University of Nebraska at Omaha
DigitalCommons@UNO

Student Work

8-1-1987

An Evaluation of the Pilot Appraisal System Adopted by the Omaha Public Schools

Sharon M. Watts
University of Nebraska at Omaha

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork

An Evaluation of the Pilot Appraisal System

Adopted by the Omaha Public Schools

———————————

Presented to the Graduate Faculty

University of Nebraska at Omaha

———————————

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

the Degree Specialist in Education

University of Nebraska at Omaha

———————————

by

Sharon M. Watts

August 1987

UMI Number: EP74132

UMI

Dissertation Publishing

UMI EP74132

ProQuest®

FIELD PROJECT ACCEPTANCE

Accepted for the Graduate Faculty, University of Nebraska, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Specialist in Education, University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Supervisory Committee

Name   Department

Edward Padller   _TED_

Blaine E. Ward   _Ed. Admin._

Darrell Kellams
Chairman

_8/18/87_
Date

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

The writer wishes to acknowledge the invaluable help and assistance that she received from Dr. Darrell Kellams, Dr. Blaine Ward, Dr. Edward Sadler, Dr. Thomas Petrie and Mrs. Rita Peterson. Their constructive suggestions, help, patience and support made this paper possible. I would also like to express a special thank you to my husband, Roger, my children, Kevin and Jason and to the friends who encouraged me to go the extra mile during the writing of this field project. To all of you -- Thank You!

Tables

Table

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Currently, teacher evaluation is a dominant educational concern. Articles dealing with the problems and solutions to the evaluation of teaching reveal the extensiveness of the problem. There are complaints from teachers regarding the specifics of evaluation such as: too many administrative visits, too few administrative visits, insufficient feedback after the evaluation, lack of administrative understanding of the curriculum, lack of time for the teacher to correct the problems identified and of opportunity for teacher improvement. There are also complaints from administrators. These complaints include the lack of time to make observations, lack of understanding of the teacher's goals and lack of opportunity to gather needed data to justify a competency hearing.

These problems are accompanied by a host of measurement complications. Formal and informal observations, check lists, and rating scales have been designed to help in teacher evaluation but these tools seem to measure only the high and low aspects of the teaching performance. Thus, they create credibility difficulties for the administrator when data is needed to assist or defend decisions in a due process situation.

Many techniques have evolved and have been used in the

search for a fair appraisal method. Among them are:

a. the classroom evaluation

b. student ratings

c. peer review

d. student achievement data

e. self-evaluation and goal setting.

However, each of these methods contains problems. The classroom evaluator often lacks knowledge of the curriculum or may observe insufficiently to make valid judgements. Student ratings lack validity in cases of competency hearings. Although peer review has merit, many teachers resent peer evaluation and it often results in staff tension. Student achievement data has been shown to inhibit both growth and creativity as the teacher becomes caught up in "teaching to the test" (Darling-Hammond, 1983). Furthermore self-evaluation and goal setting, although helpful, must be complimented by administrative data for competency hearings.

Two very important figures in the field of teacher evaluation are George Redfern and Dick Manatt. Dr. Redfern combined several techniques such as the establishment of job targets by both teacher and principal, observations and post-conferences for final assessment and future planning. Dr. Manatt also uses goal setting, teacher involvement and post-conferences but establishes the job targets in advance. He also includes

self-appraisal, pre-observation conferences, observations and post-conferences followed by assistance and time for improvement (Bock, 1978).

Trends in evaluation include contributions and patterns of the past with some different twists. However, the same problems seem to continuously surface:

1. lack of teacher involvement in the appraisal process

2. observations that are too short to be valid

3. insufficient data to justify a competency hearing

4. opportunity for teacher growth

5. evaluator understanding of the curriculum and relevant teacher competencies

6. relevance of feedback to the teacher.

The problems are not insurmountable. Teachers, administrators, boards of education and legislative bodies continue to improve the process. Redfern and Manatt (1963) made major contributions when they incorporated the pre-observation conference, teacher self-evaluation, classroom observations and the post-observation conferences as part of the evaluation procedure. Since then, goal setting has become a part of many evaluations. Transcriptions have become valuable assets insofar as they give much valuable information to the teacher. Still another trend is the added emphasis on staff development to help the teacher in areas needing improvement.

Major contributions are coming from other sources. Legislators have mandated supervision and evaluation. The Nebraska State Teachers' Association made recommendations which were incorporated into a Nebraska law. Now each district must make its evaluative criteria explicit and document deficiencies. The law also states: "The commissioner...must approve teacher evaluation policies and procedures developed by school districts and educational service units..." (Nebraska Legislative Bill 994, 1189-1193).

With these pressures and the emphasis on excellence in education, a large midwestern school system redesigned their appraisal system. A committee was formed to create a system which would contribute to the:

1. improvement of instruction,

2. climate of continuing professional development,

3. assessment of the ability of individuals to perform required tasks,

4. appropriate placement and assignment of personnel,

5. identification of staff development needs,

6. documentation of competencies required for tenured status,

7. identification of performance standards,

8. continuing interchange of ideas among staff, supervisors and administrators,

9. identification and assistance of instructional staff having difficulty,

10. building of a relationship of trust and respect between administrator and teacher. (Comprehensive Guide for Appraisal, 1985)

With these goals in mind, a system of teacher evaluation was set up with the following seven components:

1. A professional development plan--The staff member completes a yearly development plan in which he/she sets specific goals. This is to share understandings between the administrator and the staff member.

2. Informal observations--Brief visits (2-10 minutes) are made for the purpose of on-going evaluation of job functioning. They provide visibility, familiarity and less disruption of normal routine when it is time for making formal observations.

3. Formal observations and conferences--Longer classroom visits which are followed by conferences between the observer and the staff member. These visits are sometimes pre-arranged and focus on performance goals. Each formal observation includes: a) a pre-observation conference in which the lesson is described for the observer and performance goals are set up and discussed, b) a classroom observation which consists of approximately thirty minutes during which the observer describes what happened during the observation, c) a post-observation conference during

which the staff member and the observer meet to analyze the lesson, review performance goal progress and discuss future strategies.

4. Artifact evaluation—A review of the instructional materials used by the teacher—study quizzes, worksheets, writing assignments, projects, audiovisual aids, quizzes, tests and lesson plans.

5. Employee's activity record—A list of professional growth activities.

6. Evaluation summary—The performance review of the staff member. It is a composite of all evaluation activities and a general overall impression of the teacher's performance. There are four categories in the summary—a) instructional performance, b) classroom management and climate, c) professional qualities, d) personal qualities.

7. Intervention process—There are two stages to this step which are designed to help a staff member who is not performing satisfactorily. Stage one is informal intervention in which the principal structures directed goals. These include listing: a) deficiencies, b) suggested intervention steps, c) assistance to be provided, d) a time frame for improvement. Stage two, formal intervention, occurs if no improvement happens during stage one. The goal of this system is to help the staff member gain or regain professional competence. To accomplish

this, a team is formed which will: a) give official notice to

the staff member, b) prepare a performance contract which will

list specific performance deficiencies, the required intervention

steps, detail the assistance to be provided, list the intervention

team members and their roles, delineate the evaluation procedures

and give a time line, c) draw up a performance contract conference

between the principal and the staff member, d) implement the

contract, e) give an evaluation summary, f) make an employment

decision (Comprehensive Guide, 1985).

The pilot program was dissiminated and tried in thirty-four

schools. The problem was to assess its effectiveness in

accomplishing the aforementioned goals.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness

of the teacher evaluative system as perceived by the participating

teachers and administrators. It was the intention to herein

answer the following basic questions:

1. Is there a difference between the perceptions of teachers

and/or administrators in the pilot program and those not in the

pilot program regarding the improvement of instruction?

2. Is there a difference between the perceptions of teachers

or administrators in the pilot program and those not in the pilot

program regarding the professional development climate?

3. Is there a difference in the perception of abilities of

teachers involved in the pilot program and those not in the program to perform required tasks?

4. Is there a difference in the perception of teachers in the pilot program and teachers not participating in the program regarding the usefulness of the information provided by the principals?

5. Is there a difference perceived in the identification of staff development needs of teachers in the pilot evaluation program and the needs of teachers not participating in the pilot?

6. Is there a difference perceived between documentation of teacher competencies required for tenure of teachers in the pilot evaluation program and the documentation of competencies for tenure of teachers not in the pilot program?

