKenna, op. cit., p. 115.

<sup>3</sup>Special Committee on Merit Payments, "Teacher Merit and Teacher Salary" (Albany, New York: New York State Teachers Association, 1957), p. 17.

<sup>4</sup>Florida Education Association, op. cit., p. 6; McKenna, op. cit., p. 118.

<sup>5</sup>Gibson, op. cit., p. 147.

prevalent function of the planning bodies in the school systems responding to his survey.

### Summary

A cooperative-group approach to the study and development of a program to identify and provide recognition for the superior teacher was instituted in the Oklahoma City school system during the 1961-62 school year. The groups represented in this effort were the classroom teachers, building principals, and central office personnel.

The organizational structure established for this study included a general steering committee and three subcommittees. Each of these committees included fifteen members of which twelve were classroom teachers. The general steering committee was assigned the responsibility for the development of the total program. In addition, they were to make recommendations on the advisability of implementing the plans for the program. Each of the subcommittees was asked to study a specific problem area and develop a particular segment of the total plan. The identification of the criteria by which the effectiveness of teachers in this school system might be judged was designated as the task of Subcommittee A. The development of a plan to measure the degree to which the individual teacher meets these criteria was the assignment of Subcommittee B. Subcommittee C was asked to develop a plan for the recognition of those teachers identified by the

plan for evaluating teachers recommended by Subcommittee B.

The superintendent arbitrarily selected the individuals to represent the central administrative staff on the planning body. The determination of the specific building principals to serve on this body was made by the superintendent from a list submitted by the local administrators' organization. The selection of the classroom teachers for service on the planning body was also made by the superintendent from a list of persons submitted by the two local teachers' organizations.

The principals assigned to these committees comprising the planning body were selected in such a way that there was representation from both the elementary and secondary schools on each of the committees. The classroom teacher members of the committees were selected as at-large representatives of the total teaching staff of the Oklahoma City school system in respect to the factors of sex, age, experience, marital status, and teaching level.

A chairman for each of the committees was appointed by the superintendent and the committees were assisted in the identification and understanding of their specific functions and responsibilities. The administrative intern was assigned to each of the committees to serve in the capacity of a resource person.

The plans and procedures followed in the establishment of the planning body were developed by the administrative

intern following a review of the literature in this area. Considerable support was found for those plans and procedures employed and reported in this chapter.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE GUIDING PRINCIPLES

An integral part of this study as outlined in the first chapter was the establishment of principles for the development and operation of a program to identify and provide recognition for superior teachers. A commonly accepted definition for a principle is "a statement formulated as a guide to action."<sup>1</sup> A principle is abstracted from the observation of a series of successful activities and techniques. Therefore, a program developed on the basis of guiding principles is more likely to be successful. In this chapter will be explained the procedures followed in the development of the guiding principles. A description of the manner in which they were presented to the committees and their reactions to and use of these principles is also included.

#### Development of the Principles

The purpose in developing the principles connected

---

<sup>1</sup>N. L. George, "A Plan for the Centralized School Service Shops of Oklahoma City, Oklahoma," (unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1947), p. 80.



with this study was to provide a guide for the development and operation of a program to identify and provide recognition for superior teachers. Therefore, the principles were formulated prior to the inception of the program rather than following it. They were not abstracted from the firsthand observation of a series of successful activities and techniques. They were, instead, derived from the reports in the literature regarding the successful activities and techniques of other school systems. Principles such as these have also been formulated by other persons and organizations and published in the literature. The principles reported in this chapter came primarily from these two sources. While they were not entirely new, they formed the ground work upon which it was hoped a successful program to identify and provide recognition for superior teachers would be built.

The first step in the development of the guiding principles for the establishment of the program in Oklahoma City was that of reviewing the literature with the purpose of isolating and identifying common basic principles. The principles were extracted from the recommendations of professional leaders in education, such as Edmund H. Thorne<sup>1</sup>, who have reported in professional textbooks and periodicals; from the reports of criteria developed and used by other

---

<sup>1</sup>Edmund H. Thorne, "Teacher Merit Rating Really Works! Here are Sixteen Tested Requisites," The Nation's Schools, LXIV (November, 1959), 70-72.

school systems, such as Summit, New Jersey<sup>1</sup>; from the reports of various regional and state organizations as for instance that of the Utah State Merit Study Committee<sup>2</sup>; from reports from workshops on merit rating in teachers' salary schedules, such as the one at Syracuse University<sup>3</sup>; from principles promulgated in unpublished doctoral dissertations such as those of Lester B. Ball and John J. McKenna<sup>4</sup>; and finally from reports and pamphlets issued by various national organizations such as the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development or the Development of Classroom Teachers of the National Education Association.<sup>5</sup>

Those principles that were consistently evident in

<sup>1</sup>"A Teacher Merit Pay Plan for the Summit, New Jersey Board of Education," (Board of Education, Summit, New Jersey, 1959). (Mimeographed)

<sup>2</sup>Utah School Merit Study Committee, "Reports and Recommendations Utah School Merit Study," (Salt Lake City: Utah School Merit Study Committee, 1958), pp. 9-10.

<sup>3</sup>Virgil M. Rogers, Merit Rating for Teachers?, A Report on the First Annual Workshop on Merit Rating, (Syracuse: School of Education, Syracuse University, 1958).

<sup>4</sup>Lester B. Ball, "An Evaluation of Teacher Merit Rating Salary Schedules in the Public Schools," (unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, College of Education, Northwestern University, 1948), pp. 102-103; John J. McKenna, "A Merit Salary Policy for a Public School District," (unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, School of Education, New York University, 1959), pp. 25-29.

<sup>5</sup>Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Better Than Rating, (Washington, D. C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1950); Department of Classroom Teachers, Teacher Rating, (Washington, D. C.: Department of Classroom Teachers and the Educational Research Division of the National Education Association, Discussion Pamphlet No. 10, 1954).

the aforementioned sources and which seemed to be most appropriate for use in large school systems were identified. The completed set of principles was the result of considerable revision and organization of previously reported materials and represents a synthesis of the material reported in the literature.

In an effort to further validate and refine these principles, they were submitted to a jury of experts in the field of teacher evaluation and merit salary schedule development. The jury consisted of eight persons of which four were superintendents in school districts with similar programs already in operation. Those superintendents were: W. L. Gragg, Ithaca, New York; Ivan C. Nicholas, Ladue, Missouri; Edmund H. Thorne, West Hartford, Connecticut; and Russell W. Wiley, Sarasota County, Florida. The jury included two professors of education, Robert C. Gibson of Radford College and David V. Tiedeman of Harvard Graduate School of Education, each of whom have published important reports on teacher evaluation and merit pay. Dean Virgil M. Rogers, Dean of the School of Education at Syracuse University, also served on the jury. Dean Rogers has conducted annual workshops on merit rating in teachers' salary schedules which have made a significant contribution to the exploration of the problems centering around the issue of merit rating as they relate to salary schedules and teacher evaluation. Gale W. Rose, former director of the Utah School

Merit Committee, was the eighth member of the jury.

With but three exceptions, the principles were considered to be valid by an overwhelming majority of jurors. The three principles about which some question seemed to exist in the mind of the jurors were revised to eliminate their objectionable features. Certain other changes were also made as the result of the constructive criticism of this jury. The list of principles presented below include the revisions made as the result of suggestions by the jury of experts:

#### Developmental Principles

1. The professional staff should be conditioned for the initiation of the study.

2. The program should grow out of a cooperative study by a representative group of teachers and administrators.

3. The program must be acceptable to a majority of those involved.

4. The program should be based on locally felt needs and should be adapted to local conditions.

5. The purpose of the program should be the improvement of instruction with the emphasis on helping staff members to improve and develop their effectiveness.

6. The objectives, philosophy, and problems of the program should be clearly understood by the whole professional staff.

7. The procedures and approaches undertaken in the study should be seriously considered as they will significantly affect the results.

8. The study should be comprehensive and not conducted under the pressure of time.

9. A recommendation for the adoption of a specific program should come after the planning group has reached a fair degree of agreement as to the content of the program.

10. The program should be continuously evaluated and periodically revised in the light of the evaluations.

#### Operational Principles

##### I. The Evaluation Program

1. The evaluation should be based on a set of criteria for teaching effectiveness which is known and accepted by the staff as well as a plan for making its implementation possible.

2. The evaluation, although necessarily subjective, should be based on the collection of as much objective evidence as possible.

3. The evaluation should take into account variations in teaching situations.

4. The evaluation should identify both the teachers' weaknesses and strengths and should aim at eliminating the weaknesses while developing and improving performance on the basis of the staff members' strengths.

5. The evaluation should encourage creativity and a willingness to try new methods, ideas, and techniques.

6. Self-evaluation on the part of the staff member should be encouraged.

7. The evaluation should be made by trained professional personnel which necessitates the provision of sufficient staff.

8. There should be adequate opportunity for observation of the staff members who are to be evaluated.

9. More than one person should be involved in the evaluation of each staff member where possible.

10. An evaluation should be made of each school staff member regularly although not necessarily each year.

11. Each staff member should be informed of the results of his evaluation.

12. There should be an appeals procedure for staff members who feel that their evaluation does them an injustice.

## II. The Recognition Program

1. A base salary schedule which is competitive with those of other school districts in the vicinity should be provided before a program is attempted.

2. The school board should know that such a program will increase the operating costs of the school district and enough funds should be available to pay for the awards to all staff members who qualify.

3. Superior service should be but one of several factors considered in determining the yearly salary of staff members who qualify.

4. The recognition given for superior service should be worth striving for and commensurate with the value placed upon the service.

5. Continued incompetence or ineffective service should be penalized by dismissal.

6. The initial evaluation and recommendation for the superior service recognition should be made in the individual building but the final evaluation and recommendation should be made on a system-wide basis.

7. The recognition should extend for only a specified period before a re-evaluation of the staff members' work is made.

8. The superior service recognition and the penalties for ineffective service should be based on the results of the evaluation process and not on percentage quotas.

9. The superior service recognition should be available to all staff members who have passed the probationary status.

10. A staff member should not be required to accept the superior service recognition.

11. A staff member should be able to appeal a negative recommendation for superior service recognition.

### Presentation of the Principles to the Planning Body

The revised set of guiding principles was presented to the general steering committee of the planning body for the Oklahoma City study at their meeting on January 4, 1962. The purpose of the principles, as explained by the resource person, was to serve as an aid and a guide in the development of a program to identify and provide recognition for the superior teacher. The procedure followed in the development of these principles was also reviewed. It was suggested to the members of the committee that these principles could be accepted in their entirety by the group, revised to conform more closely to their ideas, or rejected completely.

### Reaction of the Committees to the Principles

The committee discussed the various principles and asked for interpretations of and the reasoning behind some of them. They decided to assume jurisdiction for the adoption of the developmental principles but delegated the consideration of the operational principles to the two subcommittees responsible for the development of the evaluation and recognition programs. Therefore, those principles concerned with the evaluation program were assigned to Subcommittee B and those principles concerned with the provision of recognition for the superior teacher were assigned to Subcommittee C. The general steering committee adopted the developmental principles without



change.

Subcommittee B reviewed each of the twelve principles dealing with the evaluation program. They made slight revisions in four of the twelve principles. The principles adopted by the committee were:

1. The evaluation should be based on a set of criteria for teaching effectiveness which is known and accepted by the staff as well as a plan for making its implementation possible.

2. The evaluation, although necessarily subjective, should be based on the collection of as much objective evidence as possible.

3. The evaluation should take into account variations in teaching situations.

4. The evaluation should identify both the teacher's weaknesses and strengths and should aim at eliminating the weaknesses while developing and improving performance on the basis of the staff member's strengths.

5. The evaluation should encourage creativity and a willingness to try new methods, ideas, and techniques.

6. Self-evaluation on the part of the staff member should be encouraged.

7. The evaluation should be made only by trained professional personnel which necessitates the provision of sufficient staff.

8. There should be adequate opportunity for

observation of the staff members who are to be evaluated with at least one evaluation by a person with classroom teacher experience in a like field.

9. More than one person should be involved in the evaluation of each staff member.

10. An evaluation should be made of each school staff member regularly although not necessarily each year.

11. Each staff member should receive a copy of the results of his evaluation.

12. There should be an appeals procedure for staff members who feel that their evaluation does them an injustice.

Subcommittee C reviewed the eleven principles related to the recognition program. Three of the principles were revised by this committee. The principles adopted by this group were:

1. A base salary schedule which is comparable with those of other high-paying school districts in this and neighboring states should be provided before a program is attempted.

2. The school board and community must know that such a program will increase the operating costs of the school district and enough funds should be available to pay for the awards to all staff members who qualify.

3. Superior service should be but one of several factors considered in determining the yearly salary of

staff members who qualify.

4. The recognition given for the superior service should be worth striving for and commensurate with the value placed upon the service.

5. Continued incompetence or ineffective service should be penalized by dismissal.

6. The initial evaluation and recommendation for the superior service recognition should be made in the individual building but the final evaluation and recommendation should be made on a system-wide basis.

7. The recognition once given should extend from year to year.

8. The superior service recognition and the penalties for ineffective service should be based on the results of the evaluation process and not on percentage quotas.

9. The superior service recognition should be available to all staff members who have passed the probationary status.

10. A staff member should not be required to accept the superior service recognition.

11. A staff member who feels that he should have been recommended for superior service recognition may appeal.

Utilization of the Principles

These principles were used by the committees primarily as guidelines for the development of the particular aspect of the program assigned to the committee. The final report of the subcommittees to the general steering committee and the report of the general steering committee to the superintendent and the board of education included a copy of this list of guiding principles.

## CHAPTER V

### THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CRITERIA OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

#### Introduction

After long study the Utah Merit Study Committee reported that:

. . . it is unrealistic for a district to attempt to say anything truthful and helpful about a teacher's work unless a set of functional criteria has been accepted and is understood by the personnel.<sup>1</sup>

No one can make a decision as to how well a particular teacher performs without defining, in some way, what the teacher's job is. In searching for the criteria of teacher effectiveness an attempt is being made to define the term. Flanagan clearly expressed the equivalence of a criterion and a definition of an activity:

It is impossible to study the requirements for success in an activity without defining the activity. A complete definition of what is meant by success in the activity is practically identical with a statement of

---

<sup>1</sup>Gale Rose, "Preparation Unlocks the Door to Successful Merit Rating," The Nation's Schools, LXIV (October, 1959), p. 51.

the procedure for obtaining a criterion.<sup>1</sup>

In the study of teaching ability great use has been made of strictly empirical and statistical procedures. Despite this fact, it must be recognized that the ultimate conception of the effective teacher is neither an empirical nor a statistical matter. There is no way to discover the characteristics which distinguish effective and ineffective teachers unless one has made or is prepared to make a value judgment. To quote Scates:

The particular statements of what constitutes a good teacher in any particular locality are in the nature of policy statements emphasizing those qualities which are deemed to be acceptable to the person or group whose thinking has dominant force, whether it be the school board, the administrator, the faculty, or local citizens. The ideal concept thus becomes one of fitting into the situation without too much sacrifice of one's own educational convictions.<sup>2</sup>

Or as Rabinowitz and Travers stated it:

A criterion is first and foremost a matter of decision. Effectiveness as an attribute does not inhere in teaching but is imposed upon it from without. Imposition, in this context, is neither necessarily offensive nor arbitrary. It merely signifies that in the final analysis a criterion rests upon consensus. There is no higher authority to which one can appeal nor is there any way to escape the judgmental origin of the criterion.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>William Rabinowitz and Robert M. W. Travers, "Problems of Defining and Assessing Teacher Effectiveness," Educational Theory, III (July, 1953), p. 213, quoting J. C. Flanagan, "Personnel Psychology," Current Trends in Psychology, University of Pittsburg Press, 1947.

<sup>2</sup>D.E. Scates, "The Good Teacher: Establishing Criteria for Identification," Journal of Teacher Education, I (June, 1950), pp. 137-41.

<sup>3</sup>Rabinowitz and Travers, op. cit., p. 214.

Thus, the criterion problem is largely definitional in nature. If teaching effectiveness can be satisfactorily defined, the needed criteria will be produced. The definition of teaching competence evolves from value judgments and the definition will vary from community to community just as the values of these communities vary. Teaching effectiveness is whatever the local people think it to be. Therefore, teaching effectiveness can only be assessed by reference to local definitions of teaching effectiveness.

Subcommittee A was assigned the problem of developing the definition of good teaching, or the criteria of teaching effectiveness, for the Oklahoma City School System. The assumption was made that the procedures followed in the selection of members for this subcommittee and the procedures followed by the group would tend to make the definition developed acceptable to the instructional and administrative staffs of the Oklahoma City School System.

#### Organization of the Subcommittee

The membership of this subcommittee included nine persons representing the elementary level of which two were elementary school principals, and six persons representing the secondary level of which one was a high school principal and another a high school counselor. These persons were serving in different schools in the system with the exception of two of the elementary teacher

members. The membership of this subcommittee included nine women and six men. The age and experience of these persons was well distributed along an age-experience continuum as previously shown in Chapter III.

Thirteen meetings were held by this subcommittee with an average attendance of twelve persons. Most of the members were present at every meeting while one of the members was seldom present. The meetings were held at ten to fourteen day intervals prior to the Christmas vacation period. Beginning the first of January, the meetings were held almost weekly until the final report of the subcommittee was completed. These meetings, each of approximately two hours duration, were held in a conference room in the Administration Building beginning at 4 p.m. During the month of January, two all-day meetings were held on consecutive Saturdays. An additional all-day meeting was scheduled for March 2, 1962. Substitute teachers were provided for the teacher members of the subcommittee on that day.

#### Chronological Description of the Subcommittee's Work

The first several meetings of Subcommittee A were primarily concerned with the isolation and definition of its purpose and functions. At first, some difficulty was experienced by the members in confining thought and discussion to the particular purpose and functions of this subcommittee. It was necessary for the chairman and the resource person to



frequently remind the group of their special problem and functions. Another purpose of the beginning meetings of this subcommittee was to allow the members to discuss the reactions of their fellow teachers to the announcement of the study. This procedure was thought to be a necessary prerequisite to the later progress of the subcommittee. A further purpose of the first meeting was to explain the plan for the distribution of study materials collected by the resource person. This plan consisted of providing each member of the subcommittee with several different articles or studies concerning the problem area of the subcommittee. Each piece of material was numbered and had a paper listing the names of the subcommittee members attached. When finished with a specific article or study, each subcommittee member was instructed to send it to the next person on the attached list of names. This plan provided the members of the subcommittee with access to a great deal of material of which only one copy was available. The first major decision to be made by this subcommittee was the selection of an approach to criterion development for the evaluation of teaching. The special committee on the Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness of the American Educational Research Association defined criterion as "a standard against which a measurement is made in estimating

the validity of the measurement."<sup>1</sup> This committee also suggested that there were three related aspects or criterion dimensions to identifying effectiveness in teaching. These three were: the personal traits of the teacher, the professional performance of the teacher, and the effects the teacher has on pupils and others in the school.

The effects the teacher has on the pupils were listed as an ultimate criterion by this special committee because of its closeness to the ultimate purpose of education. However, this criterion, commonly called the pupil-growth criterion, was not selected for use by Subcommittee A because of the difficulties in isolating the influence of the individual teacher and of precisely measuring the growth of the pupil in areas such as attitudes and behavior. McCall developed a method of measuring pupil-growth in the study he directed in North Carolina but reported that "the time, trouble, and expense involved make the systematic use of such a method unwise."<sup>2</sup>

Unable to use the ultimate criterion, pupil-growth, the subcommittee turned its attention to the proximate criteria: the personal traits and the observable behavior

---

<sup>1</sup>H. H. Remmers and others, "Report of the Committee on the Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness," Review of Educational Research, XXII (June, 1952), p. 242.

