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The primary purpose of this study was to answer the question: When reduction in force (RIF) decisions are necessary, what is the extent of agreement between teachers and administrators in regard to criteria to be considered? The criteria of seniority and performance evaluation were investigated in depth through analysis of the responses to these questions:

1. To what extent do teachers and administrators have similar opinions concerning the definition of seniority?

2. Would a change in nature of existing evaluation systems affect the acceptance of evaluation as a criterion in RIF decisions?

In order to collect the data necessary to answer the questions posed, copies of a questionnaire developed by the researcher were mailed to the 320 teachers and 20 administrators from three NEA districts randomly selected from the 18 largest in Connecticut. Except for items specific to position characteristics and five attitudinal items, the teacher and administrator forms were identical. Questions associated with the choice of criteria for RIF staffing decisions, preferred indicators and participants in evaluation systems, and preferred definitions of seniority were each answered on a 5-point Likert-type scale.
Substantial agreement was found between teachers and administrators regarding criteria to be used in RIF situations. The majority (over 50%) endorsed the use of multiple criteria, e.g., areas of certification, degree status, program needs, teacher evaluation, seniority, specific experience at grade level or in subject area, and tenure. No definition of seniority was agreeable to a majority (over 50%) of each group.

Although most of the teachers and administrators favored some form of teacher evaluation as a criterion in RIF staffing decisions, only 45.7% of the teachers were in favor of developing and using separate formative and summative evaluations. Over 50% of each group indicated willingness to accept the following indicators for either formative or summative evaluation: classroom environment, teacher command of subject, observation of classroom, pupil-teacher relations, individual performance objectives, lesson plans, and personal attributes. Over 50% of each group was willing to accept the participation of principal, department chairpersons, and self in either formative or summative evaluation systems.
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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND ITS BACKGROUND

"The Board of Education may find it necessary from time to time to reduce the number of certified personnel which it employs, due to reduced enrollment within the district, elimination or reduction of a special program, lack of funds, or other substantial reasons" (Draft Policy, Greenwich, Connecticut Public Schools, 1982). These or similar words are being heard in increasing numbers of school districts each year. The 1978 American Association of School Administrators' "Critical Issues Report" suggested that secondary schools will serve 25% fewer students in 1990 than they did in 1976.

According to Dearman and Plisko in their 1980 report for the National Center for Education Statistics:

Between 1979 and 1984, the lowest enrollment year projected, the number of students is expected to decline by another 3 million. Thus, from the lowest year, a 15 percent reduction is anticipated. Smaller numbers are expected through 1984 in the lower grades, K-8, and through 1989 in the upper grades, 9-12. Most of this decline is projected in the public sector, while nonpublic school enrollment is expected to remain fairly constant. (p. 44)

More recent projections from the Center (Grant & Eiden, 1981) indicated that:

There will be small annual reductions in elementary school enrollment for the next 2 years. These decreases are directly attributable to the expected decline during this period in the number of children aged 5 to 13. After 2 or 3 years of relative stability, enrollment in the elementary grades should start to rise again in the mid-1980's. The small annual decreases in high school
enrollment, which began in 1977, are expected to continue throughout most of the 1980's. (p. 1)

These projected enrollment swings and their concomitant effect on the staffing requirements of elementary and secondary schools compound the already complex problem of development of educationally, legally, and ethically sound reduction in force (RIF) policies and procedures. Moreover, the choice of criteria used to make RIF employment decisions—e.g., seniority, current program needs, areas of certification, performance evaluation—may have far reaching effects on the quality of educational opportunity available to the students of a particular district in the future. Talented and gifted teachers who find themselves pink slipped due to reduction in force employment decisions may choose to pursue alternate careers in business and industry. The current shortage of qualified math and science teachers is partially a result of teachers choosing the relative security of business and industry over the uncertainty caused by "riffing" (a colloquialism for "reduction in force") in the public schools.

Obviously not all school districts will lose students in the coming years, but the majority will. Some school districts have already had to cut professional staff by as much as 10% in 1 year because of major enrollment drops (Phay, 1980b, pp. 11-35).

According to Robert Eagen, President of the Connecticut Education Association, reduction in force is among the most painful elements of being a teacher in this decade.
It is impossible to be completely free of its effects and still remain a committed teacher. It lurks there for all of us to face. Sometimes it happens in a neighboring town, then a neighboring school, and finally, our own school. We are not all going to be laid off, but our work and emotions are bound to be affected by RIFs. (Eagen, 1982, p. 2)

Teachers are not the only educators affected by reduction in force. A 1978 study designed to assess the relative magnitude of stress induced by a variety of administrative events that confronted education administrators concluded that "conflicts between administrators and teachers are perceived to be most stressful" (Koff, Olson, & Cichon, 1979-1980, p. 1). The most commonly reported cause of stress centered around staff management problems such as staff reduction and teacher evaluation. A sampling of comments included: "Teacher dismissal and expulsion hearings are the two most stressful events that have been encountered"; "teacher evaluations have been extremely stressful" (Koff et al., 1979-1980, p. 2). It is unlikely that the situations causing this stress will lessen.