7. Is there a difference between the teacher perceptions of performance standards of teachers in the pilot program and those not in the pilot program?

8. Is there a difference between the perceptions of teachers or administrators participating in the pilot evaluation program and those not in the pilot program regarding the encouragement and interchange of ideas and professional rapport among staff and administrators?

9. Is there a difference in the perception of teachers or administrators participating in the pilot evaluation and those not in the pilot program regarding the identification and

relevance of instructional assistance?

10. Is there a difference in the perceptions of teachers or principals regarding the relationship of trust and respect between those individuals participating in the pilot and those not participating?

Significance of the Study

Since this was a pilot system, it was particularly important to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the program before being permanently adopted. As has been stated, an effective system builds trust and respect between administrator and teacher. This can be much more effectively accomplished if each has input into the evaluative instrument. By gathering the perceptions of administrators and teachers, the instrument can have more validity for both and can serve as a model for other districts looking to update and enhance their own evaluation systems.

Methodology

To measure the perceptions of those involved in the pilot program, several steps were followed:

1. A questionnaire was devised to collect data that measured teacher and administrator perceptions of the effectiveness of the pilot evaluation instrument. The form consisted of one or more questions designed to answer each of the stated basic questions. It should be noted that since this study dealt specifically with the perceptions of teachers and administrators toward the new

evaluative device, the questionnaire served as the primary device for gathering those perceptions.

2. This questionnaire was distributed to selected teachers and administrators participating in the pilot evaluation procedure and in the standard evaluation procedure in order to determine areas of differences.

3. Teachers and administrators who received the questionnaire were asked to fill it out and return it in order to collect the data.

4. The data, once gathered, were tabulated and analyzed in order to display the differences between the perceptions of teachers participating in the pilot program and those not participating in the program.

Delimitations

The study was limited to the evaluation systems being used in the Omaha Public Schools in the year 1986-87. Attention was focused on the perceptions of a sample of teachers and administrators within the district who were using the pilot system which was in place in thirty-four schools and a sample of those who were using the present standard system.

Organization of the Project

Chapter 1   Introduction

Chapter 2   Related literature

Chapter 3   Methodology

Chapter 4   Presentation of Data and Findings

Chapter 5   Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

CHAPTER TWO

Related Research

The concept of teacher evaluation seems to need little justification among educators--on the contrary, its importance seems to be growing as teacher accountability has also assumed increasing importance. Evaluation has the general purpose of safeguarding and improving the quality of instruction received by students (McGreal, 1983).

Teacher evaluation appears to have had its origin in the late nineteenth century. It was then that scientific management became very popular along with the work of Frederick Winslow Taylor in 1890.

In his work Contemporary Research on Teaching Effectiveness, Bruce Biddle (1964) outlines a brief history of the growth of evaluation and points out that 1910 was a landmark year because of a teaching scorecard that was developed by E. C. Elliott. The card included seven headings: 1) physical efficiency, 2) moral-native efficiency, 3) administrative efficiency, 4) dynamic efficiency, 5) projected efficiency, 6) achieved efficiency, 7) social efficiency. All of the points on the scorecard added up to one hundred.

In his study of evaluation as a means to improvement in instruction, Larry Bock (1978) suggests that models for teacher

evaluation are generally based on two premises: 1) that a sufficient body of research exists to form generalizations about good teaching and good teachers and 2) that classroom educational systems and other evaluative tools have been designed that enable supervisors, peers and students to systematically evaluate teachers. The prevailing method for measuring classroom behavior seems to be check lists and rating scales since they have the advantage of allowing an observer to consider suggestions from a number of sources before forming an opinion. This same thought will be expressed again and again for varying reasons but among them is that of adding validity to due process proceedings (Peterson, 1980). However, in considering check lists and rating scales as an evaluative tool, one needs to also consider the definite disadvantage and major flaw of rating all persons high or all persons low or the difficulty of differentiating the middle range (Bock, 1978).

Looking at the history of evaluation then, the spring of 1976 found the National Institute of Education (NIE) calling for a new approach to the definition of effective teaching. By this time, competence and performance had already become the basis for teacher education programs. This emphasis from the NIE placed more focus on the teaching behaviors which most seemed to indicate effective teaching. From this, a new type of evaluation seemed to be evolving with a major thrust of

improvement of instruction. (Bock, 1978)

As evaluation continued to develop and become one of the most important and complex responsibilities of the administrator, more legal challenges also developed. It became extremely important for the evaluator to allow for "due process." Due process may be defined as following established rules which insure the protection of individual rights.

There are many legal complications that can occur when teachers are evaluated but many of the pitfalls can be avoided if administrators and supervisors can be sensitized as to the limits of the law. This does not mean that an administrator needs to become a self-made attorney in order to protect himself and his district, but it does indicate that he had better be informed well enough to practice preventive law. (Peterson, 1980)

Peterson (1980) also suggests that there are four commonly cited grounds on which grievance cases and law suits are based: 1) due process, 2) discrimination, 3) validity, 4) reliability. The first of these, due process, is derived from the fourteenth amendment which states "no state shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law." This simply means that an evaluator must follow rules which will insure the protection of each individual's rights. Due process can be substantive when it is based on the first and fourteenth amendment and deals with the fundamental freedoms of speech, religion,

association and privacy or it can be procedural when it involves the right to notice of dismissal, hearings and where applicable, statements or reasons for dismissal.

It seems to follow then that today's evaluator needs to be aware of some major points to bear in mind in order to observe due process. The evaluator must first give the teacher notice. This may be done orally but if the evaluator really considers the offense serious, written notice is more apropos since, ultimately, it will be legally required. In that written notice, reference may be made to earlier verbal warnings, but it should also include what has happened, why it is objectionable or what rule it breaks, what the teacher is expected to do and what will happen if the problem is not corrected. The notice should be as specific as possible, describing date, time, place and, above all, it should contain an explicit behavorial description of what was seen or heard. The notice must further state that the teacher will be given an opportunity to improve but that failure to do so will involve further action. A copy should be given to the teacher and to the personnel office.

After having given notice, the second step for the evaluator is to provide a clear and adequate explanation of what is actually objectionable. A phrase like consistently uncooperative is too vague and does not communicate to the teacher exactly what it is that the evaluator finds objectionable.

The third step for the evaluator is to offer help--whether that help is a recommendation to improve the academic preparation or to work with a master teacher. Finally, the evaluator must allow adequate time to correct the deficiencies and must also state clearly to the teacher the time periods for improvement.

Another common category under which school districts are often challenged is that of bias and unfair discrimination. The basis for this is found in constitutional guarantees but also in Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. What becomes clear from Title VII is that any group or individual must be evaluated on the basis of the qualities that relate directly to the performance of that job. The provisions of affirmative action require the employer to make an aggressive positive effort to seek out persons from minority or disadvantaged groups but it does not require a district to hire people for jobs for which they are not qualified.

Validity is also a general basis for grievance procedures. This refers to the validity of teacher evaluation procedures. Evaluation should concentrate on job relatedness such as interaction with students, tested knowledge of subject matter, evidence of planning and organizing instruction, the maintenance of discipline in order to be more defensible.

Reliability is another commonly cited category for grievances and lawsuits. Although most districts rely on classroom

observation as a basis for rating teachers, many of the instruments
used have a high potential for creating legal problems. From a
legal point of view, the best instrument will contain relatively
few criteria but those will be important to the learning environment
in almost any classroom and will provide statements of observable
behavior to verify the presence of the criteria. A district can
improve the legal merits of a system by increasing the reliability
of the instrument. One way to do this is to improve the
objectivity of evaluations by using multiple ratings of teachers
whose competency is questioned. Teachers are rarely dismissed on
the basis of one rating. Several ratings done by several people
with some degree of consistency offer a more impressive record to
place before a court.

In her article "State Regulation of Educator Evaluation",
Laura Meyers Pope (1983) states that the message of evaluation
statutes and case law is simple if within the framework of the
law, standards are set, a regular process is developed and if
fairness is observed. She suggests ten guidelines for an
administrator: 1) establish written criteria for the selection
and evaluation of certificated personnel, 2) use trained
supervisory personnel to conduct evaluations, 3) evaluate all
certificated personnel regularly, 4) if a particular instrument
is prescribed by law, try to supplement it with anecdotal
information, 5) discuss openly with the person being evaluated

all aspects of evaluation and make specific recommendations for improvement as needed, 6) if the deficiencies are so serious that failure to change could lead to demotion, nonrenewal of contract or dismissal, give the person a written explanation to that effect, counsel him or her and set a reasonable timetable for correcting the problem, 7) rely primarily on evaluations made after the period of remediation to determine whether demotion, reassignment, nonrenewal of contract or dismissal is appropriate, 8) listen to complaints from parents, but rely on the opinions of qualified evaluators if there is disagreement, 9) observe all the relevant procedural and substantive requirements set forth in states, regulations, board policies and collective bargaining agreements when making an employment decision that is adverse to the employee, 10) move with deliberate speed and without surprises.