<sup>2</sup>William A. McCall, "Measurement of Teacher Merit," Publication No. 284, (Raleigh: North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, 1952), p. 36.

characteristics of the teacher. The adoption of several basic assumptions was necessary in order to utilize these proximate criteria. They were:

1. Effectiveness in the proximate criteria will be reflected in the ultimate criteria.
2. Highly effective teachers will utilize observably different behavior patterns in their classrooms and in their association with other teachers in their school than will less effective teachers.
3. A valid and reliable judgment concerning a teacher's behavior can be made by individuals closely associated with the teacher and his work.

The subcommittee did not make extensive use of teacher traits and characteristics in the criterion development. This was because the research findings such as reported by Howsam were not encouraging, the traits and characteristics of teachers were not always easily observed, and they were not closely related to the ultimate criterion.<sup>1</sup> The behavior of teachers or teacher performance was selected as the primary criterion to be utilized in the Oklahoma City School System. This seemed to be the approach most commonly used in the development of criteria in other cities as determined from the materials secured from those

---

<sup>1</sup>Robert B. Howsam, Who's A Good Teacher? (Burlingame: Joint Committee on Personnel Procedures, California School Boards Association and the California Teachers Association, 1960), p. 17.

cities by the resource person. In addition, this approach was recommended by many authorities such as Howsam<sup>1</sup> and Rose<sup>2</sup>.

The next major step to be taken by this subcommittee was the selection of the major areas or categories which seemed to be the most important in describing teacher competence or performance. This task was assigned by the subcommittee to a small group consisting of the chairman and three of the members. This group reviewed several kinds of materials before attempting to select these categories. They were:

1. The recommendations of persons such as Carl Peterson<sup>3</sup> and John J. McKenna<sup>4</sup>. Peterson had considerable experience as a superintendent of schools and McKenna had recently completed a doctoral dissertation on the development of a merit policy.

2. The recommendations of such persons as J. R. Shannon who suggested ten categories following interviews with one hundred and sixty four public school administrators

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid.

<sup>2</sup>Gale Rose, "Toward the Evaluation of Teaching," Educational Leadership, XV (January, 1958), p. 231.

<sup>3</sup>Carl Peterson, "Seven Keys to Evaluating Teacher Competence," American School Board Journal, CXXXVI (May, 1958), pp. 34-46.

<sup>4</sup>John J. McKenna, "A Merit Salary Policy for a Public School District," (unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, School of Education, New York University, 1959), p. 122.

concerning their best and their worst teachers.<sup>1</sup>

3. The criteria used in cities throughout the country as reported by Karam and Dade County, Florida Public Schools.<sup>2</sup>

4. The criteria developed in a number of cities and secured directly from those cities.

The major areas or categories chosen by this small group following their study of the assembled material were:

1. Classroom performance
2. Classroom environment
3. Contribution to the total school program
4. Personal factors
5. Professional growth and development

The recommendations of the small group were accepted by the subcommittee and they began working towards the identification and definition of the major aspects of functions of each of these categories and the criteria which specify the most important and critical dimensions of those aspects or functions.

The bulk of the developmental work on the criteria took place at the two Saturday meetings in January.

---

<sup>1</sup>J. R. Shannon, "Elements of Excellence in Teaching," *Educational Administration*, XXII (March, 1941), pp. 168-176.

<sup>2</sup>Irvin A. Karam, "Merit Rating Salary Plans in Public Schools Systems of the United States, 1955-56," *Journal of Educational Research*, LII (December, 1959), 144-148; Letter from Jack Prance, Personnel Director, Dade County School System, Dade County, Florida, December 11, 1961.

Resource material, such as referred to above, was used to provide the members with specific suggestions for criteria and as a check on the scope and breadth of the material developed. The decisions as to which of the criteria should be included in the document and the wording of the specific statements were the result of the consensus of the persons present at those meetings. While use was made of criteria developed previously by other groups and school systems, the value judgments of the subcommittee members as to what constitutes good teaching were interwoven into the framework of the document and made it the unique creation of this subcommittee.

Standards were developed by the group for judging each criterion suggested in the subcommittee sessions.

They were:

1. It is clearly defined.
2. It is observable at least to a degree.
3. All teachers can achieve it to a degree.
4. It falls within the generally accepted objectives of education.

The necessity of producing a definition of good teaching which could be applied to all teaching positions in the system regardless of teaching level or subject matter field dictated the inclusion of the second and third standards.

The product of the subcommittee's work at these

two meetings was then revised by the resource person to provide for an improved plan of enumeration, organization, and consistency in the wording of the various criteria. The subcommittee then approved and accepted the revised statement of criteria.

The next phase of the work of this subcommittee involved an attempt to list some observable evidences of each of the criteria developed. The committee eventually decided, after experiencing some difficulty, that this was not a legitimate task for this particular committee to undertake.

After the committee as a group expressed its approval of the criteria which it had developed, it decided to submit them to the faculties of the committee members for comment and constructive criticism. The criteria for the evaluation of teaching were submitted to the faculties of eight elementary schools and six secondary schools. The combined faculties of these schools was in excess of six hundred teachers.

A very favorable reception of these criteria by the faculties of these schools was reported by the subcommittee members. There were some criticisms, however, and recommendations for specific changes in wording.

The subcommittee met on Friday, March 2, 1962 to revise the criteria according to the suggestions received from the faculties of the selected schools. While there

were some deletions and additions made at this meeting, the main effort of the group was directed at the rephrasing of the statements already present in the document.

The subcommittee, at the meeting on March 12, 1962, voted unanimously to submit the criteria<sup>1</sup> in their present form to the general steering committee. They were included in a final report by Subcommittee A which was presented to the general steering committee on March 26, 1962. The report described the procedure followed in the development of the criteria and called the attention to the following three areas of concern:

1. The committee does not recommend that the five areas be weighted equally in the evaluation instrument or that the dimensions under the subheadings be assigned specific weights.

2. There is necessarily a philosophy of education implied in the statement of criteria; the members of the committee hope that the implied philosophy is compatible with the locally accepted philosophies of education.

3. The committee recommends that the evaluator should be aware of the problems and differences with the school and locale; familiar with the teaching field being taught; and some cognizance of the development and growth patterns of the pupils being taught.

---

<sup>1</sup>See Appendix A.



The general steering committee accepted the report as well as the criteria for the evaluation of teaching which was submitted by Subcommittee A. They instructed Subcommittee B to proceed with the development of instruments and procedures for measuring the degree to which the individual teacher conforms to these criteria.

## CHAPTER VI

### THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN EVALUATION PROGRAM

#### Introduction

Because teachers have always been evaluated, it has always been known that teachers differ widely both in ability and in actual accomplishment. A. S. Barr said:

Some would like to escape evaluation. This is not, however, very likely. It would seem that teachers have always been evaluated; they are now evaluated, and they will continue to be evaluated as long as they are teachers. The problem is how to bring these evaluations in the open and to improve their accuracy.<sup>1</sup>

Stoops and Rafferty, in their new textbook on school administration, expressed a similar idea. They stated:

All teachers are rated. They will be rated by their students and by the parents of the community, whether they like it or not, and regardless of whether there is a formal rating system utilized by the school district which employes them.<sup>2</sup>

Howsam recognized the complexity of the teaching act and the admitted inadequacies of the evaluation methods and

---

<sup>1</sup>A. S. Barr and Others, Wisconsin Studies of the Measurement and Prediction of Teacher Effectiveness, (Madison: Dembar Publications, Inc., 1961), p. 150.

<sup>2</sup>Emery Stoops and M. L. Rafferty, Practices and Trends in School Administration, (New York: Ginn and Company, 1961), p. 424.

instruments developed so far. Yet he still believed that the evaluation of teachers was a practical necessity. He said:

. . . you can never tell where the teacher's influence starts or whence it goes, what its value is, or whether the influence of one teacher is as great as that of another. For none has yet succeeded in demonstrating what good teaching is or who does it.

Yet the practical problem of administering schools remains. It little profits to say that we do not know what good teaching is or that we cannot tell which of the teachers are better or poorer than others. We have to know. For practical decisions have to be made, and these decisions are dependent upon ideas about teaching quality. . . . Teachers have to be employed, assigned, transferred, given or refused tenure, promoted or dismissed.<sup>1</sup>

Some would argue that the assessment of the effectiveness of teachers should be postponed until after an accurate and objective plan has been devised. In opposition to this argument, McCall suggested:

It is important to bear in mind that there is no absolute certainty anywhere in human affairs. He who advises inaction until certainty has been achieved will never act on anything. The moral obligation rests upon us all to act in the way which available evidence indicates is more probably true than any other proposed behavior.<sup>2</sup>

If the evaluation of teaching effectiveness is inevitable, as these authorities have agreed it is, the problem in the Oklahoma City School System was not whether

---

<sup>1</sup>Robert B. Howsam, *Who's A Good Teacher?*, (Burlington: California Teachers Association and the California School Boards Association, 1960), p. 5.

<sup>2</sup>William A. McCall, *Measurement of Teacher Merit*, (Raleigh: North Carolina State Superintendent of Instruction, 1952), p. 33.

we would or would not evaluate the effectiveness of teaching but how we would evaluate it. As Stoops and Rafferty stated it:

It is apparent that, since teachers are inevitably rated in one way or another, it would be best to accomplish this through some agreed upon and logically defensible method of evaluation.<sup>1</sup>

Heretofore, the assessment of the effectiveness of the teachers in the Oklahoma City School System has been based upon the general impression and intuitive judgment of the building principals. However, the Superintendent of Schools felt an acute need for a more accurate evaluation than this general impression method could supply. Therefore, he proposed that a committee representative of the teaching staff be appointed to work on the problem of developing a means for identifying the clearly superior and the definitely ineffective teachers. The two basic components of this problem were: (1) what to measure, and (2) how to measure. The first of these components was assigned to Subcommittee A whose work was reported in the previous chapter. Developing the means for the actual measurement of teaching effectiveness was delegated to Subcommittee B and is reported in this chapter.

#### Organization of the Subcommittee

The membership of this subcommittee included eight

---

<sup>1</sup>Stoops and Rafferty, op. cit., p. 424.

women and seven men. The age and experience of these persons was distributed along an age-experience continuum as shown in Chapter III. A secondary school principal served as chairman of the group. There were ten persons representing the elementary teaching level, two of whom were building principals and one an elementary supervisor. There were five representatives of the secondary level, one of whom was a building principal and another a counselor.

Subcommittee B held twenty meetings with an average attendance of twelve persons. The actual attendance varied from seven to fifteen persons. Three of the meetings were scheduled before the Christmas vacation period and the rest were held from January until the middle of May, at intervals of approximately one week to ten days. The meetings were held in a conference room of the Administration Building beginning at four o'clock in the afternoon. The development of specific documents, a purpose of the committee which could not be efficiently accomplished in the short amount of time available at the afternoon meetings, was done at two meetings scheduled for a full day. Substitutes were provided for the teacher members of the group on these days.

#### Chronological Description of the Subcommittee's Work

There were four major objectives of the first

meeting of the subcommittee. They were:

1. To provide an opportunity for the members to become acquainted.
2. To discuss teacher reaction to the announcement of the study.
3. To orient the members of the group to their specific functions and goals.
4. To explain the system devised for the distribution of study materials to the subcommittee members.

The Superintendent was present to explain the need for the study and the purpose of it. Most of the discussion at the first meeting centered around the reactions of teachers to the announcement of the study. The purpose and functions of the subcommittee were also discussed, and the resource person explained the plan for the distribution of the study materials. This plan consisted of providing each member of the subcommittee with several different articles or studies. Each piece of this material was numbered and had a paper listing the subcommittee members' names, attached to it. When finished with a specific article or study, each subcommittee member was instructed to send it to the next person on the attached list of names.

The discussion at the second meeting of the subcommittee once again centered around the purposes and functions of the subcommittee and the reactions of teachers to the announcement of the study. The purposes of teacher

evaluation were discussed, with the group accepting the following purposes:

1. To improve the quality of instruction,
2. To help plan in-service programs,
3. To motivate teachers toward self-improvement,
4. To provide a basis for administrative decisions about personnel.

Identifying the procedures to be followed by the subcommittee in attempting to achieve its objectives was the purpose of the next meeting. Selecting the method of evaluation was considered to be the logical place to begin work on the development of a teacher evaluation program. The chairman suggested that the group might find it expedient to adopt some principles to guide them in the development of this program. Thirteen principles were submitted for their consideration, and action on the adoption of these principles was delayed to allow the subcommittee members additional time for study. At the next meeting, after some discussion and revision, the principles were adopted by the subcommittee. The revisions made in these principles were reported in Chapter III.

Following the adoption of these guiding principles for developing a teacher evaluation program, the subcommittee considered the procedure to be followed in developing an evaluation program. It became apparent that developing the mechanics of the program would have to precede the

development of any instruments. John McKenna attested to the correctness of this decision when he wrote, "the major point about which any merit plan must orbit would be the mechanics of evaluation."<sup>1</sup>

At the next meeting, the subcommittee began to make the basic decisions necessary to the development of the mechanics of a teaching evaluation program. First, a distinction was made between observing and evaluating. Each of these words was defined explicitly to eliminate the confusion caused by the tendency of some subcommittee members to use them interchangeably. The following definitions were accepted:

Observing - refers to the act of collecting information regarding the observable behaviors and characteristics of the teacher.

Evaluating - refers to the process of arriving at a judgment based on collected evidence regarding the effectiveness of the teacher. As the subcommittee members reviewed articles and studies appearing in the literature, such as the one promulgated by the New England School Development Council,<sup>2</sup> the members of the subcommittee were led to

---

<sup>1</sup>John J. McKenna, "A Merit Salary Policy for a Public School District," (unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, School of Education, New York University, 1959), p. 48.

<sup>2</sup>New England School Development Council, Teacher Competence and Its Relation to Salary, (Cambridge: New England School Development Council, 1956), p. 91.



believe that these two functions could not be effectively performed simultaneously. In their estimation, a better procedure called for the collection of the evidence by observations made throughout the year and the evaluation reserved until all evidence was accumulated at the end of the school year. A second basic decision made at this meeting concerned the number of persons who should be involved in the observation of teachers. It was decided that not less than two and preferably three persons should observe each teacher being evaluated. The consensus of opinion among the subcommittee members was that the principal, the supervisor, and the assistant principal in those schools where such a position existed, should be the persons designated to observe and record the classroom behavior and personal characteristics of the teacher. It was decided that a teacher could be observed a maximum of nine times and made it mandatory that at least six observations be made. Although no specific rule was made on this matter, the subcommittee members tended to believe that the observations of the teacher should be made independently by the observers. The subcommittee members were cognizant of certain advantages to having more than one observer present in the classroom at the same time, but they felt such a procedure severely limited the possibility of observing the whole spectrum of the teacher's behavior. Since the observing and evaluating most commonly have taken place

simultaneously, it was difficult for the subcommittee to secure guidance and support from the writings in the literature in regard to making decisions on observations and observers. Gale Rose<sup>1</sup> reported research indicating that the total repertoire of a teacher's functional behavior may be exhibited within 120 minutes when a proper sample of teaching is obtained. The subcommittee members established a time requirement for observing each teacher more than the 120 minutes indicated as necessary to see the total range of a teacher's functional behavior.

At the following meeting, the subcommittee attempted to identify those persons who should act as evaluators. Most of the recommendations found in the literature indicated that more than one person should evaluate each teacher. For instance, Howsam said:

More than one person should rate each teacher; such ratings should be done independently. Validity may be improved by averaging the ratings of several persons.<sup>2</sup>

The reports of current practices by school systems employing merit rating also suggest that more than one person should evaluate each teacher. The Research Division of the National Education Association<sup>3</sup> found that one-third of the school

---

<sup>1</sup>Gale Rose, Some Assertions About Teaching and Administration, A Report to the Advanced Administrative Institute, Cambridge, Massachusetts, July, 1961, p. 4.

<sup>2</sup>Howsam, op. cit., p. 44.

<sup>3</sup>National Education Association, Quality-of-Service Provisions in Salary Schedules, 1958-59, A Report Prepared by the Research Division (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1959), p. 23.

systems employing merit rating were using only one evaluator, while the other two-thirds of these school systems were utilizing two evaluators. Despite these findings stating otherwise, the subcommittee recommended that only one evaluator be involved in the evaluation program being developed. The two major reasons for this decision were: (1) the recommendation of Lloyd P. Young<sup>1</sup> that only one person should be responsible for the final evaluation of a teacher, and (2) the difficulty, when involved in a large school system of this size, in locating qualified professional personnel who were sufficiently acquainted with the work of the teacher both in and out of the classroom.

The individual designated by the subcommittee to serve as the evaluator was the building principal. He seemed to be the logical choice for this assignment since the major responsibility for the instructional program of the individual school rests with him. It was decided that he was possibly the only person with adequate knowledge of all aspects of the teacher's work. The subcommittee members were not adverse to this principal consulting with other persons such as supervisors or an assistant principal in regard to the quality of the teacher's services, but firmly believed that only he should make the final decision.

---

<sup>1</sup>Lloyd P. Young, The Administration of Merit-Type Teachers' Salary Schedules, (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1933).

The reports of current practices such as the one promulgated by the Research Division of the National Education Association<sup>1</sup> indicated that the principal was the person most commonly serving as evaluator of teachers. Authorities writing in the literature most often recommended the school principal as the best evaluator. One of these authorities, T. L. Patrick, indicated:

The logical person to make such an evaluation for the teacher would be the local school principal. System-wide supervisors have valuable functions but they cannot know and work individually with each teacher in the system as well as the principal of the individual school.<sup>2</sup>

While supervisors were considered for the role of evaluator, it was decided that their use in this role was not wise for several reasons. The supervisor has some opportunity to become acquainted with the classroom instructional role of the teacher but is often ill-informed as to the performance of the teacher in his other roles as defined in the criteria developed by Subcommittee A. Also, it was feared that the use of supervisors as evaluators might interfere with their other functions such as serving as an aide to the teacher who is experiencing teaching difficulty. Although the utilization of parents and pupils as teacher evaluators was mentioned in subcommittee discussion, it was never seriously considered by this group.

---

<sup>1</sup>National Education Association, op.cit., p. 23.

<sup>2</sup>T. L. Patrick, "The Importance of Evaluating the Work of the Individual Teacher," Educational Administration and Supervision, XLII (January, 1956), p. 7.

The next major decision of the subcommittee regarding the mechanics of the evaluation program was concerned with provisions for reviewing the principal's evaluation, when requested by the affected teacher. Such a procedure was recommended by many authorities in the sources which were reviewed by the members of the subcommittee. The Florida Education Association<sup>1</sup> was one of these. The establishment of procedures providing for this review was also specified in one of the guiding principles adopted earlier by the subcommittee. The responsibility for making this review was delegated to an Appeals Board composed of the Director of Personnel, designated as the chairman and only permanent member of this board, and six other members. The identity of these six members was dependent upon the teaching level of the individual teacher, and included the Director of Education for the appropriate teaching level, a supervisor, a principal, and three teachers. The latter five members were to be selected by the affected teacher, through lot drawing from a pool of teachers' and administrators' names. This pool consisted of at least one teacher from each building in the school system, and an additional teacher for every fifteen teachers in the building. Each of these teachers must have had five years of teaching

---

<sup>1</sup>Florida Education Association, Guideposts for Developing Career Increment Programs for Florida's Teachers, (Tallahassee: Florida Education Association, 1958), p. 10.

experience. The affected teacher was given the privilege of choosing one of the teacher-members for this board from his own building, if he and the principal could agree on the person to be selected. The Board of Education was named as the final and ultimate source of appeal available to the teacher.

The next major item considered by the subcommittee was the frequency with which the evaluations were to be made. A frequent recommendation found in the literature was that the evaluation be a yearly occurrence. Coen<sup>1</sup> reported that all school districts responding to his query indicated their permanent staff members were evaluated once each year. However, Barr differed from the majority of the authorities when he stated that:

The evaluation of a teacher's effectiveness, when properly done, is a time consuming activity, and when made with due regard to its complexity may better be done not annually, as now pursued, but merely from time to time as the need arises . . .<sup>2</sup>

The workload of the principal was a potent factor to be considered in making a decision as to the frequency of the evaluations. The members of the subcommittee believed the large number of teachers in many schools in the system made it impossible for the principal to evaluate each teacher every year as recommended by most authorities. However,

---

<sup>1</sup>Alvin W. Coen, "An Analysis of Successful Merit Rating Programs," Phi Delta Kappan, XXXIX (June, 1958), pp. 394-397.

<sup>2</sup>Barr, op. cit., p. 151.

the annual evaluation of each probationary teacher was considered to be an absolute necessity. In an effort to lighten the load of the principal, the subcommittee decided to provide for the evaluation of the non-probationary teacher once each three years.

The procedure to be followed in dealing with the teacher who had been judged as ineffective was the next matter to concern the subcommittee. The consensus was that they could not devise a set of rules that could apply to every case. Rather, they indicated that any decision as to the action to be followed should be made on an individual basis by the administrative officials directly concerned.

Another step taken by the subcommittee was the selection of specific dates to serve as deadlines for completion of the different phases of the evaluation program. They decided that the teachers should be notified of their forthcoming evaluation by November 15, and the evaluations should be completed and reported to the Personnel Office by March 1. The Director of Personnel was consulted by the subcommittee for help in choosing these deadlines.

At this point in the subcommittee meetings, first mention of injecting teacher self-evaluation into the evaluation program was made. This idea was suggested by a subcommittee member who had seen a description of the

teacher evaluation program used by the school system in Cincinnati, Ohio, and the members of the group were interested in both the concept and the instrument used in that school system for teacher self-evaluation. At the following meeting, further discussion of the idea of utilizing self-evaluation was held, and the decision was made to include self-evaluation as an integral part of the evaluation program being developed by the subcommittee. This decision was supported by many recommendations found in the literature, such as that by Howsam<sup>1</sup>, and by the guiding principles adopted previously by the subcommittee.

The next matter of significance considered by the subcommittee was that a cumulative folder for each teacher be adapted for the storage of evidence collected regarding the effectiveness of the teacher. The use of cumulative record folders was advocated by Elsbree and Reutter,<sup>2</sup> the New England School Development Council,<sup>3</sup> and Reavis and Cooper.<sup>4</sup> The subcommittee recommended that these folders should be maintained by the principal and kept in his

---

<sup>1</sup>Howsam, op. cit., p. 43.

<sup>2</sup>Willard Elsbree and Edmund Reutter, Principles of Staff Personnel Administration in Public Schools, (New York: Bureau of Publications, Columbia University, 1959), p. 46.

<sup>3</sup>New England School Development Council, op. cit., p. 102.

<sup>4</sup>William C. Reavis and Dan H. Cooper, Evaluation of Teacher Merit in City School Systems, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945).



office. The following types of evidence were suggested for placement in this folder:

1. Transcripts
2. Classroom observation records
3. Self-evaluation forms
4. A list of suggestions for improvement of the teacher's performance
5. Records and results of teacher-principal conferences
6. Anecdotal records

The final action of the subcommittee with respect to the mechanics of the evaluation program, was to review the decisions which had been made previously and to put the mechanics into written form. Between January 11, 1962, and March 1, 1962, a total of five meetings were consumed in the development of these mechanics. The conclusion of this phase of the work for Subcommittee B was timed to coincide with the conclusion of the development of the criteria by Subcommittee A. This made it possible for Subcommittee B to proceed with the development of the various forms and instruments to be used in the evaluation program.

The first action taken by Subcommittee B in this phase of its work was to reorganize the criteria developed by Subcommittee A, because they preferred a different order for listing these criteria. These criteria were then

inserted into a form<sup>1</sup> which was adapted from an evaluation instrument developed by the Cincinnati School System which was designed to be used by the teacher for self-evaluation purposes, and by the principal to identify the strongest and weakest areas of competence of the teacher.

The next major project to be undertaken by this subcommittee was the development of an observation instrument<sup>2</sup> to be used in collecting evidence of the effectiveness of the teacher in the classroom. It was recognized that expert technical assistance was needed at this point. This assistance was secured in the person of Paschal Twyman, Assistant Professor at Oklahoma State University. Twyman, whose specialty is research methods, served as the consultant to the subcommittee for the next two months.

Until this time, all meetings of this subcommittee had been held at the end of the school day for a period of one to two hours. However, it soon became apparent that larger blocks of time were needed for the type of activity required in the development of the observation instrument. Arrangements were made for the subcommittee to hold an all-day meeting to work on the development of this instrument.

At this meeting on March 22, 1962, the subcommittee made some key decisions regarding the type of instrument

---

<sup>1</sup>See Form AF - 1 in Appendix B.

<sup>2</sup>See Form AF - 1 in Appendix B.

to be developed. It was decided that the instrument would include both the "yes-no answer" and the "open-ended" type questions. The subcommittee divided itself into three small groups to facilitate the development of questions to be used in the instrument. Each of the small groups was made responsible for writing questions to cover approximately one-third of the criteria which had been previously designated as observable in the classroom. The small groups then assembled together to evaluate the items which had been developed, and a considerable amount of adding, deleting, and revising of these items was done. The chairman assumed the responsibility for the compilation of these items into one instrument. After looking at the instrument, the subcommittee was convinced that further revision was needed. The responsibility for this revision was delegated to the chairman, the consultant, and the resource person. These three persons met on March 29, 1962, and made extensive revisions which were then duplicated and re-submitted. These revisions were considered by the subcommittee at a meeting held a week later, at which time it was decided to test the usefulness of the instrument in observing classroom teaching performance.

Four teams of observers were asked to use the instrument to determine to some degree the reliability, applicability, and the discriminatory power of the instrument. Two of the teams were comprised of an elementary

principal and a supervisor. They observed classes at both the primary and intermediate levels while different types of activity were going on in the classroom. A third team consisted of a junior high school principal and his assistant, and the fourth team was comprised of a high school principal and his assistant. Each of these teams made approximately six observations, each of which was one hour in length. The observation instruments were completed independently by each observer while still in the classroom. The secondary school teams made observations of classes in the vocational and fine arts areas as well as in the more academic area.

These four teams of observers reported back to the subcommittee, giving their impressions, difficulties, and problems in using the observation instrument. They discovered a close similarity between some of the questions, some questions which should have been divided into two separate questions, and a lack of questions in some areas of teaching competence. Concern was expressed in regard to the apprehensiveness of the teachers being observed, but much of this was attributed to the fact that this was the first time these individuals had been observed. The instrument was reported as being applicable at all grade levels both in elementary and secondary schools. The secondary teams reported the instrument as being applicable in all subject matter fields although better adapted to the academic

subject area than to the vocational or fine arts subject areas. One indication of the reliability of the instrument was the high degree of agreement between the two observers watching the same class session. No attempt was made by the observers to test the instrument for its ability to discriminate between the good and the poor teacher. Following the report of the observers and the suggestions they offered, the chairman and the resource person were delegated the responsibility for revising the instrument once again. The revised questions were submitted to the subcommittee again and were accepted this time.

The attention of the subcommittee then turned to the development of examples which would indicate the meaning of questions on the observation instrument. Each member of the subcommittee was assigned the task of writing examples for three questions, but when the subcommittee held a meeting to evaluate these examples, it soon became apparent that this method of developing the examples had not been satisfactory. Another all-day meeting was scheduled for the purpose of studying definitions and examples employed by other school systems in their evaluation instruments, and then these were utilized by the subcommittee in the development of the examples.

The latter half of the second all-day meeting of the subcommittee was spent considering the other forms and

instruments to be included in the evaluation program. It was decided that a professional growth and activity record form<sup>1</sup> similar to the one used in Cincinnati should be constructed. The resource person was asked to submit a copy of this form for evaluation by the subcommittee. A report was made to the subcommittee by the resource person in regard to findings which resulted from a questionnaire distributed to all building principals in the school system. The purpose of the questionnaire was to determine the values the principals as a group placed on each of the eleven areas of teaching competence listed in the criteria developed by Subcommittee A. The findings indicated that the principals placed the greatest weight upon the "in-the-classroom" aspects of teaching, and considered the personal and professional characteristics and qualifications of the teacher to be somewhat less important. The third category in order of importance was the "extra-duty" and "outside-the-classroom" activities and assignments of the teacher. The resource person was asked to construct a form<sup>2</sup> to be used by the principal in reporting his evaluation of his teachers to the Personnel Office. This form was to be designed so that the findings of this survey might be used to assist the principal in determining the

---

<sup>1</sup>See Form AF-2 in Appendix B.

<sup>2</sup>See Forms AF-4S and AF-4E in Appendix B.

weight to be assigned to each of the areas of teaching competence in arriving at a final judgment of teacher effectiveness. The resource person was also asked to have all forms and instruments duplicated and ready for the group to evaluate at the next meeting.

The three final meetings of the subcommittee were devoted to the checking of all material in the proposed teacher evaluation program for mistakes in wording, spelling, punctuation, and meaning. The procedure followed was for the subcommittee as a whole to indicate the changes which should be made, and then to delegate the making of those changes to the resource person. At the meeting held on May 14, 1962, the subcommittee accepted the material without further changes, and the members voted unanimously to submit the proposed evaluation program to the general steering committee at their next meeting. On May 17, 1962, the evaluation program was accepted by the general steering committee.

## CHAPTER VII

### THE INVESTIGATION OF MERIT RATING

#### Introduction

Interest in the evaluation of teaching performance for the determination of salaries is by no means new in the history of American education. Over the last fifty year period, merit rating has been, from time to time, a crucial issue in American education. Lay citizens, including school board members, and a number of school administrators, have tended to support the idea of merit rating. Professional teacher organizations have opposed the utilization of this method for determining teachers' salaries. Despite the vehement vocal and written opposition of these large teachers' organizations, there has appeared to be an ever-increasing interest in relating teachers' salaries to quality-of-service. This increased interest has been stimulated by teacher demands for higher salary, manpower shortages, fear that the quality of education is low, and the enormous expenditures of money needed to build new facilities and hire teachers for the continually increasing student population.



One result of this increased interest and an indication that the interest exists is the increase in the utilization of and the experimentation with merit salary schedules by school districts. Hazel Davis, Associate Director of the Research Division of the NEA, reported:

Twenty years ago at least 20 per cent of the school systems of over 30,000 population made some sort of provision for a superior-service maximum. Each year the percentage grew smaller, until in 1952-53 we identified only 4 per cent. It was up to six per cent in 1955-56, down a little the next year, and in 1958-59 it was still about 6 per cent. If the proportion has changed in the past four years, it has increased rather than decreased.<sup>1</sup>

Possibly more indicative of the increasing interest in merit salary schedules than this small increase in utilization, was the large increase in the number of articles about this topic appearing in the leading professional journals. Ovard<sup>2</sup> reported that only 25 articles dealing with merit rating appeared in the Education Index over a three year period from June, 1947, to May, 1950. In the month of September, 1957, he reported 15 separate articles were listed. This is three-fifths as many in one month as there had been over a previous three year period. However, the best indication of the increasing interest in merit

---

<sup>1</sup>Hazel Davis, Merit Rating: Facts and Issues, A Report of the Second NEA National School for Teacher Salary Scheduling, Washington, D.C., November 11-14, 1959, p. 3.

<sup>2</sup>Glen F. Ovard, "Teachers Merit Rating," The American School Board Journal, CXXXIX (October, 1959), p. 45.

salary schedules was contained in a statement made by Hazel Davis. She said:

In the past year we have received scores of letters which indicate that local education associations are studying the problem of merit pay. These local studies and the actions based upon them will doubtless determine the direction this development will take in the next few years.<sup>1</sup>

The purpose of this chapter is to report the actions and procedures followed by a subcommittee making such a study in the Oklahoma City School System. Subcommittee C was delegated this responsibility by the general steering committee. Its responsibility included:

1. A review of the literature and the abundance of material available regarding merit pay.
2. A determination of the feasibility of the adoption of a merit salary schedule by the Oklahoma City School District.
3. The development of a plan for relating teachers' salaries to quality-of-service.

#### Organization of the Subcommittee

The membership of the subcommittee C included nine persons representing the elementary teaching level of which two were building principals, and six persons representing the secondary level of which one was a building principal. No two members were from the same school faculty. The

---

<sup>1</sup>Davis, op. cit., p. 7.

chairman of this subcommittee had been a long time member and leader of the Classroom Teachers' Salary Committee. Two other members of the subcommittee had also served on the salary committee. A total of nine women and six men served on the committee and as with the other committees the age and experience of these persons was distributed in the same proportion as was the age and experience of the total staff of the school system.

Ten meetings were held by the subcommittee spaced approximately three weeks apart not including time when school was not in session. The meetings were all held in a conference room in the Administration Building beginning at 4 p.m. The average attendance at these meetings was fourteen with a range from eleven to fifteen members present.

#### Chronological Description of the Committee's Work

The primary purposes of the first meeting of the subcommittee were: to orient the members to the purpose of the subcommittee, to distribute study material regarding merit pay, to allow the committee members to express the fears, reactions, and ideas of their peers in regard to the study, and to provide an opportunity for the members of the group to become better acquainted and begin to develop some degree of cohesiveness. The Superintendent was present at this meeting to explain to the group the need and purposes

of the study. The resource person discussed with the subcommittee its specific functions and objectives. He also explained the plan for the distribution of study materials. The same plan was utilized with this group as with the other two subcommittees. It consisted of providing each piece of material with a number and an attached list of the members of the subcommittee. The committee member, when finished with one specific piece of material, was instructed to cross his name off the attached list and send the material to the next person on the list. The remainder of the time of the first meeting was spent in discussing the reaction of teachers to the announcement of the study.

The second meeting was delayed some three weeks so that the committee members might have an opportunity to read part of the material with which they had been supplied. Once again, the reactions of the teachers to the study consumed a large part of the discussion period. However, two rather basic decisions were made which opened the way for future progress. Those decisions were:

1. That the committee would concern itself only with provisions for dealing with the highly satisfactory and the unsatisfactory teachers rather than with the wages of all teachers.

2. That the committee would proceed on the assumption that the other two subcommittees would be able to reach the goals set for them.

The acceptance of these two concepts by the subcommittee members made it possible for them to concentrate on their specific problems and functions to the exclusion of those of the other two subcommittees.

The next major consideration to come before the subcommittee, at the third meeting in January, was the adoption of operational principles to serve as guidelines to the development and operation of the recognition program. The principles developed by the resource person were presented to the group for study, but definite action on the adoption of the principles was delayed until the next meeting. The following meeting was devoted to the discussion and revision of the guiding principles for the recognition program. The revisions made by this group were reported in Chapter IV.

A significant decision was made by the subcommittee during its January meeting. That decision was to subdivide the members of the subcommittee into groups of three for the study of the various devices used for relating teachers' salaries to quality-of-service in school districts throughout the United States. The next several meetings, held in a six weeks period of time, were devoted to the study and reporting of findings by these small groups. The following devices for rewarding superior teachers were studied:

1. Super-maximums

2. Acceleration
3. Bonus plans
4. Track plans

A fifth group also studied and reported on penalty provisions for the teacher whose services were judged to be unsatisfactory. Information about these devices was secured from such sources as the NEA Research Division<sup>1</sup>; the June, 1957 issue of the Journal of Teacher Education<sup>2</sup>; a doctoral dissertation by Lorna Swain<sup>3</sup>; and the various educational journals, in which an actual or hypothetical merit salary plan was described.

The sub-groups were able to identify specific school systems which were utilizing one or a combination of each of these devices, with the exception of the bonus plan. The reward devices most frequently utilized, according to the findings of the subcommittee, were super-maximums, and acceleration. These findings were in agreement with those of Holloway<sup>4</sup> and Davis. In fact, Davis reported

---

<sup>1</sup>National Education Association. Quality-of-Service Provisions in Salary Schedules, 1958-59. Research Report 1959-R24 Prepared by the Educational Research Division. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1959.

<sup>2</sup>Davis, Engleman, et. al., "Merit Salary Schedules for Teachers," The Journal of Teacher Education, VIII (June, 1957), pp. 126-193.

<sup>3</sup>Lorna Swain, "Merit Rating Plans for Teachers," (an unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, School of Education, Stanford University, 1960).

<sup>4</sup>George E. Holloway, Jr., "Objective Look at the Merit Pay Issue," The School Executive, LXXVIII (April, 1959), pp. 19-21.

that:

Although the details may be various, just two separable devices are found, either of which added to a schedule makes it a "merit schedule" according to this discussion: (a) acceleration through the schedule, and (b) superior-service maximums.<sup>1</sup>

The members of the committee were unable to find any extensive use of the track plans such as proposed in the literature by Arbuckle<sup>2</sup>, Grieder<sup>3</sup>, and the New England School Development Council<sup>4</sup>.

The subcommittee, following the reports of the sub-groups on the various devices used for rewarding superior teachers, selected the super-maximums and acceleration as the devices to be included in its proposed plan<sup>5</sup>. These devices were selected not only because of their wide use by other school systems but because the combination of the two offered the opportunity of merit advancement to the largest percentage of the teaching staff. Because no great amount of evidence was found in the literature concerning penalty devices, the subcommittee arbitrarily

<sup>1</sup>Davis, op. cit., pp. 128-129.

<sup>2</sup>Douglas S. Arbuckle, "A Merit Salary Schedule," The Clearing House, XXXII (March, 1958), pp. 395-398.

<sup>3</sup>Calvin Grieder, "A Practical Compromise on Merit Rating: Academic Ranks for Teachers," Education, LXXVIII (March, 1959), pp. 426-429.

<sup>4</sup>New England School Development Council, Teacher Competence and Its Relation to Salary, (Cambridge, Mass.: New England School Development Council, 1956), pp. 103-106.

<sup>5</sup>See Appendix C.

selected the withholding of increments and dismissal as the penalty provisions to be included in this plan.

With the decision made as to which reward and penalty devices were to be used, the subcommittee was then ready to devise its plan for relating quality-of-service to teachers' salaries. The proposed evaluation program, as developed by Subcommittee B and reported in Chapter VI, provided for an evaluation of each non-probationary teacher at the end of each three year period of that teacher's tenure in the Oklahoma City School System. According to the merit plan devised by Subcommittee C, a teacher was eligible to receive a merit increment only after an evaluation of his teaching effectiveness. Thus, a teacher could receive a merit increment only once each three years.