With this development of evaluation and with the development of many legal implications, it is easy to see why so much attention is now paid to teacher accountability. In the article, "Teacher Evaluation in the Organizational Context: A Review of the Literature," the authors, Darling-Hammond, Wise and Pease (1983), suggest that today's evaluative processes reveal that the approaches for evaluating teachers really seek to measure very different aspects of teaching and the teacher. They rely on different conceptions or ideas of what demonstrates adequacy and how to

recognize and/or measure adequacy. Some methods concentrate on the quality of the teacher, others assess the quality of teaching and still others try to look at the teacher and his/her teaching by means of student outcomes.

In the past, the teacher appraisal interview and the classroom evaluation represented the total evaluation process. After visiting the teacher in the classroom, the principal would visit with the teacher discussing everything from teacher standards to motivation to assessments being made, warnings issued and maybe guidance and/or praise given. But recently the interview, particularly the pre-observation interview, has gained more recognition as an important part of the evaluation process. Classroom observation is still the mainstay of most teacher evaluations. Through it, the evaluator can see the climate, the rapport, the interaction and the functioning that happen between that teacher and those students. This method has the advantage of seeing teachers in action and within the context of their schools but it does have limitations such as: 1) observer bias, 2) insufficient sampling of performance, 3) poor measurement instruments and 4) even supervisory ratings have generally been found to lack interrater reliability and validity.

Student ratings are also sometimes suggested as a means of evaluation but it should be noted that evaluations of this type

preclude the basic assumptions that the student knows when he/she has been motivated, that the student rating is feedback to the teacher and that the student may additionally motivate the teacher. Validity and utility of student ratings really limit their acceptance as primary evaluative instruments.

Another type of evaluation is peer review. This is accomplished via a committee of peers which evaluates lesson plans, exams, examples of graded examinations and classroom observation. The process covers a broad look at performance and also covers intentionality. This system contains the assumption that peers are in the best position to assess competence since they are familiar with classroom experience, subject matter and the demands on a teacher. They can also give specific and practical suggestions for improvement. However, some critics of this method have found that teachers lacked respect for their peers' evaluation and that such evaluations actually resulted in tension within the staff. This method is also generally not recommended because it is not subject to direct administrative control.

Still another suggested form of evaluation is that of student achievement. This can be measured in several ways: 1) comparing student test scores to a national norm, 2) comparing test score gains with those of a comparable class or 3) net gains over a period of time. Studies indicate that reliability of this type of evaluation is quite low and that it can actually inhibit curriculum

innovation since teachers would probably teach to the ultimate test.

Finally, there is also faculty self-evaluation. This concept suggests that the combination of self-evaluation and individual goal-setting may promote self-reflection and motivation toward change and growth. To achieve the evaluation, the teacher may use data derived from student or peer ratings, self-assessment measures of student achievement or any data that will help in formulating self-judgments, strengths and/or weaknesses. Although this method encourages professionalism, it is not suitable for accountability decisions.

It seems then that no one method is totally successful. The success depends on the purposes for which a technique is used as well as its ability to measure what it seeks to measure. Some try to measure competence, others performance and others rely on student performance. Each of the methods examined herein has some merit but alone they lack reliability and viability. Therefore, it might be assumed that a better way would be to combine several techniques. Two of the most widely discussed models that do this are Manatt's "Mutual Benefit Evaluation" and Redfern's "Management by Objectives Evaluation." Both are characterized by: 1) goal setting, 2) teacher involvement in the evaluation process, 3) centralized teaching standards and criteria. The major point of difference between the two methods seems to be

when a teacher is brought into the evaluation process.

According to Darling-Hammond, et al. (1983), Manatt's system tries to objectively evaluate teachers, administrators and the educational program itself. Although his primary purpose is to improve teacher performance, he stresses points needed to withstand court scrutiny of resulting dismissals. Darling-Hammond, et al. (1983) identifies four steps in Manatt's model: 1) the schoolboard and administration must determine criteria for minimum acceptable standards, 2) a diagnostic evaluation is performed to assess each teacher's present status in regard to the standards--it suggests that the evaluative process should include a pre-observation conference with the teacher, a teacher self-evaluation, classroom observations and post-observation conferences, 3) with the teacher, the evaluator sets job targets (three to five are recommended) for the teacher's performance improvement, the targets should be specific and measurable, 4) after a specified time, the teacher is reevaluated and new job targets are set.

In his book How To Appraise Teaching Performance, George Redfern (1963) looked at the nature of the teacher's job in order to decide what to appraise and locked in on five broad fields of performance. These five major categories are: 1) classroom instruction which includes basic preparation, current knowledge and continuing growth, good planning, interest in students and a

recognition of their abilities and differences and finally the use of resourceful and challenging classroom techniques, 2) consultation with individual pupils. Redfern sees teachers as more than sources of information, he sees them as counselors, willing to consider a student's background and needs and to give extra help when needed--humanizing education by placing an emphasis on education. 3) effective communication: the teacher has the responsibility of adding to good public relations with the community. The teacher needs to be fully aware of, to adhere to and to conduct himself in conformance to the ethical standards of his local, state and national organizations, 4) professional participation: this includes being willing to contribute time and knowledge to the many kinds of committees and groups who work to enhance education, 5) self-criticism and analysis: this segment allows the teacher to look critically at the existing program to appraise the effectiveness of his/her performance and to incorporate new ideas and methods. To appraise these five major areas, it was Redfern's idea that the principal and the teacher work together to establish basic performance targets, then to appraise the results of the performance and finally to plan for future performance.

There are still other evaluation concepts that should be noted. Shared governance entails management by decentralized concensus among parents, teachers and administrators and allows

widespread input into nearly all aspects of school operations including assessment of teachers. Teachers are evaluated under a system based on communal decisionmaking with appeal to a higher authority. Shared governance includes four principles: 1) delegation, 2) consent and parity, 3) review and appeal, 4) trust, openness and equity. In 1973, in Salt Lake City, Utah, the board of education agreed to delegate all but the most important decisions to the superintendent with the proviso that he administer the schools in cooperation with the employees and the patrons of the school district. Under the review and appeal aspect, the superintendent hears all appeals from groups unable to reach concensus or achieve a unified parity vote. All other matters utilize a process called Review of Services. Anyone in Salt Lake--citizen, school employee or superintendent--can compel an external review by a mutually acceptable neutral party or any matter not in the students' best interests. (Wise, 1984)

In a sense, shared governance is a trade-off between management and labor. All teachers are assumed to be competent professionals unless proved incompetent by a procedure comanaged by their peers. The criteria for judging teacher performance were developed by teachers and teachers take the responsibility for helping new and unsatisfactory teachers.

Other interesting factors in the shared governance system used in Salt Lake are the three mechanisms which underlie it.

They are: 1) accountability, 2) informal remediation--which is undertaken when a principal believes that a teacher is not functioning at the desired level but does not appear in the file, 3) formal remediation involves a remediation team of four or five which consists of the learning specialists, the principal, a teacher whose grade level or subject matter matches that of the teacher in question, another who protects the teacher's due process rights and if necessary, a fifth teacher who spends all day, every day, with the teacher--modeling, coaching and helping with planning and materials. After two months, if remediation succeeded, the process is dropped, if not, it continues for three months. At the end of five months, the principal determines whether the teacher should be recommended for termination (Wise, 1984).

One final approach that seems to include many of the goals of the already described methods is that of clinical supervision. The components of this program are often compared to the Manatt and Redfern models and while similar, it is more informal in setting performance goals and generally involves more one-to-one interaction between the teacher and the evaluator. Between them, areas of improvement are mutually identified and professional goals evolve because of classroom observations. Although this method is very time-consuming and although the data is sometimes not interpretable to others, still it does seem to promote proficiency and a high sense of efficacy (Darling-Hammond, et al. 1983).

The search for good evaluation models and devices goes on and on and while many of the principal forms have been herein discussed, there are still many more. The search for an effective evaluation device began in the nineteenth century and it still continues.