Three criteria were established for identifying those teachers to receive merit increments. These criteria were:

1. The teacher must have passed probationary status.
2. The teaching performance of the teacher must have been judged to be highly satisfactory by his building principal.
3. The teacher must have been recommended for a merit increment by the review board.

The plan then provided for the Superintendent of Schools to recommend for merit increments those teachers



who had qualified by fulfilling each of the above criteria.

The merit increments recommended in the plan were of two types:

1. An acceleration increment which is four times the size of the regular yearly increment. This type of increment would be available for the teacher who had not yet reached the normal maximum on the teachers' salary schedule.

2. A super-maximum increment in the amount of five hundred dollars. This type of increment would be available for the teacher who had already reached the normal maximum on the teachers' salary schedule. A limit of three super-maximum increments per teacher was established.

The merit plan devised by this subcommittee also made provisions for dealing with the unsatisfactory teacher. It provided for the teacher whose services had been judged to be unsatisfactory to be returned to probationary status. If at the end of the second year on probation the quality of the teacher's performance had not improved, the teacher was to be dismissed.

The provision for a review board was another major element of the merit plan proposed by Subcommittee C. Its purpose was to review the evaluations of teachers judged to be highly satisfactory by their principals. This procedure was necessary to ensure some degree of consistency in the quality of teaching performance required to qualify for a

merit increment. Following their review of the teacher evaluations, the review board would then submit to the Superintendent the names of those teachers designated to receive merit increments.

The membership of this review board consisted of nine members. The Directors of Personnel, Elementary Education, and Secondary Education were identified as permanent members. The other members of the board were to be selected by the Superintendent for staggered two year terms. These members would include one principal and two classroom teachers from each of the two teaching levels.

The last and probably the most crucial and controversial issue handled by this subcommittee was the making of a recommendation on the feasibility of the establishment of a merit salary schedule in the Oklahoma City School System at this time. While the subcommittee did not feel that its responsibility was to make the recommendation, they were willing to inform the general steering committee of the prerequisites of a successful merit salary schedule. The two most important of these conditions, the ones upon which the feasibility of a merit salary schedule depend were:

1. A sound evaluation program. This program should utilize correct procedures for collecting and recording accurate relevant data by persons with specialized training. This data should then serve as the basis for a judgment of

the effectiveness of the teacher by the building principal.

2. A good basic salary structure. This structure should provide a salary high enough to compete in the market for the teacher who is just beginning as well as the teacher who may have experience and additional training. It should, in addition, provide some measure of reward to those teachers who have exhibited satisfactory performance over a period of years.

The subcommittee went on to specify the minimum and maximums of the base salary schedule in the actual dollar figures which they felt were necessary before a merit salary plan could be successfully instituted. They stated they were cognizant of the fact that these dollar figures would have to be revised from time to time to keep up with economic changes.

A small group, composed of four of the subcommittee members and the resource person, was designated to draft a final report<sup>1</sup> to the general steering committee. This decision was made because the subcommittee believed that the group discussion process did not lend itself well to the writing of a report. Each member of this small writing group worked on a separate segment of the report, and the segments were then compiled to form the final report. The report was then given to all members of the subcommittee to be studied and evaluated. They made some revisions

---

<sup>1</sup>See Appendix C.

in the report primarily in wording and punctuation.

The report was then adopted by the subcommittee and submitted to the general steering committee on May 17, 1962. The report was accepted by the general steering committee on that date.

Recommendations of the Steering Committee

Following the acceptance of the subcommittee reports, the general steering committee then considered what recommendations if any should be made to the Superintendent of Schools. The belief was stated that teacher evaluation has important purposes and inherent values other than providing the basis for relating quality-of-service to teacher salaries. It could be a powerful tool for improving teacher performance and the instructional program of the school system. In the opinion of the committee members, the teacher evaluation program proposed by Subcommittee B may be a potential first step in the establishment of a sound teacher evaluation program. Consequently, the following recommendation was made to the Superintendent:

The teacher evaluation program developed by Subcommittee B should be adopted and used experimentally in the 1962 school year.

A sound teacher evaluation program would make it possible for judgments to be made about the quality of a

teacher's services with some known degree of accuracy, validity, and reliability. In the opinion of the members of this committee, the institution of a merit salary schedule before such a program was established would not be wise. Therefore, the following statement was drafted by the committee:

No recommendation will be made to the Superintendent concerning merit salary schedules without the prior establishment of a sound evaluation program.

The committee adjourned.

## CHAPTER VIII

### SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Summary

It was the purpose of this study to accomplish the following:

1. To develop a set of guiding principles for use in the establishment and operation of a program for the identification and recognition of the superior and ineffective teachers in a metropolitan school district.

2. To describe the action research process and procedures followed by a metropolitan school district as it attempted to solve the following problems: (a) the improvement of its teacher evaluation program by the development of means for identifying as objectively as possible the clearly superior and the definitely ineffective teachers, and (b) to investigate the possibility of introducing factors of professional merit into decisions about advancement on the salary schedule for some teachers.

The study was consummated through the following procedures:

1. Principles were developed which were appropriate

to the establishment and operation of a program to identify and provide recognition for the superior and ineffective teachers. These principles were formulated following a review of the literature in this area and were submitted to a jury of experts for a validity check.

2. A plan of organization was devised for establishing and selecting the group to work on the two important problems which were designated by the school system. This plan, developed to conform as closely as possible to the recommendations found in the literature which pertained to the formation of such groups, did not violate the developmental principles established for this study. It utilized the cooperative group approach which involved both classroom teachers and administrators. The plan provided for a planning body comprised of a general steering committee and three subcommittees. The general steering committee was designed to serve as a coordinating and recommending body, and its responsibility included coordinating the work of the subcommittees and making recommendations to the Superintendent in regard to the feasibility of adopting programs developed as a result of the study. The total problem area of the study was divided into three segments, each to be considered and resolved simultaneously by different subcommittees.

Fifteen persons were appointed to serve on each committee, and the general steering committee consisted of

five members from each of the subcommittees. A list of names was submitted by the leaders of the local professional organizations, and selection was accomplished in such a manner that the distribution of committee members in respect to the factors of sex, age, experience, marital status, and teaching level was similar to that of the entire staff. The committee members were selected as representatives "at large" of the total teaching staff.

3. The literature was surveyed and reviewed in the areas of teacher evaluation and merit rating.

4. The subcommittee established to work on the designated problems were referred to as A, B, and C. The actions of these subcommittees were reported and summarized. Subcommittees A and B developed the teacher evaluation program; the two basic components of this program were: (1) what to measure, and (2) how to measure. Subcommittee A was concerned with what to measure, and selected the approach to teacher evaluation to be utilized in the evaluation program and developed the criteria which defined good teaching. Subcommittee B was concerned with how to measure, and developed a teacher evaluation program based upon the criteria for judging the effectiveness of teachers developed by Subcommittee A. The program developed by Subcommittee B included the methods to be utilized in the evaluation, the steps in the process of evaluation, the instruments to be used in the evaluation, and the records to



be kept.

Subcommittee C was concerned with investigating the possibility of introducing factors of professional merit into decisions about advancement on the salary schedule for some teachers and determined the basic conditions upon which the feasibility of a merit salary were dependent. The subcommittee developed a merit salary plan which assumed the presence of the two basic conditions previously determined.

5. Conclusions and recommendations were made in regard to the principles and procedures followed by the school district in its attempt to solve the two important problems.

#### Findings and Conclusions

1. Principles (listed in Chapter IV), developed from the literature, were demonstrated as a useful guide in developing a teacher evaluation program.

2. Professional personnel proved willing to devote the time required and able to propose a teacher evaluation program.

3. The organizational structure of the planning body was effective in decreasing the total amount of time required for the completion of the study.

4. The organizational structure of the planning body promoted the involvement of a comparatively large

number of persons in the actual development of a program.

5. The coordination of the work of the subcommittee was not a major problem.

6. A high level of participation was obtained in the discussions and work of the committees.

7. The late afternoon meetings of the committees were not suitable for the developmental work.

8. The all-day meetings made a significant contribution to the coalescence of the group and the development of an esprit de corps.

9. The discussions of merit rating at the beginning of the study were emotionally charged and reflected the mind-set of many committee members in respect to this topic.

10. The discussions of merit rating became less emotional and more rational as the work of the committees progressed.

11. Periodic progress reports to the total teaching staff tended to allay teacher apprehensions regarding the study.

12. The greatest concern regarding the results and implications of the study were expressed by older women teachers.

13. Less concern was found among the teachers in schools whose faculties were represented on the committees than in those schools without faculty representation on the committees.

14. It is possible, by following the recommendations appearing in the literature, to establish an organizational structure which will expedite the development of a teacher evaluation program and provide for the involvement of a comparatively large number of persons in the developmental activity.

15. The members of a professional staff, though already burdened with a full workload, will contribute much of their own time to the pursuance of other professional activities.

16. The attention focused on teacher evaluation will make a professional staff aware of the inadequacies of present evaluation procedures and of the values and need for a sound teacher evaluation program.

17. The professional staff of a school system will be stimulated and experience growth as the result of involvement in a study of the teaching function and how to measure it.

18. The apprehensions of teachers in respect to merit rating which have been induced by the professional teachers' organizations have made it difficult for most teachers to objectively and rationally consider or discuss this topic.

19. These apprehensions were primarily responsible for the decision of the general steering committee not to make a recommendation to the Superintendent of Schools

regarding the adoption of a merit salary schedule.

20. The general steering committee was sufficiently convinced of the feasibility of the teacher evaluation program that had been developed they recommended an experimental trial for the next year.

21. The members of the Board of Education, as a result of the study, have a much clearer understanding of the extreme complexity of the teacher evaluation process and the difficulties involved in the establishment of a merit salary schedule for a teaching staff.

#### Recommendations

The following recommendations are based on the findings and conclusions of this study:

1. That other school systems with problems similar to those of the Oklahoma City School System should attempt to solve them by the use of the processes of cooperative group action.

2. That any group established for the purpose of developing a program such as resulted from the study made in the Oklahoma City School District should as a first step adopt some guiding principles.

3. That a person be relieved of other duties and responsibilities in the school system so that he might be available to assist the group designated to make the study.

4. That several copies of each item in the

bibliography pertinent to the work of the committees be secured to facilitate the rapid acquisition of the required background by the committee members.

5. That provision should be made for at least one faculty member in each school building throughout the school system to be continually informed on the work and progress of the committees making the study.

6. That a study of teacher evaluation should be attempted in a school district only if the Superintendent of Schools is so thoroughly convinced of the need for a sound program that he will exert the leadership needed to implement it.

7. That further studies should be made by other school systems to determine what constitutes good teaching in their community and how it might be more accurately and effectively measured.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Books and Pamphlets

- Alexander, William M. Are You a Good Teacher? New York: Rinehart & Company, Inc., 1959.
- Barr, A. S., and others. Wisconsin Studies of the Measurement and Prediction of Teacher Effectiveness. Madison: Dembar Publications, Inc., 1961.
- Beecher, Dwight E. The Evaluation of Teaching. Syracuse: University Press, 1949.
- Boyce, Arthur C. Fourteenth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. "Methods of Measuring Teachers Efficiency." Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1914.
- Chandler, B. J., and Petty, Paul V. Personnel Management in School Administration. New York: World Book Company, 1955.
- Cooke, Dennis H. Administering the Teaching Personnel. Chicago: Benjamin H. Sanborn and Company, 1939.
- Department of Classroom Teachers. Teacher Rating. Washington, D. C.: Department of Classroom Teachers and the Educational Research Division of the National Education Association, Discussion Pamphlet No. 10, 1954.
- Elliott, Edward C. City School Supervision. New York: World Book Company, 1914.
- Elsbree, Willard, and Reutter, Edmund. Principles of Staff Personnel Administration in Public Schools. New York: Bureau of Publications, Columbia University, 1959.
- Florida Education Association. Guideposts for Developing Career Increment Programs for Florida's Teachers. Tallahassee: Florida Education, 1958.

- Howsam, Robert B. Who's A Good Teacher? Burlingame: Joint Committee on Personnel Procedures, California School Boards Association and the California Teachers Association, 1960.
- Huggett, Albert J., and Stinnett, T. M. Professional Problems of Teachers. New York: Macmillan Company, 1956.
- Illinois State Chamber of Commerce, Education Department. Incentive Pay Plans for Teachers Do Work. Chicago: Illinois State Chamber of Commerce.
- MacFarlane, M. James, and Furse, Bernarr S. An Experimental Study of Teacher Evaluation. Sandy, Utah: Jordan School District, 1959.
- McCall, William A. Measurement of Teacher Merit. Publication No. 284. Raleigh: North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, 1952.
- Minnesota Education Association, Research Division. Merit Rating: Facts and Issues. St. Paul: Minnesota Education Association, 1958.
- Misner, Paul J. "The Merit Rating Issue," Seven Studies. Chicago: National School Boards Association, August, 1958.
- Mosher, William E., Kingsley, J. Donald, and Stahl, Glen O. Public Personnel Administration. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.
- National Education Association. Addresses and Proceedings, LI, 1913.
- New England School Development Council. Teacher Competence and Its Relation to Salary. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Spaulding House, 1956.
- New Jersey Education Association, Research Division, Information on Merit Rating. Research Bulletin No. 57-1. Trenton: New Jersey Education Association, July, 1957.
- New York State Teachers Association, Committee on Merit Payments. Teacher Merit and Teacher Salary. Albany: New York State Teachers Association, 1957.
- Reavis, William C., and Cooper, Dan H. Evaluation of Teacher Merit in City School Systems. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945.

- Research Division, New Jersey Education Association, Information on Merit Rating. Bulletin 57-1. Trenton, New Jersey: New Jersey Education Association, July, 1957.
- Special Committee on Merit Payments. Teacher Merit and Teacher Salary. Albany, New York: New York State Teachers Association, 1957.
- Stoops, Emery, and Rafferty, M. L. Practices and Trends in School Administration. New York: Ginn and Company, 1961.
- Utah School Merit Study Committee. Reports and Recommendations Utah School Merit Study. Salt Lake City: Utah School Merit Study Committee, 1958.
- Utah School Merit Study Committee. Reports and Recommendations Utah School Merit Study. Salt Lake City: Utah School Merit Study Committee, 1960.
- Who's A Good Teacher? Washington: American Association of School Administrators, Department of Classroom Teachers, and National School Boards Association, 1961.
- Wichita City Teacher Association. A Study of Merit Rating Programs for Teachers. Wichita: Wichita City Teachers Association, 1956.
- Young, Lloyd P. The Administration of Merit-Type Teachers' Salary Schedules. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1933.

#### Articles and Periodicals

- Ackerman, Walter I. "Teacher Competence and Pupil Change," Harvard Educational Record, XXIV (Fall, 1954), 273-89.
- Arbuckle, Douglas S. "A Merit Salary Schedule," The Clearing House, XXXII (March, 1958), 395-398.
- Bagley, William C. "The Problem of Recognizing and Rewarding Merit in Teaching," School and Society, LIX (April, 1944), 259-60.
- Barlow, A. T. "Teachers Rate Their Professional Growth as Basis for Salary Increases," Nation's Schools, XLII (March, 1952), 63-65.



- Barr, A. S., and others. "Report of the Committee on the Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness," Review of Educational Research, XXII (June, 1952), 238-263.
- Beecher, Dwight E. "Judging the Effectiveness of Teaching," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, XXXIV (December, 1950), 270-81.
- Beecher, D. E. "New York Plan for Rewarding Good Teaching," American School Board Journal, CXIX (October, 1949), 35-37.
- Beecher, D. E. "Salary Law in New York Produces Tangible Benefits," Nation's Schools, XLV (February, 1950), 54-57.
- Brickman, Benjamin. "Rewarding in Superior Teacher," School and Society, LXXXVII (September, 1959), 356-58.
- Bushong, James W. "Automatic Salary Increases Cannot Be Justified," The Nation's Schools, LXI (February, 1958), 43-45.
- Chandler, B. J. "Study Shows that Merit Rating Is Not Detrimental to Teacher Morale," The Nation's Schools, LXI (April, 1958), 58-59.
- Cocking, W. D. "Judging Merit in Teaching," School Executive, LXVII (September, 1947), 5.
- Coen, Alvin W. "An Analysis of Successful Merit Rating Programs," Phi Delta Kappan, XXXIX (June, 1958), 394-397.
- Davis, Engleman, et. al. "Merit Salary Schedules for Teachers," The Journal of Teacher Education, VIII (June, 1957), 125-193.
- Davis, Hazel. "Where We Stand on Merit Rating," NEA Journal, XLVI (November, 1957), 535-36.
- Domas, Simeon J., and Tiedeman, D. V. "Teacher Competence: An Annotated Bibliography," Journal of Experimental Education, XIX (December, 1950), 101-128.
- Fattu, Nicholas A. "What Research Says About Teacher Effectiveness," NEA Journal, L (October, 1961), 55-56.
- Gragg, William L. "Ithaca's Revised Teacher Rating Plan," American School Board Journal, CXIX (July, 1949), 23-25.

- Gragg, W. L. "Merit Pay for Teachers," Nation's Schools, CLXXXIX (June, 1959), 528-30.
- Grieder, Calvin. "A Practical Compromise on Merit Rating: Academic Ranks for Teachers," Education, LXXVII (March, 1959), 426-429.
- Hamstra, R. H. "Merit Rating of School Personnel," American School Board Journal, CXVII (December, 1948), 19-21.
- Henderson, E. "Florida's Career Increment Plan," Phi Delta Kappan, XLII (January, 1961), 152-53.
- Holloway, George E., Jr., "Objective Look at the Merit Pay Issue," The School Executive, LXXVIII (April, 1959), 19-21.
- Karam, Irvin A. "Merit Rating Salary Plans in Public School Systems of the United States, 1955-56," Journal of Educational Research, LIII (December, 1959), 144-148.
- Kennedy, E. D. "Advantages and Disadvantages of Teacher Merit-Rating Plans," Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, XLII (September, 1958), 38-40.
- Lynch, J. M. "Why Argue About Merit Rating?" Clearing House, XXXV (January, 1961), 298-300.
- Megel, Carl J. "Merit Rating Is Unsound," Phi Delta Kappan, XXXXII (January, 1961), 154-56.
- Miller, Van. "The Advantage of Paying for Quality in Teaching," The American School Board Journal, CXVIII (April, 1949), 21-23.
- Morrison, J. Cayce. "History of New York State's Approach to Problems of Relating Salaries to the Quality of Teaching Service," Harvard Educational Review, XXII (Spring, 1952), 124-131.
- Morrison, J. C. "New York State is Now Testing Promotion for Merit," Nation's Schools, XLII (October, 1948), 20-23.
- National Education Association, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. "Merit Salary Schedules for Teachers," Journal of Teacher Education, VIII (June, 1957), 126-209.

- Nichols, Ivan C. "Salary Schedules Are Based on Effectiveness of Teaching," Nation's Schools, LVII (June, 1956), 52-56.
- Nixon, Richard M. "Let's Take a Searching Look at Schools," The Nation's Schools, LXI (February, 1958), 47 (Excerpts from a speech made at the twenty-ninth anniversary dinner of Yeshiva University, New York, December 15, 1957).
- Orton, Don A. "A New Approach to Merit Rating," The Nation's Schools, LVI (July, 1955), 53-56.
- Ovard, Glen F. "Teachers Merit Rating," The American School Board Journal, CXXXIX (October, 1959), 35-45.
- Parker, Jack S. "The Merit Study," Superintendent's Bulletin Oklahoma City Public Schools, XIII (November 10, 1961), 1-4.
- Patrick, T. L. "The Importance of Evaluating the Work of the Individual Teacher," Educational Administration and Supervision, XLII (January, 1956), 4-9.
- Peterson, Carl H. "Five Basic Steps to a Practical Merit Plan," The American School Board Journal, CXXXV (November, 1957), 26-28.
- Peterson, Carol. "Seven Keys to Evaluating Teacher Competence," American School Board Journal, CXXXVI (May, 1958), 34-46.
- Rabinowitz, William, and Travers, Robert M. W. "Problems of Defining and Assessing Teacher Effectiveness," Educational Theory, III (July, 1953), 213, quoting Flanagan, J. C., "Personnel Psychology," Current Trends in Psychology, University of Pittsburgh Press, 1947.
- Reed, Roberts. "Blueprint for Merit Rating," School Executive, LXXVII (June, 1958), 52-55.
- Remmers, H. H. and others. "Report of the Committee on the Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness," Review of Educational Research, XXII (June, 1952), 238-263.
- Remmers, H. H. "Second Report of the Committee on Teacher Effectiveness," Journal of Educational Research, XLVI (May, 1953), 641-658.

- Rose, Gale W. "A Plan for Merit Rating," Administrator's Notebook, IX (May, 1961), 1-4.
- Rose, Gale. "Preparation Unlocks the Door to Successful Merit Rating," The Nation's Schools, LXIV (October, 1959), 51-53.
- Rose, Gale. "Toward the Evaluation of Teaching," Educational Leadership, XV (January, 1958), 231-38.
- Ryans, David G. "Notes on the Rating of Teacher Performance," Journal of Educational Research, XLVII (May, 1954), 695-704.
- Scates, D. E. "The Good Teacher: Establishing Criteria for Identification," Journal of Teacher Education, I (June, 1950), 137-141.
- Shane, Harold G. "Seven Types of Teacher Appraisal," The Nation's Schools, L (July, 1952), 58-59.
- Shannon, J. R. "Elements of Excellence in Teaching," Educational Administration, XXII (March, 1941), 168-176.
- Smith, J. B. "Lexington Moves Toward Merit Rating," American School Board Journal, CXXXIII (November, 1956), 27-29.
- Sperber, Robert I. "A Sound Staff Evaluation Program," American School Board Journal, CXXXI (July, 1960), 15-16.
- Stiles, Lindley J. "The Cooperative Research Program Contribution and Next Steps," Phi Delta Kappan, XLIII (March, 1962), 231-36.
- Thorne, Edmund H. "Teacher Merit Rating Really Does Work! Here are Sixteen Tested Requisites," Nation's Schools, LXIV (November, 1959), 70-72.
- Thorne, E. H. "West Harford's Career Salary Plan," Nation's Schools, LV (March, 1955), 51-52.
- Wood, Lloyd K. "To Attract Good Teachers," The Nation's Schools, LXII (October, 1958), 83.
- Worth, Walter W. "Can Administrators Rate Teachers?", The Canadian Administrator, I (October, 1961), 1-6.

Reports

- Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Better Than Rating. A Report Prepared by the Commission on Teacher Evaluation. Washington, D. C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1950.
- Beecher, Dwight E., and Bump, Janet W. The Evaluation of Teaching in New York State. A Report of Standards and Procedures Recommended by Local Advisory Committees. New York: The University of the State of New York, 1950.
- California Teachers Association. Teacher Competence Its Nature and Scope. A Report Prepared by the Commission on Teacher Education, Burlingame, California: California Teachers Association, 1957.
- California Teachers Association, Research Department. Information on Merit Rating of Teachers. Research Bulletin No. 98. San Francisco: The California Teachers Association, 1956.
- Davis, Hazel. Merit Rating: Facts and Issues. A Report of the Second NEA National School for Teacher Salary Scheduling. Washington, D.C., November 11-14, 1959.
- Florida Education Association. Guideposts for Developing Career Increment Programs for Florida's Teachers. A Report Prepared by the Florida Education Association. Tallahassee, Florida: Florida Education Association, 1958.
- Logan City Board of Education. Report of Logan City Merit Study. A Report of Activities, Procedures, Findings, Problems not Resolved, and General Observations. Logan, Utah: Logan City Board of Education, 1961.
- National Education Association. Appraisal and Promotion Procedures in Urban School Districts, 1955-56. A Report Prepared by the American Association of School Administrations and the Research Division. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1956.
- National Education Association, Department of Classroom Teachers. Classroom Teachers Speak on Merit Rating. November 23-24, 1956. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1957.

- National Education Association. Quality-of-Service Provisions in Salary Schedules, 1958-59. Research Report 1959-R24 Prepared by the Educational Research Division. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1959.
- National Education Association. Teacher Rating. Discussion Pamphlet No. 10 Prepared by the Department of Classroom Teachers and Research Division. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, July, 1954.
- Office of the County Superintendent. A Plan for the Development of a Teacher Appraisal Program. A Report Prepared by the Administrative Advisory Service. Santa Clara County: County Superintendent of Schools, 1957.
- Ohio Education Association. School Personnel Development Plans. A Report Prepared by the Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio Education Association, 1958.
- Pennsylvania State Education Association. Merit Rating, A Guide for Study. A Report Prepared by the State Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State Education Association, 1957.
- Rogers, Virgil M., editor. Do We Want "Merit" Salary Schedules? A Report of Second Annual Workshop on Merit Rating in Teachers' Salary Schedules. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1960.
- Rogers, Virgil M., editor. "Merit Rating" for Teachers? A Report on Workshop on Merit Rating in Teachers' Salary Schedules. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1959.
- Rogers, Virgil M., editor. Merit Rating or Effective Personnel Policies. A Report of Third Annual Workshop on Merit Rating in Teachers' Salary Schedules. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1961.
- Rose, Gale W. Some Assertions About Teaching and Administration. A Report to the Advanced Administration Institute. Cambridge, Massachusetts, July, 1961.

University of the State of New York. Development and Refinement of Measures of Teaching Effectiveness. First Report of the Cooperative Study to Predict Effectiveness in Secondary School Teaching. Albany, New York: The State Education Department, 1956.

Unpublished Material

- Ball, Lester B. "An Evaluation of Teacher Merit Rating Salary Schedules in the Public Schools," Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, College of Education, Northwestern University, 1949.
- Best, Leonard E. "Incentive Pay for Teachers." Copy of a speech given before the Board of Education, Summit, New Jersey, May 11, 1954.
- George, N. L. "A Plan for the Centralized School Service Shops of Oklahoma City, Oklahoma." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1947.
- Gibson, Robert C. "The Influence of the Planning Processes Upon the Success of Merit Salaries for Teachers." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, School of Education, University of Virginia, 1960.
- McKenna, John J. "A Merit Salary Policy for a Public School District." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, College of Education, New York University, 1959.
- Prance, Jack. Letter from the Personnel Director, Dade County School System, Dade County, Florida, December 11, 1961.
- Swain, Lorna. "Merit Rating for Teachers." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, College of Education, Stanford University, 1960.
- Wiley, Russell W. "The Development of a Merit Salary Schedule for the Teaching Personnel of Sarasota County Public Schools." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, College of Education, Syracuse University, 1958.

APPENDIX A



March 12, 1962

Final Report of Subcommittee A  
to General Steering Committee

In the United States today, it is the responsibility of local school officials to obtain an estimate of teacher effectiveness. This estimate is necessary so that decisions can be made on employment, placement, retention, promotion, dismissal, and on how teachers can be helped to improve or to partially determine salary increases.

In Utah, after long study, a committee has reported that:

. . . it is unrealistic for a district to attempt to say anything truthful and helpful about a teacher's work unless a set of functional criteria has been accepted and is understood by the personnel. <sup>1</sup>

No one, however, can make a decision as to how well a particular teacher performs without defining, in some way, what the teacher's job is. In searching for the criteria of teacher effectiveness we are in effect attempting to define the term. Flanagan clearly expressed the equivalence of a criterion and a definition of an activity:

It is impossible to study the requirements for success in an activity without defining the activity. A complete definition of what is meant by success in the activity is practically identical with a statement of the procedure for obtaining a criterion. <sup>2</sup>

In the study of teaching ability great use has been made of strictly empirical and statistical procedures. Despite this fact, it must be recognized that the ultimate conception of the effective teacher is neither an empirical nor a statistical matter. There is no way to discover the characteristics which distinguish effective and ineffective teachers unless one has made or is prepared to make a value judgment. To quote Scates:

The particular statements of what constitutes a good teacher in any particular

---

1

Gale Rose, "Preparation Unlocks the Door to Successful Merit Rating," The Nations Schools, LXIV, (October, 1959), 51.

2

J. C. Flanagan, "Personal Psychology," Current Trends in Psychology, Pittsburg, Pennsylvania: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1947.

locality are in the nature of policy statements emphasizing those qualities which are deemed to be acceptable to the person or group whose thinking has dominant force.<sup>3</sup>

Or as Rabinowitz and Travers have stated it:

A criterion is first and foremost a matter of decision. Effectiveness as an attribute does not inhere in teaching but is imposed upon it from without. Imposition, in this context, is neither necessarily offensive nor arbitrary. It merely signifies that in the final analysis a criterion rests upon consensus. There is no higher authority to which one can appeal, nor is there any way to escape the judgmental origin of the criterion.<sup>4</sup>

For all practical purposes, teacher competence is whatever people think it is.

A definition of teaching competence evolves from a value judgment, rather than empirical research, and the definition will vary in different communities just as do the value judgments. Therefore, teacher performance can only be assessed by reference to locally defined functions.

The development of this local definition of teaching functions was the problem assigned to Subcommittee A. The accompanying statement of criteria, represents our efforts to complete this task. It consists of five general areas of teaching responsibility. The major aspects or functions of each of these areas of responsibility have been identified. In the opinion of the members of the committee, the criteria contained herein specify the most important and critical dimensions of those aspects or functions.

In arriving at these five categories and considering the several aspects and functions of each one, the committee consulted evaluation plans of many other local and state school systems and found these to be areas considered important by other evaluators as well as the members of Subcommittee A.

---

<sup>1</sup>D. E. Scates, "The Good Teacher: Establishing Criteria for Identification," Journal of Teacher Education, I, ( , 1959), 137-141.

<sup>2</sup>William Rabinowitz and Robert M. W. Travers, "Problems of Defining and Assessing Teacher Effectiveness," Educational Theory, III, (July, 1953). 214.

In addition, the committee members took the statement to their faculties for criticism and suggestions, and the fourteen faculties (those of six secondary and eight elementary schools) endorsed the criteria.

The committee selected and evaluated each criterion according to the following standards:

1. It is clearly defined.
2. It is observable at least to a degree.
3. All teachers can achieve it to a degree.
4. It falls within the generally accepted objectives of education.

The resulting statement of criteria is of necessity idealistic. Part of the function of the superintendent's special committee is to develop an instrument that will differentiate between the superior, the competent, and the ineffective teacher. This statement of standards, then, must be sufficiently comprehensive to make provision for both the variety and quality of the activities of a superior teacher; and if it is possible for any person to meet all the standards to a high degree, only a superior teacher could do so.

In so far as possible, the statement has been couched in general terms, leaving the means and methods of meeting the criterion to the imagination of the individual teacher. While the committee hopes to draw the attention of teachers to several areas of importance, it does not wish to restrict the creativity of any teacher. The ultimate purpose of the superintendent's special committee is to improve the quality of teaching in Oklahoma City, and it is our hope that the statement of criteria will be of value to teachers in suggesting an ideal for which to strive as well as of value to Subcommittee B in its preparation of an evaluation instrument.

As the committee discussed and evaluated the criteria, there were several areas of concern which, though they do not appear in the statement, should, we feel, be brought to the attention of the steering committee:

1. The committee does not recommend that the five areas be weighted equally in the evaluation instrument or that the dimensions under the subheadings be assigned specific weights .
2. There is necessarily a philosophy of education implied in the statement; the members of the committee hope that the implied philosophy is compatible with the locally accepted philosophies of education.
3. The committee recommends that the evaluator should be aware of the problems and differences within the school and locale and familiar with the teaching field being taught and with the development and growth patterns of the pupils being taught .

## CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING TEACHING

## 1. Classroom Performance

## 1.1 Knowledge of subject matter

- 1.11 Possesses a broad grasp of subject and related fields
- 1.12 Understands major objectives of the teaching field
- 1.13 Makes clear and adequate explanations
- 1.14 Emphasizes key concepts
- 1.15 Shows interrelationships among subject matter fields
- 1.16 Shows a familiarity with current, available materials and community resources

## 1.2 Motivation of pupils

- 1.21 Develops an enthusiasm for the subject matter in the pupils
- 1.22 Encourages inquisitiveness and learning through discovery
- 1.23 Stimulates pupils by the wise use of praise

## 1.3 Organization of work

- 1.31 Formulates specific class goals with pupil participation when appropriate
- 1.32 Develops lesson plans to guide himself or another teacher in conducting the class
- 1.33 Organizes subject matter content in sequential order and systematically plans learning experiences
- 1.34 Demonstrates creativity in providing learning experiences
- 1.35 Recognizes and uses opportunities for impromptu teaching
- 1.36 Provides for wide participation in a variety of classroom activities
- 1.37 Employs a variety of appropriate teaching methods and materials
- 1.38 Structures class period so that the necessary classroom routine is accomplished without undue loss of time
- 1.39 Completes required reports on pupils, property, and routine matters efficiently and promptly

## 1.4 Attention to individual needs and abilities

- 1.41 Is aware of the growth and development patterns characteristic of the group taught
- 1.42 Designs subject matter content, teaching techniques and materials to meet the needs, interests, and abilities of the individual pupils
- 1.43 Helps children to understand and accept their differences
- 1.44 Makes differentiated assignments which meet the needs, interests, and abilities of the individual pupils
- 1.45 Utilizes school records and tests in ascertaining the needs and abilities of the pupil, in planning work, and guiding the learning process

### 1.5 Pupil Control

- 1.51 Conducts class in an orderly manner without continuous resort to reprimand
- 1.52 Provides opportunities for pupils to develop qualities of leadership and self-direction which are commensurate with their ability to control themselves
- 1.53 Treats pupils fairly and consistently
- 1.54 Maintains a class in which pupils are courteous and respectful to each other and the teacher

### 1.6 Pupil guidance and counseling

- 1.61 Accepts the guidance of pupils as a primary responsibility
- 1.62 Acquires necessary knowledge and techniques to give counseling assistance and seeks the advice of specialists to supplement these knowledges and techniques
- 1.63 Provides time and sympathetic attention to pupil requests for guidance
- 1.64 Assists pupils in defining realistic goals of an educational and vocational nature

### 1.7 Pupil evaluation procedures

- 1.71 Uses a variety of methods and techniques of evaluation which further the objectives of the course
- 1.72 Designs evaluations so that they help the pupil locate his strengths and weaknesses
- 1.73 Keeps adequate records--and, when practical, samples-- of the pupils' work
- 1.74 Interprets to pupils and parents the significance of the grading and reporting practices
- 1.75 Interprets to pupil and his parents the the extent of his educational growth

## 2. Classroom Environment

### 2.1 Physical conditions of room

- 2.11 Provides as healthful and attractive environment as circumstances permit

### 2.2 Supplies and equipment

- 2.21 Anticipates needs for teaching materials and uses resourcefulness in providing them
- 2.22 Teaches a respect for school property

### 3. Contribution to the Total School Program

#### 3.1 Participation in pupil activities

- 3.11 Accepts and values the extracurricular activities as a means of vitalizing the school program
- 3.12 Accepts a leadership responsibility and gives active support to student activity programs
- 3.13 Provides time in personal schedule for participating in student activity program

#### 3.2 Committee and duty assignments

- 3.21 Willingly accepts and fulfills committee and school duty assignments
- 3.22 Recognizes and voluntarily assumes responsibility as the need arises

#### 3.3 Curriculum work

- 3.31 Takes an active part in the improvement of the curriculum

#### 3.4 Support of school policies

- 3.41 Supports existing school policies
- 3.42 Makes constructive suggestions through appropriate channels for the improvement of school policies
- 3.43 Interprets school programs and policies to the public effectively

#### 3.5 Teacher-pupil relationships

- 3.51 Shows a sincere respect for pupils as individuals
- 3.52 Is accepted and respected by pupils
- 3.53 Maintains desirable communicative relationships with pupils

#### 3.6 Teacher-staff relationships

- 3.61 Maintains a friendly, cooperative, and harmonious relationship with other employees
- 3.62 Demonstrates a helpful attitude toward new teachers and substitutes
- 3.63 Shares professional knowledge and techniques with other faculty members

#### 3.7 Teacher-parent relationships

- 3.71 Develops an effective and harmonious working relationship with parents and community

#### 4. Personal Factors

##### 4.1 Emotional stability

- 4.11 Retains poise and self-control even in frustrating and difficult situations
- 4.12 Accepts and uses criticism in a constructive manner

##### 4.2 Speech

- 4.21 Expresses himself effectively in a well-modulated voice
- 4.22 Uses correct English
- 4.23 Uses an adequate, appropriate vocabulary which is free from profanity and excessive slang

##### 4.3 Personal appearance

- 4.31 Dresses appropriately to the school situation
- 4.32 Follows the dictates of good grooming

##### 4.4 Physical stamina

- 4.41 Has the physical strength and vigor to meet the demands of the work
- 4.42 Seems rested and ready for work

##### 4.5 Adaptability

- 4.51 Adopts new procedures without frustration
- 4.52 Accepts changing situation with initiative and direction

##### 4.6 Interest and enthusiasm

- 4.61 Demonstrates a positive, enthusiastic attitude

#### 5. Professional Growth and Development

##### 5.1 Professional organizations

- 5.11 Recognizes the need for membership and actively participates in professional organizations
- 5.12 Accepts personal responsibility for improving the status of the profession

##### 5.2 Educational self-improvement

- 5.21 Selects and participates voluntarily in in-service training programs which are appropriate to his grade level or subject area
- 5.22 Pursues a program of reading which fosters professional growth
- 5.23 Continues to take college or university courses which will help him in his professional growth



- 5.24 Utilizes travel to broaden his preparation for teaching
  - 5.25 Participates in cultural and recreational activities which enrich his teaching
- 5.3 Observances of professional ethics
- 5.31 Understands, accepts, and practices acceptable standards of professional conduct
- 5.4 Citizenship responsibility
- 5.41 Exemplifies the democratic way of life both in the classroom and as a citizen

APPENDIX B

## FOREWORD

The following proposed evaluation program is the consensus of Sub-Committee "B" appointed by the Superintendent for that purpose. Meeting after school and in two all day meetings, trying out the various instruments in their schools, responding to responsible professional opinions, and reviewing the literature published in this field have been an extra burden on the teachers, supervisors, counselors, and principals on this committee. Their interest and zeal is a tribute to their professional attitude.

Wallace R. Smith  
Chairman, Sub-Committee "B"

## Members of Sub-Committee "B"

Lloyd Estes	John Hill
Margaret Gentz	Dan Gardner
Frances Bailey	Florence Green
Georgia Rogers	Thurgasu Dill
Viola Cooley	Aristle Russell
Wesley Kirk	Elaine Siebuhr
Max Niles	Edna Gross

OBJECTIVES OF THE TEACHER  
EVALUATION PROGRAM

1. To improve instruction by the use of a systematic procedure that will identify particular strengths and areas of the teaching performance that need improvement.
2. To identify teachers who deserve commendation where such commendation is warranted by superior teaching performance.
3. To identify those teachers who need help or are unsatisfactory in performance.