In summary, with a study of the history of evaluation, it becomes clear that there is a need to observe frequently enough to make valid judgements, to include the teacher in the compiling of data which will be used in the final evaluation, to provide guidance in the correction of problem areas, to provide opportunities for change and growth—in short—to include the teacher in the evaluation from beginning to end.

It also becomes clear that there is a need for an evaluation system which strives for accountability and staff improvement but which also builds on a relationship of trust and respect. A good system will build interaction between staff members and evaluators. A good system will also recognize the professionalism of the staff member and the high complexity and variables of the job itself.

It was with those needs in mind that the Omaha Public Schools decided to update and change the evaluation system that it had been using. A committee was chosen to study various evaluation instruments that were being used and to put together an instrument that would indeed stress accountability and staff improvement but which would also emphasize professionalism and mutual trust and respect.

Since both the pilot and in-place evaluation devices were
used in designated schools throughout the year, a questionnaire
was prepared to measure the perceptions of the administrators
and teachers involved. This would allow an opportunity to see
if the pilot was indeed a perceived improvement.

CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

In order to identify any perceived differences in the new evaluation devise and the in-place evaluation system, a basic questionnaire was prepared and then adapted for teachers and administrators who participated in this project. Although both questionnaires tested the questions discussed in Chapter One, one was prepared to measure the perceptions of the teachers while the other measured the perceptions of administrators.

Each questionnaire was coded for purposes of group identification and then sent to two distinct groups--each comprised of seventeen schools. Group I, coded as Group W, consisted of those schools who used the new evaluative device during the past year. Group II, coded as Group G, consisted of seventeen schools who had continued to utilize the evaluative system previously in place. Schools similar in type, size and geographic areas were selected.

Each questionnaire was coded W-1, W-2, etc. or G-1, G-2, etc. for the purpose of charting the returned questionnaires of each group. One administrative questionnaire and two faculty questionnaires were sent to each building principal with a cover letter requesting that he/she give a copy to members of his/her building who had been evaluated during the past year. All

responses remained nameless using only the coding system as a means of identification. Each questionnaire was also coded A to indicate administrator or B to indicate faculty. Thus the coding system might read W1-A indicating a questionnaire from school number 1 of the pilot group completed by an administrator. G4-B would indicate a questionnaire from school number 4 of the group using the previous evaluation instrument completed by a faculty member.

After a period of two weeks, a follow-up letter was sent to non-responding schools requesting their participation. (See appendixes A, B and C for questionnaires and letters sent to both groups)

Fifty-one questionnaires were sent to each participating group of seventeen schools for a total of 102 questionnaires. As each questionnaire was returned, the responses to each question were tabulated and percentages were calculated for each group. The percentages were calculated based on each group's number of returned forms.

CHAPTER FOUR

Presentation of Data and Findings

A total of 102 survey forms were distributed to designated schools. Of those 102, 86 forms or 84.3% were returned. For facility of reference, the group of schools using the pilot evaluations will be called Group I and the group still using the in-place evaluations will be called Group II.

51 forms were sent to both Group I and Group II. Group I returned 47 of the 51 forms (92%). Sixteen of the seventeen administrators (94%) and 31 of the 34 teachers (91%) responded. Group II returned only 39 for the 51 forms (76.5%). This included 14 administrators (82.4%) and 25 teachers (73.5%).

Each question of the form was designed to discover the teacher and administrator perceptions to the basic questions set forth in Chapter One. The following information indicates a) the basic question, b) the specific questions which related to it and c) the tabulation of the information obtained from the survey.

Question I: Is there any difference between the perceptions of teachers and or administrators in the pilot program and those not in the pilot program regarding the improvement of instruction?

Administrative questionnaire, question 1: Evaluation

makes an improvement in the instructional practices of my faculty.

Faculty questionnaire, question 1: My evaluation makes an improvement in my instructional practice.

Table I

The Perceived Effect of Evaluation on the Improvement of Instruction

CONTROL GROUP I (PILOT PROGRAM)

Perceptions of	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low
Administrator	24%	59%	6%	0%	0%
Faculty	36%	32%	23%	3%	6%

CONTROL GROUP II (SYSTEM-IN-PLACE)

Perceptions of	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low
Administrator	35%	43%	2%	17%	4%
Faculty	35%	32%	12%	16%	0%

It appears that both groups perceived a strong impact on instructional practices. However, administrators seem to place more importance on evaluation as a factor than do the teachers.

Administrative questionnaire, question 2: These improvements occur as they prepare for their evaluations.

Faculty questionnaire, question 2: These improvements occur as I prepare for my evaluation.

Table 2

The Perceived Improvement of Instruction as Teachers Prepare for

Evaluation

CONTROL GROUP I (PILOT PROGRAM)

Perceptions of	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low
Administrator	6%	31%	50%	13%	0%
Faculty	19%	29%	23%	19%	10%

CONTROL GROUP II (SYSTEM-IN-PLACE)

Perceptions of	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low
Administrator	14%	35%	43%	7%	7%
Faculty	24%	16%	24%	12%	24%

There appears to be no appreciable difference between the two Control Groups in their perceptions of pre-planning for an evaluation.

Administrative questionnaire, question 3:   These improvements occur as a result of the evaluation process.

Faculty questionnaire, question 3:   Same.

Table 3

Perceived Improvement of Instruction as a Result of Evaluation

CONTROL GROUP I (PILOT PROGRAM)

Perceptions of	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low
Administrator	13%	62%	19%	0%	7%
Faculty	29%	32%	23%	6%	10%

CONTROL GROUP II (SYSTEM-IN-PLACE)

Perceptions of	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low
Administrator	28%	43%	21%	7%	0%
Faculty	24%	44%	12%	16%	0%

Administrators and faculty in both groups indicate that evaluation results in improved instruction.

Question 2: Is there a difference between the perceptions of teachers or administrators in the pilot program and those not in the pilot program regarding the professional development climate?

Administrative questionnaire, question 4: Evaluation encourages my faculty to take college classes in their field or in a related field.

Faculty questionnaire, question 4: My evaluation encourages me to take college classes in my field or in a related field.

Table 4

Evaluation Perceived as Encouraging Participation in College

Classes as a Method of Self-Improvement

CONTROL GROUP I (PILOT PROGRAM)

Perceptions of	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low
Administrator	0%	19%	56%	19%	6%
Faculty	7%	13%	16%	32%	32%

CONTROL GROUP II (SYSTEM-IN-PLACE)

Perceptions of	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low
Administrator	7%	14%	43%	29%	7%
Faculty	16%	4%	24%	20%	36%

Neither of the groups surveyed indicated that the evaluation process had any major impact on their decision to take college classes.

Administrative questionnaire, question 5: Evaluation encourages my faculty to participate in more in-service activities than they otherwise would.

Faculty questionnaire, question 5: My evaluation encourages me to participate in more in-service activities than I otherwise would.

Table 5

Evaluation Perceived as Encouraging Participation in In-Service

Activities as a Method of Self-Improvement

CONTROL GROUP I (PILOT PROGRAM)

Perceptions of	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low
Administrator	0%	31%	50%	19%	0%
Faculty	7%	19%	16%	26%	29%

CONTROL GROUP II (SYSTEM-IN-PLACE)

Perceptions of	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low
Administrator	7%	29%	35%	29%	0%
Faculty	4%	24%	32%	20%	20%

There appears to be little perceived difference between either group when looking at evaluation as a stimulus to participating in in-service activities.

Question 3:   Is there any difference in the perception of abilities of teachers involved in the pilot program and those not in the program to perform required tasks?