### Characteristics of the Proposed Evaluation Plan

This evaluation plan, designed to improve and strengthen evaluation in the Oklahoma City Public Schools, includes the following provisions:

1. The formal and systematic evaluation of all teachers throughout their entire career of service.
2. A more systematic and objective collecting and keeping of information which pertains to the services of the teacher.
3. Evaluation forms which specify more clearly the qualities of effective teaching.
4. A self-evaluation by the teacher and an evaluation by the principal that direct attention to those areas of competence in which the teacher may be both the strongest and weakest.
5. An intermingling of ideas between the teacher and the principal regarding the total role of the teacher in the Oklahoma City Public Schools and the degree of fulfillment of that role by the teacher.
6. Cognizance on the part of the teacher of the criteria by which his work is evaluated, the procedures followed in the process, and the final results of the evaluation.
7. Active participation by the teacher in the evaluation process.
8. The strengthening of the procedure for helping the teacher experiencing difficulty or who is bordering on the unsatisfactory.
9. The facilitation of appropriate administrative action in regard to the unsatisfactory teacher.

The basis for the evaluation program are:

1. The evaluation should be based on a set of criteria for teaching effectiveness which is known and accepted by the staff; and should include a plan for making its implementation possible.
2. The evaluation, although necessarily subjective, should be based on collection of as much objective evidence as possible.
3. The evaluation should take into account variations in teaching situations.
4. The evaluation should identify both the teacher's strengths and weaknesses and should aim at eliminating the weaknesses while developing and improving performance on the basis of the staff member's strengths.
5. The evaluation should encourage creativity and willingness to try new methods, ideas, and techniques.
6. Self-evaluation on the part of the staff members should be encouraged.
7. The evaluation should be made only by trained evaluators which necessitates the provision of sufficient staff.
8. There should be adequate opportunity for observation of the staff members who are to be evaluated and must include a person with teaching experience in the subject-matter field of the teacher.
9. More than one person should be involved in the evaluation of each staff member.
10. An evaluation should be made of each staff member regularly although not necessarily each year.
11. Each staff member should receive a carbon copy of the results of his evaluation.
12. There should be an appeals procedure for a staff member who feels that his evaluation does him an injustice.

**IMPORTANT DATES IN THE EVALUATION PROCEDURE**

<b>ON OR BEFORE</b>	<b><u>ACTION TO BE TAKEN</u></b>
November 15	Teachers to be evaluated are notified of their forthcoming evaluation and receive the needed evaluation forms. (AF-2, AF-3)
December 15	Initial conference held between the principal and the teacher who is to be evaluated.
March 1	Final conference completed and reported to the Director of Personnel on ineffective or border-line teachers. (AF-4)
March 31	Final conference completed and reported to the Director of Personnel on all other teachers being evaluated. (AF-4)
March 31	Self-evaluation and professional growth and activity forms completed and turned in by all other teachers. (AF-3, AF-2)

## MECHANICS OF THE PROGRAM

The assumption underlying the evaluation program is that teachers can be divided into three groups on the basis of their performance as teachers. These three groups are:

1. Highly Satisfactory
2. Satisfactory
3. Unsatisfactory

It is also assumed that teachers will be identified as needing help and will receive all possible help before ratings of unsatisfactory are given.

### NONPROBATIONARY TEACHERS

The nonprobationary teachers in each building will be formally evaluated every third year of their tenure in the Oklahoma City School System.

In order to initiate this program, one third of the nonprobationary teachers in each building will be evaluated every year. The teachers to be evaluated will be notified of their forthcoming evaluation and receive the needed evaluation forms, (AF-2, AF-3) by November 15. The remaining two-thirds of the teachers will complete a self-evaluation form (AF-3) each year.

An initial conference between the principal and the teacher to be evaluated will be held not later than December 15. The final conference with ineffective or border-line teachers must be completed and reported to the Director of Personnel not later than March 31.



All probationary teachers in each building are to be formally evaluated each year. The teachers to be evaluated are to be notified and given the necessary evaluation form (AF-2, AF-3) by November 15.

An initial conference between the principal and the teacher to be evaluated will be held not later than December 15. The final conference for the purpose of evaluation must be completed and delivered to the Director of Personnel not later than March 1.

### BASIS FOR THE EVALUATION

A cumulative folder for each teacher will be kept in the office of the principal. This folder will contain the following types of material:

1. Transcripts - up to date
2. Observation records of the classroom observers (AF-1)
3. Self-evaluation forms (AF-3)
4. Lists of suggestions offered for improvement
5. Results or records of teacher-principal conferences
6. Anecdotal Records  
(This might include parental conferences with the principal in regard to the teacher, expressions of sympathy for the children and such evidences not collectible in the classroom such as the teacher's industry integrity staff relationships, emotional and physical well-being, attendance at required meetings, punctuality, and other descriptions of the teacher's behavior.)
7. Professional growth and activity record (AF-2)

### RESPONSIBILITY FOR OBSERVING AND EVALUATING

The building principal will be directly responsible for the final evaluation of all teachers. He will consult with others who have made direct contacts with the teacher and will make use of their observational reports filed in the teacher's cumulative folder.

The principal, assistant principal (if such a position exists) and the supervisor will observe in the classroom using the instrument developed for that purpose. In all cases, the teacher will have the opportunity to examine, discuss, and sign the observational report. Each observer will make three independent observations during each evaluation period.

#### UNSATISFACTORY TEACHERS

Each teacher receiving an unsatisfactory report will be so notified by the principal by March 1. Each case will be dealt with on an individual basis. The Director of Personnel will consult with the supervisor involved and the principal before any of the following actions may be taken:

1. Contract not renewed
2. Placed on Probation
3. Transferred to another position

#### APPEALS PROCEDURE

In the event that a teacher disagrees with the unsatisfactory rating, he may appeal in writing by March 15 to the Chairman of the Appeals Board, who is the Director of Personnel. A carbon copy of that appeal will be given to the principal who made the evaluation.

#### APPEALS BOARD

The permanent member and Chairman of the Appeals Board will be the Director of Personnel. Other members of the Board will be the Director of Elementary or Secondary Education, a principal, a supervisor, and three teachers, making a total of seven members. The director, principal, supervisor, and teachers will be selected from the same teaching level as the appellant.

The principal, supervisor, and teachers will be drawn by lot by the teacher involved from a pool of qualified people. These people will have five years of experience in the Oklahoma City School System. Principals will have five years of administrative experience in the Oklahoma City System.

The pool of teachers will consist of one qualified teacher from each building with an additional qualified person added for each additional group of fifteen teachers in the building. One of the teachers may be selected from the teacher's building if the principal and teacher agree on that person.

#### PROCEDURE

The teacher will be notified in writing of the time of the Appeals Board meeting. All parties involved in the Appeal will be subject to call for conferences regarding the evaluation.

The procedure to be used by the Appeals Board will be decided by the members of the Board with the stipulation that a secret vote of 5-2 will be required to reverse the principal's evaluation of the teacher.

## GENERAL DIRECTIONS FOR THE USE OF EVALUATION FORM AF-1

## CLASSROOM OBSERVATION GUIDE AND INSTRUMENT

The purpose of this instrument is to gather evidence of an objective nature to be used in the evaluation of a teacher. For this reason, the observer is asked to record exactly what the teacher and pupils are doing without making a value judgment as to the correctness of the activity. Even if it is known that the teacher under observation is capable of performing the activity and has been known to have done so in the past, this is not to be indicated on the observation instrument. This instrument is to be used to record exactly what is happening in the classroom.

There are forty-one questions and statements in the observation instrument. Seven of these are statements that require only a written description. The other thirty-four are questions that can be answered by checking the words "yes" or "no". For all questions answered by a negative answer, a "comment" is required. The "comment" is necessary to describe as closely as possible the situation that led the observer to use the negative answer.

The seven open-ended statements that require only a written answer are easily identified by the extra space immediately after the question and the fact that the words "yes," "no," and "comment" do not appear. Since this instrument is to be used in grades K-12 and in all classes, questions could not be devised that would cover equally all the situations.

Affirmative answers should be followed by a "comment" that will indicate the quantity involved. For example: number twenty-two asks if pupils show that they take responsibility seriously by exhibiting cooperation and acceptable behavior.

An observer may answer this question "yes" but indicate in the comment section that three students did not cooperate because they were too busy talking. The observer is indicating what part of the class is involved in the activity that makes him feel that an affirmative answer more nearly describes the situation than a negative answer.

The questions on the observation instrument have been divided into groups that correspond with the headings on the evaluation instrument. This has been done to make the transfer of information from the observation instrument to the evaluation easier although the questions and statements are not in a one-to-one ratio. The observation instrument provides a written description of the classroom which can be used by the evaluator in making judgments about the value of certain practices of the teacher in the classroom.

The questions and statements on the observation instrument have been identified as to the possibility that they will be observed. Since the questions are derived from criteria which are designed to identify the highly satisfactory, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory teacher, it must follow that the observers of the outstanding teacher would see him performing those actions that are identified as "not always observable" many more times than they would see the unsatisfactory teacher doing so. On the other hand, the unsatisfactory teacher would receive negative answers to those questions that are identified as "always observable." Highly satisfactory teachers would have a variety of answers on those statements that are to be completed by the observer, whereas the unsatisfactory teacher would receive a number of similar answers for each time he was observed.

After the observation, the teacher and the observer are to have a conference in which the teacher is to see the observation instrument and to discuss with the observer any disagreements that he may have with the observation. Corrections are to be made on the instrument; both parties are to sign it; and it is to be made a part of the teacher's cumulative file.

Oklahoma City Public Schools  
Personnel Department  
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Teacher \_\_\_\_\_ School \_\_\_\_\_

Grade \_\_\_\_\_ Subject \_\_\_\_\_ School Year 19 \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION GUIDE AND INSTRUMENT

Introduction

This form is to be used by principals, assistant principals, and supervisors as a guide to classroom observation and as an instrument to record as objectively as possible the activities that take the place in the classroom. Its purpose is to serve as a partial basis for the evaluator's assessment of teaching effectiveness. The personal opinion of the observer as to the value or appropriateness of the activities observed is neither called for nor desired. However, it is necessary that a degree of judgment be expressed by the observer in the last section of the guide which pertains to the teacher's personal factors.

Instructions

This form should be completed by the observer while actually making the classroom observation. The observer should attempt to describe only what is seen during this particular class session and not what is thought, or actually known, to have preceded or followed it. A short conference should be held with the teacher after the observation during which the teacher should be shown the completed form and allowed to make any observations desired.

Seven of the questions are open-ended and require a written statement describing the exact situation in the classroom. The other thirty-four questions require that the words yes or no be circled as the situation indicates. Negative answers for all the questions require a comment that will explain why the negative answers have been given. Comments for affirmative answers are also desirable. These comments should indicate quantity or degree of agreement between the question asked and the practice followed.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Teacher's Signature\*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Observer's Signature

\*This signature does not indicate agreement or satisfaction with the recorded statements of the observer.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Teacher Comments about the observation: (Use the reverse side of the paper if necessary)

Circumstances beyond control of the teacher that influenced learning (class just returned from fire drill, etc.) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

### 1.11 Knowledge of Subject Matter

1. Do the oral and/or written responses by the pupils indicate an understanding of the teacher's explanation and the subject or lesson under discussion?

Yes      No      Comment \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Always observable

Examples:

- a. Pupils respond to the teacher's explanation in any way.
  - b. Pupils do not respond, or pupils cannot respond.  
How many? Do you observe the reasons why they do not or cannot respond?
  - c. Most pupils begin the assignment of work without unnecessary question.
  - d. Pupils listen and are able to complete the assignment in a reasonable length of time.
  - e. Pupils' curiosity and interest in further exploration are aroused by teacher's assignment.
  - f. Pupils are working with interest and enthusiasm.
2. Does the teacher explain the underlying causes for events and phenomena associated with the subject matter area?    Yes      No      Comments \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_

Not always observable

Examples:

- a. The teacher is eager and willing to explain reasons for certain scientific practices, causes for certain happenings, etc.
- b. The teacher's answers to pupil questions seem adequate to the student and seem to satisfy his curiosity on the point in question.
- c. The teacher uses a variety of pertinent illustrations.
- d. The pupils volunteer to do further investigation.



3. Does the teacher explain the reasons why certain procedures are followed?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ Comments \_\_\_\_\_

---



---

Not always observable

Examples:

- a. The teacher makes explanations which satisfy the curiosity of the pupils with respect to underlying reasons. For example:

1. Reasons for using a particular form in writing a book report, theme, or outline.
2. Reasons for the pupils showing all the steps in solving problems.
3. Reasons for using a certain form for writing science experiments.

4. Does the teacher show interrelationships between his subject matter field and others? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ Comment \_\_\_\_\_
- 
- 

Not always observable

Examples:

- a. An attempt on the part of the teacher while working with pupils, to introduce learnings and solve problems by drawing from other subjects.

5. Are new developments, new publications, or community resources in the field of study brought out by the teacher? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ Comment \_\_\_\_\_
- 
- 

Not always observable

Examples:

- a. Current materials are being used in the classroom to aid in the work.
- b. Services of experts, community leaders and specialists are being used.
- c. References are made in the classroom to events of current importance in the community, nation, or world.
- d. New concepts and information are being presented.

## 1.12 Motivation of Pupils

6. Are all pupils in the classroom ready to begin to work when the class is supposed to begin?    Yes        No        Comment \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Always observable

Examples:

- a. All pupils are in the classroom at the time the class is supposed to begin: the opening of school; the beginning of each class; the resumption of work following recess; assembly; after a break.
- b. All pupils are supplied with textbooks, paper, notebooks, pencils, etc., ready to start work when they are supposed to.

7. Are there several volunteers for any task or to answer any questions?  
 Yes                      No                      Comment \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Not always observable

Examples:

- a. Pupils respond by raising hands or volunteering in other ways to answer questions or to aid with any tasks needing to be done
- b. Only the same few pupils respond.

8. Does the teacher stimulate pupils to ask questions about the subject matter under discussion?    Yes                      No                      Comment \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Not always observable

Examples:

- a. Pupils ask questions without restrictions.
- b. Pupils ask pertinent questions leading to general discussion rather than the teacher doing all the talking.
- c. The teacher asks questions which seem to stimulate further questions from pupils.
- d. The teacher asks thought provoking questions, not just questions for factual information.

9. Do any pupils report on voluntary outside investigations and/or observations?  
 Yes                      No                      Comment \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Not always observable

Examples:

- a. Pupils make reference to reading, experiments, trips, or other activities carried out on their own initiative--not assignment.
- b. Pupil reports are welcomed by the teacher.

10. Do the pupils seek additional aid from the class library and/or other supplementary sources without being told to do so by the teacher?    Yes            No  
 Comment \_\_\_\_\_
- 

Not always observable

Examples:

- a. Pupils use the:
1. dictionary
  2. books from the class library
  3. books from the school library
  4. reference and supplementary textbooks

11. Does the teacher show appreciation for any job well done by giving praise for outstanding work or by displaying the pupils' work?    Yes            No  
 Comment \_\_\_\_\_
- 

Always observable

Examples:

- a. Work of pupils is displayed in the classroom; in the hall.
- b. The teacher makes a point of giving commendation to an individual or to a group.

### 1.13 Organization of the Classroom

12. Does the teacher formulate specific class objectives and/or plans with pupil participation?    Yes            No            Comment \_\_\_\_\_
- 

Not always observable

Examples:

- a. On beginning a new unit of work, the pupils and teacher develop an outline of what is to be studied; pupils suggest procedures to use in explaining the specific topics.
- b. Pupils suggest exercises which may be used for class or homework. (science experiments, topics for English papers, and field trips)
- c. The pupils initiative is permitted to exert a great deal of control over either content or activity.
- d. The pupils move in and out of the room looking for and using reading materials, audio-visual materials, or art materials to be used in the above mentioned activities.

13. What opportunities are pupils given to make their desires or opinions known or to exhibit special abilities, knowledges, and skills? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Not always observable

Examples:

- a. Pupils make special reports, group reports, demonstrations; engage in classroom discussions; are involved in pupil-teacher planning or in group planning.

14. Is an orderly sequence followed with additional materials being introduced when appropriate?    Yes            No            Comment \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Always observable

Examples:

- a. The classwork follows a course of study, a TV guide, textbook, pupil-teacher plans, etc.

15. What teaching methods(s) is (are) used by the teacher? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Always observable

Examples:

- a. Teacher is using: special reports, class discussion, question-and-answer, lecture, problem solving, audio-visual, committees, unit of work, development of skills procedures, etc.

16. List the different types of teaching materials in use. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Always observable

Examples:

- a. Pupils and the teacher are using:
  1. films, film strips, opaque projectors, slides, viewmaster, TV, radio.
  2. books and publications such as library books, textbooks, reference materials, National Geographic, Time, Weekly Reader, Scholastic, Junior Review, etc.
  3. maps, globes, wall charts, flannel boards, magnetic boards, educational games, records, manipulative materials, science equipment, etc.

17. Does the teacher circulate among pupils and groups to check pupils' progress?

Yes

No

Comment \_\_\_\_\_

Always observable

Examples:

- a. The teacher circulates around the classroom to answer questions during study periods; between class recitations.
- b. The teacher actually stops to help a pupil by suggesting new or different materials or approach to the solution of a problem.

18. Does the teacher recognize and use opportunities for impromptu teaching by utilizing pupils' backgrounds, experiences, interests and current events in developing learning experiences?    Yes                  No                  Comment \_\_\_\_\_

Not always observable

Examples:

- a. The teacher recognizes and uses pupils who have traveled widely or have lived in foreign countries; exchange pupils; foreign students now living in the United States.
- b. The teacher uses such current incidents as space explorations to further and clarify work in science; to tie in with other subjects.
- c. The teacher is stimulated to comment by pupils' questions, observations, articles brought to school.

19. What appearance of organization is evident in the handling of routine matters?

Always observable

Examples:

- a. The collection of money is handled in an orderly manner.
- b. Monitors (pupils) handle many of the routine duties such as; collecting papers, taking attendance, sale of tickets, etc.
- c. The teacher takes roll by looking around the room and noting vacant chairs or by some other method.
- d. Everything is in readiness for classwork to begin.
- e. Pupils follow a planned routine on entering the room; such as sharpening pencils, gathering materials needed for the lesson before the class begins.

20. How long after the class is supposed to begin does the actual instruction start? \_\_\_\_\_ Minutes

### 1.21 Pupil Control

21. Does the teacher maintain control without the constant reprimanding of the pupils?      Yes              No              Comment \_\_\_\_\_

Not always observable

Examples:

- a. The teacher repeatedly corrects pupils' conduct (or behavior).
- b. The teacher repeatedly corrects the same pupils.
- c. The teacher handles discipline problems in the classroom as inconspicuously as possible.
- d. The teacher discusses behavior infractions with the pupil (s) involved in a friendly, fair manner.

22. Do the pupils show that they take responsibility seriously by exhibiting cooperation and acceptable behavior?      Yes      No      Comment \_\_\_\_\_

Always observable

Examples:

- a. Pupils follow directions given by the teacher.
- b. Pupils misbehave while the teacher is engaged somewhere else, in the classroom, or elsewhere.
- c. Pupils misbehave while the teacher is directing the class session.
- d. Misconduct on the part of one pupil brings a reprimand from another.

23. Are pupils allowed to move about the room as needed to get equipment or materials?      Yes              No              Comment \_\_\_\_\_

Always observable

Examples:

- a. Pupils move around the classroom to look for and to use additional materials.

24. What leadership opportunities are provided for the pupils? \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Not always observable

Examples:

- a. One or more pupils act as class leader.
- b. Pupils act as committee chairmen.
- c. A pupil acts as group leader.
- d. The teacher acts as consultant, exercising minor control with the class under designated pupil leadership.
- e. Pupils serve as room monitors, game captains, supply monitors, etc.

25. What method is used in handling tardy pupils? \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Not always observable

Examples:

- a. Pupils are openly reprimanded for tardiness.
- b. Pupils who are tardy are handled by the teacher without public notice.
- c. The teacher shows any type of favoritism in handling tardy pupils.
- d. The teacher condones tardies.
- e. The teacher handles each tardy case on its own merit and in compliance with building rules.

26. Do the pupils respect the rights of others to speak by listening attentively; do they wait for proper recognition before speaking?    Yes        No  
 Comment: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Always observable

Examples:

- a. Pupils wait for recognition from the teacher; from the class or group leader.
- b. The teacher recognizes a pupil by a nod of the head, by recognizing the pupil's raised hand, or other signals.
- c. Pupils speak when another is speaking.

## 1.22 Physical Conditions of the Room

27. What attempts are made by the teacher to make the physical conditions of the room conducive to good learning? \_\_\_\_\_

---



---



---

Always observable

Examples:

- a. Pupils are seated in groups conducive to interaction.
- b. Pupils move chairs or desks to obtain better vision of the chalkboard, to form a small group, to view TV, or to participate in discussion.
- c. The teacher and pupils engage in making and keeping the classroom neat, orderly, attractive, interesting.
- d. Control of lighting, heating, and fresh air is exercised.
- e. Materials for use are arranged in centers so they will be available for pupils when they need them.
- f. Bulletin boards are stimulating and are in keeping with work being done.
- g. Children's projects and work are displayed in an attractive area.

## 1.23 Teacher-Pupil Relationships

28. Are the pupils who are experiencing adjustment difficulties given special attention?    Yes                      No                      Comment \_\_\_\_\_

---



---

Not always observable

Examples:

- a. The teacher attempts to give special attention to pupils experiencing difficulty in self-control without allowing these pupils to become objects of class attention, or without allowing them to disrupt the learning situation.
- b. The teacher has to disrupt the class in some situations. (It may be necessary to disturb class proceedings to prevent injury to the pupil i.e. in shop, physical education, swimming, etc.)



29. Is there any pupil-teacher interaction? Yes No pupil-pupil interaction?  
Yes No Comment \_\_\_\_\_

Not always observable

Examples:

(Interaction in this question refers to a spontaneous discussion in which the role of the informant changes rapidly from teacher to pupil to other pupils. Teacher-question-pupil-answer situations cannot be considered interaction)

- a. Pupils shape and rephrase questions and comments, making additional pertinent comments.
- b. Pupils exchange ideas with each other; during class discussion, while the pupils are at work-stations; during small group discussion periods.

30. Do the pupils show respect for the teacher? (This refers to the attitude of the pupils toward the teacher as expressed by their behavior during class.)  
Yes No Comment \_\_\_\_\_

Not always observable

Examples:

- a. Pupils make remarks designed to draw attention to themselves.
- b. Pupils work on projects or assignments with little evidence of wandering attention.
- c. Pupils respond promptly to the teacher's direction.
- d. Pupils accept guidance and constructive criticism in a manner that shows their desire to improve.

1.3 Pupil Growth and Provision for Individual Needs and Abilities

31. Does the teacher provide for the pupil with special difficulties?  
Yes No Comment \_\_\_\_\_

Not always observable

Examples:

- a. Pupils with visual difficulties are seated so that material on chalkboard, TV or in a book may be seen without eyestrain.
- b. Pupils with visual difficulty are seated in correct relation to lighting. (window, overhead light)
- c. Pupils with physical handicaps are seated for their comfort and well being.
- d. Pupils with language difficulties or from another culture are seated with a "buddy", or pupil-helper.
- e. The teacher and pupils indicate by tone and inflection that they respect the individual worth of each other. (pupils with special difficulties)
- f. Teacher and pupils indicate by opportunities given to make contributions that they respect the culture and the right of the pupil to make his contribution.

- g. Pupils with learning difficulties are given assignments and tasks where some measure of success is possible.
- h. Pupils with emotional problems are seated where they cause the least possible disturbance to the rest of the group.

32. Are pupils able to do individual assignments with only a minimum amount of additional help?      Yes                      No                      Comment \_\_\_\_\_

---

Not always observable

Examples:

- a. The teacher is making clear and concise explanations to the pupils.
- b. Pupils are encouraged to ask questions.
- c. The teacher gives more than one type of explanation when pupils encounter difficulty.
- d. Pupils begin to work as soon as the assignment is given.

33. Does the teacher reassure the pupils by calling attention to their past achievements when difficulty is encountered?      Yes                      No                      Comment \_\_\_\_\_

---

Not always observable

Examples:

- a. The teacher exhibits faith in a pupil's ability.
- b. The teacher helps the pupil to realize that his best is the desired result and that perfection is not always possible.
- c. The teacher guides the pupil to accept the fact that improvement over the previous effort is the desired goal.
- d. The teacher points out past successes and shows how such learnings can apply to immediate tasks and problems.
- e. The teacher and pupils accept the "right" of the pupil to make a mistake and then to learn from the mistake.

34. Do the pupils contribute to the general appearance and attractiveness of the room?      Yes                      No                      Comment \_\_\_\_\_

---

Always observable

Examples:

- a. Pupils practice good housekeeping by picking up paper, replacing materials neatly on shelves, refraining from marking on walls and desks, etc.

## 2.3 Personal Factors

35. Does the teacher exhibit patience and poise? Yes No Comment\_\_\_\_\_

Always observable

Examples:

- a. The teacher handles the classroom effectively during adverse as well as normal situations.
- b. The teacher has patience in continuing attempts to make some point known.

36. Does the teacher speak distinctly? Yes No Comment\_\_\_\_\_

Always observable

Examples:

- a. The teacher enunciates clearly.
- b. The teacher speaks in a pleasant, firm, and well-modulated voice.

37. Is the teacher's voice audible throughout the room? Yes No  
Comment\_\_\_\_\_

Always observable

Examples:

- a. The pupils evidence difficulty in hearing instructions given by the teacher.

38. Does the teacher use acceptable English? Yes No Comment\_\_\_\_\_

Always observable (with the possible exception of foreign language classes)

Examples:

- a. The teacher uses good English within the range of pupil's understanding.
- b. The teacher is able to use a vocabulary that is suited to the needs of pupils.

39. Does it appear evident that the teacher pays attention to grooming and avoids extremes in dress? Yes No Comment\_\_\_\_\_

Always observable

Examples:

- a. The teacher's grooming and manner of dress reflect neatness, attractiveness, and good taste.

40. Does the teacher appear rested and ready for work?    Yes            No

Comment \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Always observable

Examples:

- a. The teacher participates in activities with the pupils.
- b. The teacher stands and moves about the classroom most of the time rather than sitting at the desk.
- c. The teacher fulfills assigned responsibilities in the halls, playgrounds, and cafeterias.

41. If the classroom situation changes abruptly, is the teacher able to handle the situation?    Yes            No            Comment \_\_\_\_\_

Not always observable

Examples:

- a. The teacher remains in control of class in spite of influences outside the classroom.
- b. The teacher retains poise and self-control even in frustrating and difficult situations.

## GENERAL DIRECTIONS FOR THE USE OF EVALUATION FORM AF-2

## PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND ACTIVITY RECORD

The professional growth and activity record is a form devised to record information not obtainable on form AF-1 which is needed to help complete the evaluation. Such items as 3.1, professional growth; 3.3, participation in student activities; 3.4, committee and duty assignments; and 3.5, curriculum work need to be evaluated by the principal.

This form will be given to the teachers before their self-evaluation forms are due in March. Teachers who are being evaluated by the principal will need to present this form to the principal sometime before the final conference in order that this information may be properly evaluated. The principal will be the best judge of how much time he will need to evaluate this information, and shall set the date accordingly. All other teachers will hand in this form along with form AF-3 on or before March 31.

Form AF-2 will be filed in the cumulative file to present a permanent record of the professional growth and activities of the teacher.

After all forms are received, the information from parts c and d of statement seven will be tabulated and sent to the Director of Personnel.

Oklahoma City Public Schools  
Personnel Department  
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Teacher \_\_\_\_\_ School \_\_\_\_\_

Grade \_\_\_\_\_ Subject \_\_\_\_\_ School Year 19 \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_

PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND ACTIVITY RECORD

1. In-Service Training:

A. Formal

Courses

Institution

Sem. Hours

B. Informal

Type

Area Covered

Clock Hours

2. Work on system-wide committees:

3. Work on local school committees:

4. Extra-curricular activities and supervisory responsibilities:

5. Membership and office in professional education organizations:

6. Activities other than the above which you feel have contributed to your effectiveness in teaching:
7. In the space provided, or on another sheet of paper, please describe:
- a. The sort of help, if any, which you have received this year and which you found to be valuable.
  - b. The sort of additional help which you feel would be most likely to improve the quality of your work.
  - c. The suggestions you would make for the improvement of administration and/or supervision on either a system-wide or local school basis.
  - d. The suggestions you would make for the improvement of the appraisal system.

## GENERAL DIRECTIONS FOR THE USE OF EVALUATION FORM AF-3

## EVALUATION OF TEACHER PERFORMANCE

The main purpose for the use of form AF-3 is for the teacher and the principal to determine cooperatively the areas in which the teacher needs to improve during the school year. This is to be done in a professional manner with both parties involved seeking to improve instruction by strengthening those areas where both parties can agree that strengthening is needed.

All teachers will be given a copy of this form and instructions for completing it in advance of December 15. This is the date by which preliminary conferences will be held with all probationary teachers and the non-probationary teachers who are being evaluated by the principal. All other teachers will return their copies on or before this date. The principal will complete the form for all teachers being evaluated by him. Code markings will be placed in Column One.

At the conference, the principal and the teacher will compare their evaluations. Areas of weakness will be determined and plans made to improve them.

On or before March 31, the principal will hand the forms back to the teachers for completion of the evaluation process. Teachers will complete Column Two. The edge of the form when folded under will conceal Column One so that the marks made at the beginning of the year will not influence the marks made at the end of the year.



The principal will also complete Column Two of form AF-3. At the conference on or before March 31, the principal and the teacher, being formally evaluated, will determine if weaknesses have been improved.

Only three marks (not including NA) will be used in evaluating the teacher. The marks mean exactly what their definitions say and are not to be construed as grades or rewards.

The following items do not appear on Evaluation Forms AF-1 or AF-2:

- 1.314 Utilizes school records and tests in ascertaining the needs and abilities of the pupil, in planning work, and guiding the learning process.

#### 1.32 STUDENT EVALUATION PROCEDURES

- 1.321 Uses a variety of methods and techniques of evaluation which furthers the objectives of course
- 1.322 Designs evaluations so that they help the pupil locate his strengths and weaknesses

#### 1.33 STUDENT GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING

- 1.331 Accepts the guidance of students as a primary responsibility
- 1.332 Acquires necessary knowledge and techniques to give counseling assistance and seeks the advice of specialists to supplement these knowledges and techniques
- 1.333 Provides time and sympathetic attention to student requests for guidance
- 1.334 Helps pupils to understand and accept their differences

- 1.335 Assists pupils in defining realistic goals of an educational and vocational nature

## 2.1 COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIPS

- 2.21 Interprets to parents the significance of the grading and reporting practices
- 2.22 Interprets to the pupil's parents the extent of his educational growth
- 2.23 Interprets school programs and policies to the public effectively
- 2.24 Develops an effective and harmonious working relationship with parents and community
- 2.25 Exemplifies the democratic way of life both in the classroom and as a citizen

## 2.3 PERSONAL FACTORS

- 2.32 Accepts and uses criticism in a constructive manner
- 2.39 Has the physical strength and vigor to meet the demands of the work
- 2.41 Adopts new procedures without frustration
- 2.43 Demonstrates a positive enthusiastic attitude

## 3.1 PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

- 3.18 Possesses a broad grasp of subject and related fields

### 3.2 PROFESSIONAL PRACTICES

- 3.21 Develops lesson plans to guide himself or another teacher in teaching the class
- 3.22 Completes required reports on pupils, property, and routine matters efficiently and promptly
- 3.23 Anticipates needs for teaching materials and uses resourcefulness in providing them
- 3.24 Understands, accepts, and practices standards of professional conduct

### 3.6 SUPPORT OF SCHOOL POLICIES

- 3.61 Supports existing school policies
- 3.62 Makes constructive suggestions through appropriate channels for the improvement of school policies

Information needed to support the evaluation made on these items will have to be gathered from a number of sources. The health of the teacher can be determined by keeping a record of absences. The use of lesson plans can be easily determined by asking teachers to show their lesson plans for the next period of time. Anecdotal records will be kept of telephone calls, visits from parents, and observations of teachers in staff meetings, teacher's lunch room, and in the teachers' lounge. Such written records will be dated and filed in the cumulative folder as they are made. It is imperative that teachers know why the principal is deciding on one code instead of another in completing form AF-3.

After the final conference, the teacher and the principal will sign the principal's copy of the evaluation form. The teacher's signature will indicate only that he is aware of the evaluation and will not indicate that he necessarily agrees with it.

The space marked "Imposed Variables" is available for the teacher to indicate conditions over which he has no control and which may prevent him from doing his best. Such conditions might be:

1. Teaching in a minor field
2. Lack of teaching materials
3. Noise and disturbance caused by building or remodeling program
4. Teaching a grade or subject that he does not feel qualified to teach

The Code NA will be used only in those instances where the other three codes do not apply. Since this form is to be used to cover all grades and all subjects, it is very possible that some of the criteria will not apply to a particular situation. It is not to be used to prevent an evaluation from being made.

Teacher \_\_\_\_\_ School \_\_\_\_\_

Grade \_\_\_\_\_ Subject \_\_\_\_\_ School Year 19 \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_

AN EVALUATION OF TEACHING PERFORMANCE

Introduction

This form may be used by the teacher for self-evaluation. Also, it is to be used by the principal to indicate what he believes are the strongest and weakest areas of the teacher's performance. It is understood that all teachers using this form will check some items as their weakest, and that this is simply an indication that improvement is desired, not that the performance is unsatisfactory. The self-evaluation seeks only to indicate what the teachers feel about their own performance and to stimulate the growth which comes from a systematic review of desirable teaching practices. The code is specifically designed to prevent comparison of one teacher with another.

Instructions

Teachers will check column 1 at the beginning of the school year and column 2 by March 1st of the same school year. The form will then be placed in the teacher's cumulative folder. The principal will also fill out a form on all probationary teachers and the non-probationary scheduled for a third year evaluation. He will refer to the cumulative folder for the information and evidence upon which to base his judgment as to the relative strength of the teacher in each of these areas. A conference will be held with the teacher at which time a comparison will be made of the two forms which have been completed independently. The principal's completed form will then be placed in the teacher's cumulative folder.

The following code will be used in checking the items on this form:

- + = the teacher's strongest areas of competence
- 0 = neither one of the strongest, nor one of the weakest areas
- = the teacher's weakest areas of competence
- NA = not applicable at this time

\_\_\_\_\_  
Teacher or Principal's Signature\*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Evaluator's Signature

\*This signature does not necessarily indicate agreement or satisfaction with the evaluation.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Imposed Variables: (Factors beyond the control of the teacher which may have had an influence on optimum performance) (Use reverse side of paper if necessary)



1.23 Teacher-Pupil relationships

- 1.231 Shows a sincere respect for pupils as individuals
- 1.232 Is accepted and respected by pupils
- 1.233 Maintains desirable communicative relationships with pupils


1.3 Pupil Growth

- 1.31 Attention to individuals needs and abilities
  - 1.311 Is aware of the growth and development patterns characteristic of the group taught
  - 1.312 Designs subject matter content, teaching techniques and materials to meet the needs, interests, and abilities of the individual pupils
  - 1.313 Makes differentiated assignments which meet the needs, interests, and abilities of the individual pupils
  - 1.314 Utilizes school records and tests in ascertaining the needs and abilities of the pupil, in planning work, and guiding the learning process
- 1.32 Student Evaluation Procedures
  - 1.321 Uses a variety of methods and techniques of evaluation which furthers the objectives of the course
  - 1.322 Designs evaluations so that they help the pupil locate his strengths and weaknesses
- 1.33 Student Guidance and Counseling
  - 1.331 Accepts the guidance of students as a primary responsibility
  - 1.332 Acquires necessary knowledge and techniques to give counseling assistance and seeks the advice of specialists to supplement these knowledges and techniques
  - 1.333 Provides time and sympathetic attention for student requests for guidance
  - 1.334 Helps pupils to understand and accept their differences
  - 1.335 Assists pupils in defining realistic goals of an educational and vocational nature
  - 1.336 Interprets to pupils the significance of the grading and reporting practices
  - 1.337 Interprets to pupil the extent of his educational growth







Oklahoma City Public Schools  
Personnel Department  
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Teacher \_\_\_\_\_ School \_\_\_\_\_

Grade \_\_\_\_\_ Subject \_\_\_\_\_ School Year 19 \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_

THE EVALUATION OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS  
PRINCIPAL'S REPORT

Introduction

The assessment of the effectiveness of the teaching performance of each of the teachers in the Oklahoma City School System is to be made by the respective building principals. This form is to be used in making that assessment. The judgments which must be made in completing this form should be based on the principal's copy of form AF-3 and the information regarding the teaching performance which is collected during the year and kept in the teacher's cumulative folder. The utilization of this information as the basis for the principal's evaluation should tend to make that evaluation more objective, accurate, and valid.

Instructions

This form should be completed for all unsatisfactory or borderline teachers not later than March 1 and for all other teachers not later than March 31. It is requested that the principal rate the teacher on each of the eleven categories listed on the following pages by circling the appropriate number. He should refer to his copy of form AF-3 for the pertinent information upon which to base his rating. The overall assessment of the effectiveness of the teacher should not be an average of those eleven categories but should reflect the professional judgment of the principal. The categories cannot be averaged because they are not of equal importance and a low level performance in just one of the important areas can render the teacher's services ineffective and unsatisfactory.

The following information may be of assistance to the principal as he makes his assessment of the effectiveness of the teachers in his buildings:

A pilot study was recently completed among the elementary principals in the Oklahoma City School System to determine the relative degree of importance attached to the selected teacher behaviors and characteristics which are related to teaching effectiveness. They considered each of the eleven areas to be important. However, it was possible to group these areas into four broad classifications. The first was viewed as the most important with the second, third, and fourth, in that order, being considered as slightly less important.