Administrative questionnaire, question 6:   My faculty attends to the required tasks listed below more during a year in which they are evaluated than a year in which they are not evaluated.

        hall duty

        bus duty
        after-school activities
        supervision
        bulletin boards
        lesson plans
        specific classroom goals

Faculty questionnaire, question 6:   I attend to the required

tasks listed below more during a year in which I am evaluated

than a year in which I am not evaluated.

        duties listed are same as listed in administrative
        questionnaire

Table 6

Improvement in the Performance of Required Tasks as Perceived

by Participating Administrators and Faculty

CONTROL GROUP I (PILOT PROGRAM)

Perceptions of	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low
Administrator					
hall duty	0%	6%	38%	25%	31%
bus duty	0%	12%	31%	25%	31%
after-school activities	0%	0%	50%	25%	25%
supervision	0%	19%	31%	25%	25%
bulletin boards	0%	19%	25%	38%	19%
lesson plans	0%	44%	25%	13%	19%
classroom goals	12%	44%	6%	25%	13%
Faculty					
hall duty	3%	3%	7%	13%	77%
bus duty	3%	0%	10%	13%	74%
after-school activities	3%	3%	3%	23%	68%
supervision	3%	3%	3%	23%	68%
bulletin boards	7%	3%	10%	10%	71%
lesson plans	13%	13%	10%	10%	55%
classroom goals	13%	7%	23%	6%	52%

CONTROL GROUP II (SYSTEM-IN-PLACE)

Perceptions of	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low
Administrator					
hall duty	7%	7%	29%	29%	29%
bus duty	7%	14%	21%	29%	29%
after-school activities	0%	7%	43%	21%	29%
supervision	7%	14%	21%	29%	29%
bulletin boards	7%	7%	36%	21%	29%
lesson plans	7%	29%	29%	14%	21%
classroom goals	7%	29%	29%	14%	21%
Faculty					
hall duty	0%	0%	24%	4%	72%
bus duty	0%	4%	20%	4%	72%
after-school activities	0%	8%	17%	8%	67%
supervision	4%	13%	17%	4%	63%
bulletin boards	4%	17%	13%	8%	58%
lesson plans	17%	8%	25%	4%	46%
classroom goals	17%	13%	21%	4%	46%

Teachers did not appear to regard their performance of
required tasks as affected by an evaluation procedure. However,
administrators in both control groups seemed to perceive a higher
correlation between evaluation and the performance of required
tasks.

Question 4:   Is there a difference in the perception of teachers
in the pilot program and teachers not participating
in the program regarding the usefulness of the
information provided by the principals.

Administrative questionnaire, question 7: The information

collected during my classroom observations is useful to me in writing my evaluations.

Faculty questionnaire, question 7: The information collected during the classroom observations is useful to my principal in writing my evaluation.

Table 7

The Perceived Usefulness of Classroom Observations in the

Preparation of Evaluations

CONTROL GROUP I (PILOT PROGRAM)

Perceptions of	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low
Administrator	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%
Faculty	55%	39%	6%	0%	0%

CONTROL GROUP II (SYSTEM-IN-PLACE)

Perceptions of	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low
Administrator	50%	36%	7%	7%	0%
Faculty	42%	38%	8%	4%	8%

Both groups perceived the information gathered from classroom observations to be of much value although the responses from the pilot program were much more positive.

Administrator questionnaire, question 10: Please assess the extent that the following evaluative activities are helpful in understanding the process and their usefulness in further planning.

Choose the number between 5 and 1 that best describes your reaction to the activity with 5 being very effective and 1 not effective.

   a. setting of performance goals
   b. pre-conference
   c. informal observations
   d. formal observations
   e. post conference
   f. professional activity
   g. resource/artifact evaluation (this is a review of the instructional materials used by the teacher-- worksheets, writing assignments, projects, audio- visual aids, etc.)

Faculty questionnaire, question 10: Same as question 10 on the administrator questionnaire.

Table 8

Perceived Usefulness of Evaluation Activities in Understanding the Process and in Further Planning

CONTROL GROUP I (PILOT PROGRAM)

Perceptions of	5 Very effective	4	3	2	1 Not effective
Administrator					
a.	31%	50%	19%	0%	0%
b.	19%	50%	31%	0%	0%
c.	38%	44%	19%	0%	0%
d.	63%	37%	0%	0%	0%
e.	63%	31%	6%	0%	0%
f.	13%	31%	44%	6%	6%
g.	6%	75%	13%	6%	0%
Faculty					
a.	42%	32%	23%	3%	0%
b.	29%	23%	29%	16%	3%
c.	29%	26%	39%	3%	3%
d.	29%	48%	16%	3%	3%
e.	35%	42%	16%	7%	0%
f.	13%	32%	39%	13%	3%
g.	13%	19%	45%	10%	13%

CONTROL GROUP II (SYSTEM-IN-PLACE)

Perceptions of	5 Very effective	4	3	2	1 Not effective
Administrator					
a.	43%	43%	14%	0%	0%
b.	21%	36%	36%	7%	0%
c.	43%	50%	7%	0%	0%
d.	50%	29%	7%	14%	0%
e.	57%	14%	29%	0%	0%
f.	14%	29%	57%	0%	0%
g.	29%	43%	29%	0%	0%
Faculty					
a.	24%	44%	20%	8%	4%
b.	20%	32%	20%	16%	12%
c.	32%	36%	20%	8%	4%
d.	44%	28%	20%	4%	4%
e.	36%	44%	8%	4%	8%
f.	24%	28%	32%	8%	8%
g.	20%	28%	28%	8%	16%

Both groups seemed to perceive all activities as very helpful in the understanding of the evaluation process and in its usefulness in further planning. However, the formal evaluation and post-conference received resounding approval from both administrator and faculty participants in the pilot group.

It should also be noted that although faculty groups did not appear to put much emphasis on the aspect of an artifact/resource record, the response of administrators in both groups was almost double that of the faculty in regard to its importance.

Question 5: Is there a difference perceived in the identification of staff development needs of teachers in the pilot evaluation

program and the needs of teachers not participating in the pilot?

Administrative questionnaire, question 8: Evaluations help my faculty become aware of areas of staff development in which they would like to participate.

Faculty questionnaire, question 8: My evaluation helps me become aware of areas of staff development in which I would like to participate.

Table 9

Evaluation as a Perceived Means of Awareness of Areas of Staff Development

CONTROL GROUP I (PILOT PROGRAM)

Perceptions of	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low
Administrator	19%	50%	25%	6%	0%
Faculty	10%	23%	32%	29%	7%

CONTROL GROUP II (SYSTEM-IN-PLACE)

Perceptions of	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low
Administrator	14%	29%	36%	14%	7%
Faculty	8%	24%	28%	20%	20%

It appears that administrators in the pilot program perceive evaluation as a strong means of emphasizing an awareness of areas of staff development.

Administrative questionnaire, question 9:   The results of an

evaluation help my faculty in planning and conducting staff

development offerings.

Faculty questionnaire, question 9:   The results of my evaluation

help me in planning and participating in staff development offerings.

Table 10

Evaluation as an Aid in Planning Staff Development Offerings

CONTROL GROUP I (PILOT PROGRAM)

Perceptions of	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low
Administrator	0%	31%	50%	13%	6%
Faculty	10%	23%	39%	23%	6%

CONTROL GROUP II (SYSTEM-IN-PLACE)

Perceptions of	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low
Administrator	14%	29%	14%	29%	14%
Faculty	8%	16%	24%	28%	24%

Evaluations do not seem to play a major role in the teacher's

planning and/or participation in staff development offerings.

However, it should be noted that Group I again seemed to perceive

that evaluations could play a stronger role in creating an

awareness of staff development needs.

Question 6:   Is there a perceived difference between documentation

of competency required for tenure of teachers in the pilot

evaluation program and the documentation of competency for

tenure of teachers not in the pilot program?

Administrative questionnaire, question 19: The evaluation

program gives a relatively complete picture of the teaching

competencies of my faculty.

Faculty questionnaire, question 19: The evaluation program

used in my building gives a relatively complete picture of my

teaching competencies.

Table 11

Perceptions of Evaluation as a Means of Providing a Complete

Picture of Teaching Competencies

CONTROL GROUP I (PILOT PROGRAM)

Perceptions of	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low
Administrator	31%	50%	13%	6%	0%
Faculty	32%	42%	16%	7%	3%

CONTROL GROUP II (SYSTEM-IN-PLACE)

Perceptions of	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low
Administrator	29%	43%	14%	14%	0%
Faculty	12%	36%	32%	12%	4%

Both administrators and faculty in Group I strongly indicate

that a complete picture of the faculty member was given while
members of Group II, while not totally negative, did not portray
a similar confidence.

Question 7: Is there a difference between the teacher perceptions
of performance standards of teachers in the pilot program and
those not in the pilot program?

Administrative questionnaire, question 11: The performance
standards of my faculty improve as a result of their evaluations.

Faculty questionnaire, question 11: My teacher performance
standards improve as a result of my evaluation.

Table 12

Perceived Improvement in the Performance Standards of

Teachers as a Result of Evaluation

CONTROL GROUP I (PILOT PROGRAM)

Perceptions of	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low
Administrator	13%	75%	6%	0%	6%
Faculty	32%	29%	29%	3%	6%

CONTROL GROUP II (SYSTEM-IN-PLACE)

Perceptions of	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low
Administrator	29%	43%	14%	14%	0%
Faculty	36%	24%	20%	16%	4%

A definite difference is indicated in the perceptions of

teacher performance standards as a result of evaluation. This difference is largely due to the extremely positive response of the administrators in Group I.

Question 8: Is there a difference between the perceptions of teachers or administrators participating in the pilot evaluation program and those not in the pilot program regarding the encouragement and interchange of ideas and professional rapport among staff, supervisors and administrators?

Administrative questionnaire, question 12: The evaluation program in my school encourages an interchange of ideas between me and my faculty.

Faculty questionnaire, question 12: The evaluation program in my school encourages an interchange of ideas between me and my administrator.

Table 13

Perceptions of Evaluation as an Encouraging Factor in the Interchange of Ideas Between Administrator and Faculty

CONTROL GROUP I (PILOT PROGRAM)

Perceptions of	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low
Administrator	63%	37%	0%	0%	. 0%
Faculty	52%	37%	12%	0%	0%

CONTROL GROUP II (SYSTEM-IN-PLACE)

Perceptions of	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low
Administrator	36%	50%	7%	7%	0%
Faculty	36%	28%	8%	16%	12%

Although both groups perceived evaluation as encouraging an interchange of ideas, the administrators and faculty of Group I seemed to more strongly endorse this aspect of the evaluation process.

Administrative questionnaire, question 13: The evaluation program in my school encourages a professional rapport between me and my faculty.

Faculty questionnaire, question 13: The evaluation program in my school encourages a professional rapport between me and my administrators.

Table 14

Evaluation as Perceived to Encourage a Professional Rapport Between

Faculty and Administrator

CONTROL GROUP I (PILOT PROGRAM)

Perceptions of	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low
Administrator	56%	31%	6%	0%	6%
Faculty	55%	29%	13%	0%	3%

CONTROL GROUP II (SYSTEM-IN-PLACE)

Perceptions of	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low
Administrator	29%	43%	21%	7%	0%
Faculty	32%	24%	24%	4%	16%

All participants of Group I overwhelmingly indicated that their evaluation encouraged a professional rapport among all involved. Although the responses of Group II were not negative, they were not nearly as positive as Group I.

Question 9: Is there a difference in the perception of teachers or administrators participating in the pilot evaluation and those not in the pilot program regarding the identification and relevance of instructional assistance.

Administrative questionnaire, question 14: If a member of my faculty is having difficulty, the evaluation program enables me to give assistance and support.

Faculty questionnaire, question 14: My evaluation enables me to receive assistance and support if I am having instructional difficulty.

Table 15

The Perceived Effectiveness of Evaluation in Providing

Assistance and Support

CONTROL GROUP I (PILOT PROGRAM)

Perceptions of	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low
Administrator	56%	38%	6%	0%	0%
Faculty	48%	39%	10%	3%	0%

CONTROL GROUP II (SYSTEM-IN-PLACE)

Perceptions of	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low
Administrator	50%	29%	14%	7%	0%
Faculty	28%	28%	32%	8%	4%

Administrators and faculty in Group I seemed to be in equal agreement as to the strength of these elements of the evaluation device whereas the support indicated by Group II seemed much less enthusiastic.

Administrative questionnaire, question 15: The evaluation program in my school helps me in identifying a teacher having difficulty.

Faculty questionnaire, question 15: The evaluation program in my school helps my administrator identify teachers having difficulty.

Table 16

The Perceived Effectiveness of Evaluation in Identifying Teachers

Having Difficulty

CONTROL GROUP I (PILOT PROGRAM)

Perceptions of	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low
Administrator	69%	13%	6%	0%	13%
Faculty	42%	39%	13%	3%	3%

CONTROL GROUP II (SYSTEM-IN-PLACE)

Perceptions of	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low
Administrator	50%	14%	14%	14%	7%
Faculty	36%	24%	16%	12%	12%

Although both groups indicated agreement that their evaluation program did indeed help identify faculty experiencing difficulty, it was Group I who expressed an especially strong confidence in this aspect of the pilot program.

Question 10: Is there a difference in the perceptions of teachers or principals regarding the relationship of trust and respect between those individuals participating in the pilot and those not participating?

Administrative questionnaire, question 16: The faculty in my building has confidence in my evaluative findings.

Faculty questionnaire, question 16: I have confidence in the evaluative findings of my principal.

Table 17

The Perceived Effectiveness of Evaluation in Building Confidence Between Participants

CONTROL GROUP I (PILOT PROGRAM)

Perceptions of	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low
Administrator	50%	44%	6%	0%	0%
Faculty	71%	29%	0%	0%	0%

CONTROL GROUP II (SYSTEM-IN-PLACE)

Perceptions of	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low
Administrator	29%	50%	21%	0%	0%
Faculty	48%	24%	24%	4%	0%

A high measure of confidence was demonstrated by both teachers and administrators in the pilot program. Although participants in Group II also indicated confidence in the evaluative findings of their principals, Group I expressed extremely strong approval.

Administrative questionnaire, question 17: The essential aspects of the professional qualities of my faculty are assessed during an evaluation.

Faculty questionnaire, question 17: The essential aspects

of my professional qualities are assessed during my evaluation.

Table 18

The Perceived Effectiveness of the Measurement of the Essential

Aspects of Professional Qualities

CONTROL GROUP I (PILOT PROGRAM)

Perceptions of	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low
Administrator	63%	37%	0%	0%	0%
Faculty	65%	13%	19%	0%	3%

CONTROL GROUP II (SYSTEM-IN-PLACE)

Perceptions of	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low
Administrator	43%	29%	14%	7%	7%
Faculty	24%	32%	32%	8%	4%

Although both instruments were perceived to measure the essential aspects of professional qualities, the Pilot Program received a much stronger demonstration of confidence from its participants.

Administrative questionnaire, question 18: The evaluation program used in my building builds mutual trust and respect between me and my faculty.

Faculty questionnaire, question 18: The evaluation program used in my building builds mutual trust and respect between me

and my administrator.

Table 19

The Perceived Effect of Evaluation in the Building of Mutual

Trust and Respect Between Faculty and Administrator

CONTROL GROUP I (PILOT PROGRAM)

Perceptions of	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low
Administrator	44%	56%	0%	0%	0%
Faculty	58%	36%	6%	0%	0%

CONTROL GROUP II (SYSTEM-IN-PLACE)

Perceptions of	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low
Administrator	36%	36%	21%	7%	0%
Faculty	24%	40%	20%	12%	4%

It is perceived that this pilot evaluation program with a 98% positive response from participants in Group I does build mutual trust and respect between the teacher and evaluator. This result compares with the 68% positive response from participants in Group II.

CHAPTER FIVE

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

Restatement of the Problem

The primary purpose of this study was to study the pilot evaluation system of the Omaha Public Schools in order to determine its effectiveness as perceived by the participating teachers and administrators.

In 1985, this large midwestern school system redesigned its evaluation program to improve instruction, create a climate of continuing professional development, assess individual abilities to perform required tasks, better identify staff needs, improve documentation of competency, better identify performance standards, encourage professionalism, rapport, trust and respect between administrators and faculty. The primary purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of this pilot evaluation device as perceived by the participating teachers and administrators.

Ten basic questions were considered in looking at the effectiveness of this program:

1. Is there a difference between the perceptions of teachers and/or administrators in the pilot program and those not in the pilot program regarding the improvement of instruction?

2. Is there a difference between the perceptions of teachers and/or administrators in the pilot program and those not in the

pilot program regarding the professional development climate?

3. Is there a difference in the perception of abilities of teachers involved in the pilot program and those not in the pilot program to perform required tasks?

4. Is there a difference in the perception of teachers in the pilot program and teachers not participating in the program regarding the usefulness of the information provided by the principals?

5. Is there a difference perceived in the identification of staff development needs of teachers in the pilot evaluation program and the needs of teachers not participating in the pilot?

6. Is there a difference perceived between documentation of teacher competencies required for tenure of teachers in the pilot evaluation program and the documentation of competencies for tenure of teachers not in the pilot program?

7. Is there a difference between the teacher perceptions of performance standards of teachers in the pilot program and those not in the pilot program?

8. Is there a difference between the perceptions of teachers or administrators participating in the pilot evaluation program and those not in the pilot program regarding the encouragement and interchange of ideas and professional rapport among staff and administrators?