The first classification was based on the behaviors and characteristics having to do primarily with the "on-the-job", "in-the-classroom" aspects category were:

1. Teaching techniques
2. Classroom environment
3. Pupil growth

The second most important classification was concerned with the personal and professional qualifications and characteristics of the teacher. The following areas fell into this category:

1. Professional practices
2. Staff relationships
3. Professional growth
4. Personal factors

The third and least important of the classifications was concerned with the "extra-duty" and "outside-the-classroom" activities and assignments of the teacher:

1. Participation in the pupil activity program
2. Community relationships
3. Curriculum work
4. School committee and supervisory assignments

The above information may be helpful to the principal as he attempts to determine the weight to be placed on each of the following areas of teaching effectiveness:

<u>Major Areas of Teaching Effectiveness</u>	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Highly Satisfactory
1. Teaching techniques (This includes knowledge of subject matter, the motivation of pupils, and the organization of work as exemplified by planning, methods and materials used, and the structure of the class period.)	1	2	3
2. Pupil Growth (This includes attention to individual needs and abilities, pupil evaluation, and guidance and counseling)	1	2	3
3. Classroom environment (This includes control of the pupils, the physical conditions of the room, and the teacher-pupil relationships)	1	2	3
4. Professional practices (This includes the development of lesson plans, completion of required reports on time, the practicing of standards of professional conduct, the support of school policies or the making of suggestions for their improvement through appropriate channels)	1	2	3
5. Staff relationships	1	2	3
6. Professional growth (This includes participation in professional organizations; attendance at workshops, summer school, reading, and travel; participation in the cultural and recreational activities of the community)	1	2	3

- |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| 6. Staff relationships  | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 7. Community relationships (This includes parent contacts and relationships, an understanding and acceptance of community expectations for teachers, interpretation of school policies to public, etc.)                     | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 8. Professional growth (This includes participation in professional organizations; attendance at workshops, summer school, reading, and travel; participation in the cultural and recreational activities of the community. | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 9. Participation in pupil activity program (This includes the assumption of responsibility for activities in this part of the total school program)   | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 10. School committee and supervisory assignments (This includes membership on faculty and system-wide committees, the supervision of halls, cafeteria, playground, etc.)  | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 11. Curriculum work (This includes work on system-wide or state-wide study groups, departmental committees, etc.)   | 1 | 2 | 3 |

On the basis of the information and evidence accumulated, I have determined that (Mr., Miss, Mrs.) \_\_\_\_\_ services as a teacher are \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Teacher's Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Principal's Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Additional Comments by Principal:

---

Additional Comments by Teacher:

Oklahoma City Public Schools  
Personnel Department  
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Teacher \_\_\_\_\_ School \_\_\_\_\_

Grade \_\_\_\_\_ Subject \_\_\_\_\_ School Year 19 \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_

EVALUATION OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS  
PRINCIPAL'S REPORTIntroduction

The assessment of the effectiveness of the teaching performance of each of the teachers in the Oklahoma City School System is to be made by the respective building principals. This form is to be used in making that assessment. The judgments which must be made in completing this form should be based on the principal's copy of form AF-3 and the information regarding the teaching performance which is collected during the year and kept in the teacher's cumulative folder. The utilization of this information as the basis for the principal's evaluation should tend to make that evaluation more objective, accurate, and valid.

Instructions

This form should be completed for all unsatisfactory or border-line teachers not later than March 1 and for all other teachers not later than March 31. It is requested that the principal rate the teacher on each of the eleven categories listed on the following page by circling the appropriate number. He should refer to the form AF-3 completed by the principal for the pertinent information upon which to base this rating. The overall assessment of the effectiveness of the teacher should not be an average of those eleven categories but instead should reflect the professional judgment of the principal. The categories cannot be averaged because they are not of equal importance and a low level performance in just one of the important areas can render the teacher's services ineffective and unsatisfactory.

The following information may be of assistance to the principal as he makes his assessment of the effectiveness of the teachers in his building;

A pilot study was recently completed among the secondary principals in the Oklahoma City School System to determine the relative degree of importance attached to the selected areas of teacher behaviors and characteristics which are related to teaching effectiveness. They considered each of the eleven areas to be important. However, it was possible to group these areas into three broad classifications. The first was viewed as the most important with the second and third, in that order, being considered as slightly less important.

The first classification was based on the behaviors and characteristics having to do primarily with the "on-the-job", "in-the-classroom" aspects of teaching. The areas classified as falling into this first and most important category were:

1. Teaching techniques
2. Pupil growth
3. Classroom environment

The second most important classification was concerned with the personal and professional qualifications and characteristics of the teacher. The following areas fell into this category:

1. Professional practices
2. Staff relationships
3. Professional growth
4. Personal factors

The third and least important of the classifications was concerned with the "extra-duty" and "outside-the-classroom" activities and assignments of the teacher:

1. Participation in the pupil activity program
2. Community relationships
3. Curriculum work
4. School committee and supervisory assignments

The above information may be helpful to the principal as he attempts to determine the weight to be placed on each of the following areas of teaching effectiveness:

<u>Major Areas of Teaching Effectiveness</u>	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Highly Satisfactory
1. Teaching techniques (This includes knowledge of subject matter, the motivation of pupils, and the organization of work as exemplified by planning, methods and materials used, and the structure of the class period.)	1	2	3
2. Pupil Growth (This includes attention to individual needs and abilities, pupil evaluation, and guidance and counseling)	1	2	3
3. Classroom environment (This includes control of the pupils, the physical conditions of the room, and the teacher-pupil relationships)	1	2	3
4. Professional practices (This includes the development of lesson plans, completion of required reports on time, the practicing of standards of professional conduct, the support of school policies or the making of suggestions for their improvement through appropriate channels)	1	2	3
5. Staff relationships	1	2	3
6. Professional growth (This includes participation in professional organizations; attendance at workshops, summer school, reading, and travel; participation in the cultural and recreational activities of the community)	1	2	3

- 3 -

- |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| 7. Personal factors (This includes speech, personal appearance, physical stamina, emotional stability, adaptability, interest, and enthusiasm)  | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 8. Participation in pupil activity program (This includes the assumption of responsibility for activities in this part of the total school program)   | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 9. Community Relationships (This includes parent contacts and relationships, an understanding and acceptance of community expectations for teachers, interpretation of school policies to public, etc.) | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 10. Curriculum work (This includes work on system-wide or state-wide study groups, departmental committees, etc.)   | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 11. School committee and supervisory assignments (This includes membership on faculty and system-wide committees, supervision of halls, cafeteria, playground, etc.)                                    | 1 | 2 | 3 |

On the basis of the information and evidence accumulated, I have determined that (Mr., Miss, Mrs.) \_\_\_\_\_ services as a teacher are \_\_\_\_\_.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Teacher's Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Principal's Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Additional Comments by Principal:



---

Additional Comments by Teacher:

APPENDIX C

## FINAL REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE C

Interest in the evaluation of teacher performance for the determination of salaries is by no means new in United States educational history. Dr. E. C.

Elliot said:

The relation of compensation to quality of service has been and will continue to be one of the perplexing issues confronting those immediately responsible for the improvement of the teaching corps.

As timely as his conclusion may seem with reference to the current merit rating controversy in public education circles, the fact is the statement was made over forty years ago.

Merit rating began to attract attention in the early 1900's. As early as 1906, Superintendent Van Sickle of the Baltimore School System made an address at the NEA convention in which he indicated that:

Any increase in salary based upon length of service can be defended only in so far as it can be shown that the length of service conduces to greater efficiency in the work of the school room.

One of the very earliest merit salary programs was instituted in Newton, Massachusetts during the first decade of the twentieth century by the Superintendent of Schools, Frank E. Spaulding. Since that time interest in merit salary plans has fluctuated considerably. During periods of teacher shortage and economic depression, merit rating programs in education have historically failed. However, periods of spiraling prosperity tend to revive interest in merit pay and to stimulate experimentation in this area by local school systems.

- 2 -

There is, at this time, an increasing interest on the part of the public and the profession in merit rating for salaried purposes. In fact, it has been suggested by some sources that present interest is greater than ever before. Much of this interest is focused on the many issues involved in merit rating. The following are the most significant of the basic issues involved in merit salary proposals:

1. Is teaching the type of profession in which public policy will favor remuneration varying with the degree of an individual's competency and success?
2. Can we agree upon the objective, measurable, and determinative items that will be used to appraise the merit of individual teaching?
3. Can we develop instruments and procedures which can be used in the measurement of these items?
4. Can competently trained supervisory personnel be provided to evaluate the degree of merit in teaching performance?
5. What shall be the staff set-up that will determine individual salary differentials?
6. How shall merit differentials be applied?
7. What will be the effects of differentiated salaries upon the teachers themselves? Their basic motives? Their esprit de corps?

The renewed interest in merit rating has caused an upsurge in the quantity of material produced. It has produced one or more articles in the leading school administration journals almost every month. Several doctoral dissertations are completed every year in this area of interest. Reports, guides, and descriptions of merit plans in operation are issued frequently by local school districts. Comprehensive reports of studies and investigations such as those done by the New England School Development Council and the Utah State Merit Committee have been recently published.

A considerable amount of the professional writing on this subject from 1940 to the present must be characterized as conjecture and opinion. Many of the

- 3 -

articles are mere statements of position or viewpoint of an individual or group with very little objective information being contributed. The supporters of merit pay use arguments based primarily upon principles and needs. Those against it indicate the unsolved practical problems of application while accepting merit pay in principle. The only consideration of the opposing viewpoint in these articles is usually confined to disproving the claims and statements made by the supporters of that viewpoint. While these articles were written by persons who have a sincere regard for education, deep-seated prejudices and biases are quite often in evidence and severely limit the value and usefulness of the material contained therein.

One result and a possible dividend of all the arguments and opinion expressed in articles concerned with merit pay is that the advantages and disadvantages are being more sharply defined and examined than ever before. Some of the advantages now being listed for merit pay are:

1. It leads to cooperative study of an important personnel problem which may result in improved understanding.
2. It attracts more competent young people to the profession.
3. It would make it unnecessary for good teachers to hold extra jobs to supplement their teaching salary.
4. It would make it possible for superior teachers to reach highest pay levels without leaving the profession or going into administration.
5. It discourages incompetency.
6. It secures support on the part of laymen for improved salary schedules.
7. It rewards teachers in a manner more commensurate with their contribution.

A number of disadvantages to merit pay have been stated by those opposing it.

Those advantages are:

1. It will cost more to initiate and implement than it will ever be worth.
2. It is not possible to evaluate teachers objectively and accurately.
3. It undermines the foundations of morale by creating professional jealousy and competition instead of cooperativeness.
4. It emphasizes conformity to the preconceived ideas of some person or group of persons.
5. It violates sound principles of teaching.
6. It does irreparable damage to the constructive and cooperative relationship between the teacher, principal, and supervisor.
7. It does not improve instruction.

The amount of useful research on merit rating is slight. While there has been a great deal of trial and error experimentation, little of what could be called basic research has been done. That research which has been done tends to be conflictive and inconsistent. After nearly five years of study and research, the Utah Merit Study Committee stated in 1959 that:

Merit salary programming is feasible and desirable in school systems which have developed appropriate evaluation procedures and which have established a set of basic conditions.

In contrast, William A. McCall concluded at the end of a research project in North Carolina in 1952:

This research failed to find any system of measuring teacher merit which the writer is willing to recommend be adopted as a basis for paying the salaries of all teachers.

Actually, not much more is known today than thirty years ago about merit pay.

While there may be ever-growing interest in and experimentation with merit salary schedules presently, extensive use has not been made of these schedules in the last several years. Figures released by the NEA Research Division showed that only 16.6% of all urban school districts included in their salary schedules authorization to recognize quality-of-service. However, the fact that most of

- 5 -

the existing merit-salary plans have been originated in the past ten years probably indicates that the practice may be in the stage of initial growth.

The members of Subcommittee C have read much of the available information about merit salary schedules and have become fairly knowledgeable in this field. They discovered that a number of school districts have had successful experience in employing merit salary plans over a period of years. (Ithaca, New York; West Hartford, Connecticut; Summit, New Jersey; and Ladue, Missouri) Evidence was also found of the abandonment of merit salary plans by a number of other school districts. (Schenectady, New York; Greenwich, Connecticut; Irvington, New Jersey; and Webster Groves, Missouri) From a thorough study of this material, the subcommittee reached a conclusion that the presence or absence of certain basic conditions are highly significant to the success or failure of a merit salary plan. Therefore, in the opinion of this committee, the feasibility of such a plan is dependent upon the presence of these basic conditions:

1. A sound evaluation program. Such a program is possible only when the job of the principal is defined to include the responsibility for the improvement of teaching which makes it necessary for him to get into the classrooms frequently. The program must utilize correct procedures for collecting and recording accurate, relevant data by persons with specialized training. The data would then serve as the basis for a later judgement by the principal of the teacher.
2. A good basic salary structure. Such a salary structure would compare with those of the higher paying school districts in this and neighboring states. It would provide for:
  1. An entrance salary high enough to compete in the market for the kind of people the district wants as beginning teachers.
  2. An allowance for experience and additional training which would allow the district to compete for those people it wants who are not beginners.
  3. An increment pattern which recognizes some of the facts about teacher career patterns. A salary schedule which conforms to these criteria would look like this:

B.A. Minimum	B.A. Maximum	M.A. Minimum	M.A. Maximum	No. Steps
\$4500	\$6300	\$4800	\$7000	15

- 6 -

This base salary schedule while currently applicable would need to be revised from year to year as adjustments are made in teachers' salaries in this and neighboring states.

After these conditions have been established, it is then time for a school district to consider how merit pay may be properly introduced into the total salary structure.

If one may deal lightly with Shakespeare, it may be said that:

To merit pay or not to merit pay,  
That is the question,  
If to merit pay, how to merit pay,  
That is the problem. --Hinds

This verse has expressed most clearly and succinctly a major part of the task assigned to Subcommittee C which was to devise a plan for relating the quality-of-service to the teachers basic salary schedule. This report contains the plan devised by this committee and represents its best thinking on this matter.

The first task attempted by the subcommittee, following their review of the available material in the field of merit pay, was to develop a set of principles upon which a merit salary plan might be based. The principles, then, served as a guide in the development of the plan proposed by this group.

The literature is replete with reports of the policies, techniques, and practices of school systems which have successfully utilized merit salary programs. In addition, frequent reference is found to the hazards to be avoided and the principles to be followed in the development of merit salary programs. The following principles adopted by this committee were derived from these sources and reflect the committee's judgment as to the characteristics that a good program should possess:

1. A base salary schedule which is comparable with those of other high-paying school districts in this and neighboring states should be provided before a program is attempted.



2. The school board and community must know that such a program will increase the operating costs of the school district and enough funds should be available to pay for the awards to all staff members who qualify.
3. Superior service should be but one of several factors considered in determining the yearly salary of staff members who qualify.
4. The recognition given for superior service should be worth striving for and commensurate with the value placed upon the service.
5. Continued incompetence or ineffective service should be penalized by dismissal.
6. The initial evaluation and recommendation for the superior service recognition should be made in the individual building but the final evaluation and recommendation should be made on a system-wide basis.
7. The recognition once given should extend from year to year.
8. The superior service recognition and the penalties for ineffective service should be based on the results of the evaluation process and not on percentage quotas.
9. The superior service recognition should be available to all staff members who have passed the probationary status.
10. A staff member should not be required to accept the superior services recognition.
11. A staff member who feels that he should have been recommended for superior service recognition may appeal.

The next major problem undertaken by the subcommittee was the study and investigation of the various types of devices used to relate the quality of service to the salary schedule. Even though there are some basic similarities common to certain plans, there are wide differences among many of the plans. The titles used to describe merit plans are both varied and descriptive: Professional Salary Plan, Career Increment Plan, Notable Service Plan and CARESS. (The latter stands for the first letters of Committee for Additional Remuneration for Exceptional Service to Students.)

However, the types of merit programs tend to utilize one or a combination of several of the following devices:

1. Devices which reward superior teachers:
  - A. Provision for accelerated progress toward the established maximum in a regular salary schedule by means of large size or multiple increments.
  - B. Provision for additional increments referred to as super-maximums is already at the maximum.
  - C. Bonus payments which are a one-year grant for exceptional service.
  - D. A track system which is the superimposition of a series of tracks based on merit ratings upon a preparation-experience schedule. (Similar to the plan followed in higher education)
  - E. Total raise is dependent upon the merit factor.
2. Devices which penalize the ineffective teachers:
  - A. The withholding of increments.
  - B. The granting of smaller-than-normal increments.
  - C. A reduction in salary.
  - D. Dismissal.

The subcommittee was able to find examples of almost all of these devices being used in specific school districts. However, the information available to the committee indicated that for rewarding superior teachers the two devices most commonly used were: acceleration and super-maximums. The utilization of these two devices offers the possibility of merit increment to the greatest percentage of the teaching staff. These considerations led the subcommittee to select these two devices for inclusion in our plan. In addition, the withholding of increments and dismissal were chosen as the most appropriate devices for use in penalizing the continually ineffective teacher.

The following plan for relating quality-of-service to the salary schedule is submitted by Subcommittee C. It is structured on the two basic conditions to the successful operation of a merit salary plan which were mentioned on page five.

### The Review Board

A review board of nine members shall be established to review the evaluations of superior teachers made by the principals. The names of teachers, principals, and schools, should be deleted from the evaluation material submitted to the review board and a code number used instead. The review board shall recommend to the superintendent of schools those teachers whose evaluations show the qualities of a superior teacher. All teachers who qualify for superior service recognition shall receive it.

The board shall consist of the following nine members: the personnel director, the directors of elementary and secondary education, one elementary and one secondary principal, and two elementary and two secondary teachers.

The teachers and the principals who serve on the review board shall be selected by the superintendent of schools. One secondary teacher, one elementary teacher, and one principal shall be chosen each year for a two year term. The initiation of this program will necessitate that one elementary teacher, one secondary teacher, and one principal serve for only a one-year term.

### Provision for the Superior Teacher

Acceleration toward the maximum salary for the superior teacher shall begin with a triple increment in addition to the regular increment after completing the three year probationary period. The superior teacher is eligible for the acceleration increment once given continues from year to year.

A super-maximum increment shall be granted to the teacher rated superior following the first evaluation after the maximum salary is achieved. This increment shall be in the amount of \$500, and a superior teacher shall be entitled to a maximum of three such increments, or a total of \$1500 above the normal maximum salary. Once given, the super-maximum increment continues from year to year.

### Provision for the Ineffective Teacher

The teacher judged to be ineffective shall not receive the annual increment, and shall be placed on probation. If satisfactory improvement is not forthcoming by the end of the second year of probation, the teacher shall be dismissed. Supervisory assistance must be provided so that the teacher has every opportunity to improve the quality-of-service.

APPENDIX D

October 25, 1961

Mr. Garwin Fleming  
Principal Classen High School  
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Dear Mr. Fleming:

The purpose of this letter is to inform you that you have been selected to serve as a member of the Research Subcommittee C which is an important component of the committee mentioned in the accompanying statement based on the proposed content of a forthcoming issue of the Superintendent's Bulletin.

I am sure that you, as I, recognize the complexity of the problem and are aware of the difficulties that may be encountered in arriving at a satisfactory solution, but I feel that its importance justifies the expenditure of the extra time and effort which will have to be made.

It is the considered opinion of your professional colleagues and myself that you have the interest as well as the necessary requisites to make a significant contribution to the attempt to solve this most important problem.

Please inform my office by telephone before 1:00 p.m. on November 1, if you will accept this assignment. Miss Noba French, commercial teacher at Capitol Hill High School, has consented to serve as chairman of this committee and you will be contacted soon and advised as to the date and time of the first meeting of this subcommittee. I will look forward to seeing you at the first meeting.

Sincerely,

Jack F. Parker

JFP:d