9. Is there a difference in the perception of teachers or

administrators participating in the pilot evaluation and those

not in the pilot proggram regarding the identification and

relevance of instructional assistance?

10. Is there a difference in the perceptions of teachers

or principals regarding the relationship of trust and respect

between those individuals participating in the pilot and those

not participating?

Description of the Procedure Used

A questionnaire was prepared to collect data that would show

the teacher and administrator perceptions of the effectiveness of

the pilot evaluation instrument. In order to determine differences,

this questionnaire was distributed to selected teachers and

administrators participating either in the pilot evaluation

procedure or in the standard in-place evaluation procedure. Once

gathered, the information was tabulated and analyzed in order to

display the perceived differences between the participating

teachers and administrators.

Principle Findings and Conclusions

Question 1 dealt with instructional improvement. According

to the data collected from the questionnaire, numbers 1-3, the

following conclusions were drawn:

1. Although both groups felt that the evaluation process

does have a strong impact on instructional practices, administrators

from both groups seemed to place more importance on evaluation

as an influencing factor than did the teachers.

2. Neither group demonstrated any appreciable difference in their perception of pre-planning for an evaluation.

3. Both groups, however, indicated that evaluation does result in improved instruction for them.

These findings would then indicate that there is no perceived difference between the perceptions of teachers and administrators regardless of the evaluation device used but that evaluative devices of and by themselves have an impact.

Question 2 dealt with the climate of professional development established by an evaluation. According to the data collected from the questionnaire, numbers 4 and 5, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. It should be noted that the faculty from both control groups denied any major impact in their decisions to take college or in-service classes. Administrators, while not negating the impact of evaluation in promoting further education, were not as negative in their response as were the faculty groups.

2. There is little perceived difference between either group when looking at evaluation as a tool to stimulate further education in college or in-service courses among teachers.

Question 3 dealt with the performance of required tasks by teachers. According to the data collected from the questionnaire, number 6, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. Required tasks such as hall duty, bus duty, after-school activities, supervision, bulletin boards, lesson plans and classroom goals showed no perceived difference in either group.

2. Teachers strongly indicated that these required tasks were not influenced by the evaluation factor whereas administrators, in their responses, perceived a higher correlation between evaluation and the performance of required tasks.

Question 4 dealt with the usefulness of the imformation provided to the principals by the evaluation devices. According to the data collected from the questionnaire, numbers 7 and 10, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. The information collected during classroom evaluations was perceived to be of much value by both groups but the response of the pilot group was more positive.

2. The activities involved in the actual evaluation process such as the setting of performance goals, the pre-conference, the informal observations, the formal observations, the post conference, the record of professional activities and the resource/artifact evaluation were viewed by Group I as being very helpful in understanding the evaluation process and in its usefulness in further planning. The formal and post-conference, in particular, received enthusiastic response by both administrators and faculty. It is interesting to note that while the formal evaluation and the post conference exist in both the pilot and the in-place

evaluative systems, the teachers and administrators from Group I
who worked with it as only segments of the whole illustrated
their approval resoundingly.

The formal evaluation and the post conference are the major
elements of the in-place evaluation device but these same two
elements constitute only a part of the pilot evaluation program.
Yet, it is in the pilot program that they receive a more
enthusiastic endorsement from both administrators and faculty.

3. The responses from both groups seemed to give little
importance to a professional activity record.

4. Whereas there is little perceived difference between
Group I and Group II in regard to artifact/resource evaluation,
administrators from both groups perceived this aspect of the
evaluation to be of almost twice the importance than did the
teachers.

It appears that the administrators consider it
very important to be informed of the support materials used in the
classroom whereas teachers do not seem to be as aware of the
administrator's active interest in this facet of their classroom.

Question 5 dealt with the identification of staff development
needs. According to the data collected from the questionnaire,
numbers 8 and 9, the following conclusion were drawn:

1. Evaluations do not play a major role in the awareness
nor selection of faculty in-service needs. However, the

administrators in Group I, unlike all other participants in the study, saw the important role that evaluations could play in creating an awareness of staff development needs.

Question 6 dealt with the documentation of teacher competencies examined for tenure. According to the data collected from the questionnaire, number 19, the following conclusion were drawn:

1. There is a noticeable difference in the results of this question. The response of Control Group I strongly indicated that a complete picture of the faculty member was given via the total pilot evaluation while the response of Group II, while not totally negative, did not portray confidence.

Question 7 dealt with the performance standards of teachers. According to the data collected from the questionnaire, number 11, the following conclusion were drawn:

1. There is some difference in the perceptions of teacher performance standards as a result of their evaluation. This difference is largely due to the extremely positive response of the administrators in Group I who overwhelmingly indicated a correlation between performance standards and evaluation.

Question 8 dealt with the exchange of ideas and the professional rapport between staff and administrators. According to the data collected from the questionnaire, numbers 12 and 13, the following conclusion were drawn:

1. There is a difference between those in the pilot program

and those in Group II in the area of idea exchange and professional rapport between staff and administrators.

All participants in Group I overwhelmingly indicated that the evaluation in which they had participated encouraged a professional rapport among all involved. The responses of Group II were not negative but neither were they nearly as positive as Group I.

Question 9 dealt with the identification and relevance of instructional assistance. According to the data collected from the questionnaire, numbers 14 and 15, the following conclusion were drawn:

1. There is a difference between the evaluation systems in the identification of as well as assistance and support of teachers having difficulty. Administrators and faculty members in Group I were in equal agreement as to the strength of these elements of the evaluation device whereas the support indicated by Group II was much less.

Question 10 dealt with the relationship of trust and respect between administrator and faculty. According to the data collected from the questionnaire, numbers 16, 17 and 18, the following conclusion were drawn:

1. There is a definite difference in the perceptions of trust and respect for both the evaluation tool and the people involved.

2. It is perceived that the pilot evaluation device accurately measures the essential aspects of a teacher.

3. It is perceived that a high measure of teacher confidence was demonstrated in the evaluative findings of the principals using the pilot program.

4. It is perceived that this pilot evaluation program with a 98% positive response does build mutual trust and respect between the teacher and evaluator. This result compares with the 68% average demonstrated by Group II which was still using the in-place evaluation device.

Recommendations

The data gleaned from this survey would indicate that the following recommendations should be implemented.

1. An evaluation device should definitely be a part of every educational system. This recommendation is based on the high percentage of positive responses by both Group I and Group II to the use of an evaluation tool as a means of improvement.

2. The district should utilize the results of the evaluation tool to design a future individual professional growth plan, whether in-service or college courses, for those teachers who demonstrate a need for improvement. Those teachers would be informed of the existing offerings which would fulfill the needs of their individual plan.

3. Results of evaluations conducted throughout the year

should be tabulated and presented to the staff development department. This would make certain that, in actuality, the offerings match the needs of the teachers.

4. A greater emphasis needs to be placed on the professional activity record by all parties concerned since it is through this type of activity that professional growth is enhanced.

5. Administrators need to strongly emphasize to their faculty members that the resource/artifact section is an important consideration in their overall evaluation. This survey pointed out that faculty overall did not regard this as an important facet of their evaluation but that it was important to their administrators.

6. The pilot evaluation system should definitely replace the evaluation currently being used. As data were compiled from both groups, there were no appreciable differences in those aspects which were primarily mechanical in professional preparation and performance. However, when the survey moved into the realm of understanding and appreciation of professional values, the response differential increased dramatically. This would indicate the importance of these factors to both faculty and administrators—especially when viewed in comparison with Group II who did not demonstrate that their evaluation led to the same interpersonal and professional growth.

It appears that the addition of specific steps in the new evaluation tool encourage a greater collaborative effort in

creating communication between teacher and administrator.

When the comfort zone of employees rises so significantly, it behooves a district to consider implementing those elements that cause such an improved reaction into its evaluation program.

Bibliography

Bock, Larry T. (1978). Areas of Concentration: A Practical
Approach to the Improvement of Instruction. Thesis.
University of Nebraska. Omaha.

Comprehensive Guide for the Appraisal of Instructional Staff
in the Omaha Public Schools. Pilot Project 1985-86.
July, 1985.

Darling-Hammond, Linda, Arthur Hammond, Arthur E. Wise and Sara
R. Pease. "Teacher Evaluation in the Organizational Context:
A review of the Literature." Review of Educational Research,
Fall, 1983, Vol. 53, No. 3, pp. 285-328.

Legislative Bill 994. Legistature of Nebraska. Eighty-eighth
Legislature, Second Session. January 12, 1984, pp. 1189-
1207.

McGreal, Thomas L. Successful Teacher Evaluation. Association
for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Alexandria,
Virginia, 1983.

Peterson, Donovan and Annie Ward. Due Process in Teacher
Evaluation. University Press, Washington, D. C., 1980,
pp. 2-30.

Pope, Laura Means. "State Regulation of Education Evaluation."
Legal Issues in Public School Employment, Joseph Beckham
and Perry A. Zirkel, Editors, 1983, pp. 137-153.

Redfern, George B. How to Appraise Teaching Performance.
School Management Institute, Columbus, Ohio, 1963, pp. 8-42.

Wise, Arthur E.; and Others. Case Studies for Teacher Evaluation:
A Study of Effective Practices. Rand Corporation, Santa
Monica, California, June, 1984.

Appendix A

Cover Letter

Dear

    You have been selected to participate in an assessment of the pilot evaluation system. We realize how busy you are, but this should only take approximately ten minutes of your time.

    The data gathered from this questionnaire will be compiled and used by the teacher evaluation committee for assessing the effectiveness of the revised teacher evaluation system and making modifications on the basis of your experiences. The data will also be used for my specialist degree field project. However, only summary data will be presented thus guaranteeing privacy to your responses. Your candor and any additional comments you might like to make will be greatly appreciated.

    Please return your form as soon as possible via the O.P.S. mail.

    Thank you very much for your help and cooperation.

                  Sincerely,

                  Sharon M. Watts
                  Bryan Senior High
                  Omaha Public Schools

Appendix B

ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Using a rating scale of 5   4   3   2   1   with 5 being considered the highest rating and 1 the lowest, please respond to the following questions.

1. Evaluation makes an improvement in the instructional practices of my faculty.   5   4   3   2   1

2. These improvements occur as they prepare for their evaluations.   5   4   3   2   1

3. These improvements occur as a result of the evaluation process.   5   4   3   2   1

4. Evaluation encourages my faculty to take college classes in their field or in a related field.
                                 5   4   3   2   1

5. Evaluation encourages my faculty to participate in more in-service activities than they otherwise would.
                                 5   4   3   2   1

6. My faculty attends to the required tasks listed below more during a year in which they are evaluated than a year in which they are not evaluated.
hall duty	5	4	3	2	1
bus duty	5	4	3	2	1
after-school activities	5	4	3	2	1
supervision	5	4	3	2	1
bulletin boards	5	4	3	2	1
lesson plans	5	4	3	2	1
specific classroom goals	5	4	3	2	1

7. The information collected during my classroom observations is useful to me in writing my evaluations.
                                 5   4   3   2   1

8. Evaluations help my faculty become aware of areas of staff development in which they would like to participate.
                                 5   4   3   2   1

9. The results of an evaluation help my faculty in planning and conducting staff development offerings.

          5   4   3   2   1

10. Please assess the extent that the following evaluative activities are helpful in understanding the process and their usefulness in further planning. Choose the number between 5 and 1 that best describes your reaction to the activity with 5 being very effective and 1 not effective.

		5	4	3	2	1
a.	setting of performance goals	5	4	3	2	1
b.	pre-conference	5	4	3	2	1
c.	informal observations	5	4	3	2	1
d.	formal observations	5	4	3	2	1
e.	post conference	5	4	3	2	1
f.	professional activity record	5	4	3	2	1
g.	resource/artifact evaluation (this is a review of the instructional mterials used by the teacher-- worksheets, writing assignments, projects, audio- visual aids, etc.)	5	4	3	2	1

11. The performance standards of my faculty improve as a result of their evaluations.   5   4   3   2   1

12. The evaluation program in my school encourages an interchange of ideas between me and my faculty.

          5   4   3   2   1

13. The evaluation program in my school encourages a professional rapport between me and my faculty.

          5   4   3   2   1

14. If a member of my faculty is having difficulty, the evaluation program enables me to give assistance and support.   5   4   3   2   1

15. The evaluation program in my school helps me in identifying a teacher having difficulty.

          5   4   3   2   1

16. The faculty in my building has confidence in my evaluative findings.   5   4   3   2   1

17. The essential aspects of the professional qualities of my faculty are assessed during an evaluation.

          5   4   3   2   1

18. The evaluation program used in my building builds
mutual trust and respect between me and my faculty.

<div align="right">5   4   3   2   1</div>

19. The evaluation program gives a relatively complete
picture of the teaching competencies of my faculty.

<div align="right">5   4   3   2   1</div>

Thank you for participating in this study. Your input
will be very valuable in future revisions of the evaluation
program.

Appendix C

FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

Using a rating scale of   5   4   3   2   1   with
5 being considered the highest rating and 1 the lowest,
please respond to the following questions.

1. My evaluation makes an improvement in my instructional
practice.   5   4   3   2   1

2. These improvements occur as I prepare for my
evaluation.   5   4   3   2   1

3. These improvements occur as a result of my evaluaton.
                              5   4   3   2   1

4. My evaluation encourages me to take college classes in
my field or in a related field.
                              5   4   3   2   1

5. My evaluation encourages me to participate in more
in-service activities than I otherwise would.
                              5   4   3   2   1

6. I attend to the required tasks listed below more
during a year in which I am evaluated than a year in which I
am not evaluated.
        hall duty   5   4   3   2   1
        bus duty   5   4   3   2   1
        after-school activities 5   4   3   2   1
        supervision   5   4   3   2   1
        bulletin boards   5   4   3   2   1
        lesson plans   5   4   3   2   1
        specific classroom goals 5   4   3   2   1

7. The information collected during the classroom
observations is useful to my principal in writing my
evaluation.   5   4   3   2   1

8. My evaluation helps me become aware of areas of staff
development in which I would like to participate.
                              5   4   3   2   1

9. The results of my evaluation help me in planning and
participating in staff development offerings.
                              5   4   3   2   1

10. Please assess the extent that the following evaluative activities are helpful in understanding the process and their usefulness in further planning. Choose the number between 5 and 1 that best describes your reaction to the activity with 5 being very effective and 1 not effective.

a.	settin of performance goals	5	4	3	2	1
b.	pre-conference	5	4	3	2	1
c.	informal observations	5	4	3	2	1
d.	formal observatons	5	4	3	2	1
e.	post conference	5	4	3	2	1
f.	professional activity	5	4	3	2	1
g.	resource/artifact evauluation (this is a review of the instructional materials used by the teacher—worksheets, writing assignments, projects, audio-visual aids, etc.)	5	4	3	2	1

11. My teacher performance standards improve as a result of my evaluation.   5   4   3   2   1

12. The evaluation program in my school encourages an interchange of ideas between me and my administrators.
                                        5   4   3   2   1

13. The evaluation program in my school encourages a professional rapport between me and my administrators.
                                        5   4   3   2   1

14. My evaluation enables me to receive assistance and support if I am having instructional difficulty.
                                        5   4   3   2   1

15. The evaluation program in my school helps my administrator identify teachers having difficulty.
                                        5   4   3   2   1

16. I have confidence in the evaluative findings of my principal.
                                        5   4   3   2   1

17. The essential aspects of my professional qualities are assessed during my evaluation.   5   4   3   2   1

18. The evaluation program used in my building builds mutual trust and respect between me and my administrator.
                                        5   4   3   2   1

19. The evaluation program used in my building gives a relatively complete picture of my teaching competencies.

5   4   3   2   1

Thank you for participating in this study. Your input will be very valuable in future revisions of the evaluation program.

Appendix D

Follow-up Letter

Bryan High School
4700 Giles Rd.
Omaha, NE   68157
May 24, 1987

Dear

    At the end of April, I sent your school a questionnaire
regarding our O.P.S. evaluation systems. This questionnaire
is designed to measure the perceptions of teachers and
administrators who are using either our pilot or our old
evaluation device. We hope to discover what you regard as
the strengths or weaknesses of each system.

    The findings of this survey will be used for my
specialist degree field project but the compiled results
will be given to the teacher evaluation committee to aid in
the assessment of the teacher evaluation system and
hopefully will lead to modifications based on your
experiences.

    Many of you have already responded but there are still
a few forms that have not yet been returned. I am enclosing
additional forms in case those that I sent earlier were
misplaced during the interval. (I am including only enough
to complete the set of three that I originally sent to you.)

    Again, many thinks for your cooperation especially at
such a busy time of year. I truly appreciate it.

                         Sincerely,

                         Sharon M. Watts

Enclosure