Stress is also engendered by the uncertainty associated with the necessity for reduction in force. "Whom shall we lay off?" is a question being asked in increasing numbers of school districts. According to Nassau (1978), "One of the most disruptive aspects of the declining enrollment phenomenon is the uncertainty which surrounds the question of which teachers will be laid off" (p. 271). Nassau stated that although seniority is often used as the criterion, other factors are also considered by administrators in many districts. S. M. Johnson, in her 1980 study of contracts of school systems throughout Massachusetts,
found that "many included performance criteria in their reduction in force provisions and few relied on seniority alone" (p. 215).

Weldy (1978), reporting on the uncertainty and apprehension of faculty in times of staff reduction, stated that "Teachers are most sensitive about unfavorable evaluations and are more inclined to contest anything going into an official record that they think might be used against them. They are sure we are building cases with unfavorable evaluations as a means of getting rid of unwanted faculty (in a few cases they are right)" (p. 7). Beckman (1981) contended that "In some cases, teachers who lose their jobs have challenged the use of teacher evaluation as a factor considered by the Board in the reduction in force employment decisions" (p. 45).

Nolte, in the July, 1976 American School Board Journal, suggested that in order to reduce the possibility of litigation "school districts should develop policies and procedures for reduction in force before they are needed, even while enrollment projections showed [sic] increases or remained steady" (pp. 26-27). In a paper presented at the 1978 annual meeting of the National School Boards Association, Haun supported the views of Nolte when he declared that "in order to help ameliorate the adverse effects of reduction in force, school districts facing declining enrollments should develop and adopt reduction in force policies before they are needed" (p. 1).

As school enrollments continue to decline and financial resources become less abundant, the need for reduction in force increases. As reduction in force increases, the pressure to develop carefully considered criteria upon which to base reduction in force decisions becomes more
urgent. Noland (1982) cautioned those facing reduction in force to re-
member the law, "Legally, a RIF is one type of 'dismissal for sufficient
cause' and as such is subject to most rules for termination. The issues
most likely to be covered by such requirements are: how employees to
be terminated are chosen; what standards and procedures must be followed”
(p. 29).

Statement of the Problem

Given the above remarks, the question investigated in this study
was: When reduction in force is necessary, what is the extent of agree-
ment between teachers and administrators in regard to which criteria
should be considered in the RIF decisions? Since seniority has tradi-
tionally been used as the only criterion for determining the order of
layoff among tenured teachers, it was deemed appropriate to investigate
the preferred definition of seniority (by teachers and administrators)
in order to determine if there was agreement in regard to the preferred
definition.

Moreover, since performance evaluation has been used (and is gener-
ally accepted) by teachers as a means of improving their effectiveness
in the classroom but has been rejected as a criterion in RIF staffing
decisions, the following question was also investigated: Would a change
in the nature of existing evaluation systems affect the acceptance of
evaluation as a criterion in reduction-in-force staffing decisions?
Purpose of the Study

It was the intention of this researcher to investigate and report similarities and differences in teachers' and administrators' self-reported perceptions and opinions about the choice of criteria to be used when making reduction-in-force staffing decisions. The possibility of developing mutually agreed upon criteria, which could reduce the stress of uncertainty and foster the trust and cooperation of the teaching staff (perhaps reducing the probability of litigation), was examined.

The 1.8 million member National Education Association (NEA) recommends that reduction in force "criteria should include seniority, objectivity, nondiscrimination, uniformity of application, and affirmative action" (NEA, 1980, p. 235). The association "urges local affiliates to negotiate RIF policies that exclude performance evaluation from consideration in the reduction-in-force process" (NEA, 1980, p. 235). However, it (the NEA) also endorses the concept of performance evaluation as a means for improving the quality of instruction offered to students.

In an attempt to understand and possibly to reconcile these seemingly contradictory sanctions, the criteria of seniority and performance evaluation were investigated in greater depth than other possible criteria; i.e., tenure; program needs of the department, the building, or the system; degree status; affirmative action; area of certification; service on school committees; and participation in district activities.
Issues Explored

The following questions were posited in order to obtain data for analysis and discussion of the problem. Answers to these questions might facilitate the development of reduction-in-force policies and practices that are agreeable to teachers and administrators and may contribute to the maintenance of educationally sound instructional programs during times of reduction in force. The questions are listed below:

1. To what extent do teachers and administrators hold similar views concerning criteria that should be considered when making reduction-in-force staffing decisions?

2. To what extent do teachers and administrators have similar opinions concerning the relative importance of each criterion in making reduction-in-force staffing decisions?

3. To what extent do teachers and administrators have similar opinions concerning "performance indicators" to be used in a teacher evaluation system designed solely to "help the teachers improve their effectiveness"?

4. To what extent do teachers and administrators have similar opinions concerning "performance indicators" to be used in a teacher evaluation system designed solely to "serve administrative decision making with respect to hiring, firing, promotions, transfers, reduction in force, etc."?

5. To what extent do teachers and administrators have similar opinions concerning who should participate in the teacher evaluation
process when the results of the evaluation will be used solely to "help the teachers improve their effectiveness"?

6. To what extent do teachers and administrators have similar opinions concerning who should participate in the teacher evaluation process when the results of the evaluation will be used solely to "serve administrative decision making with respect to hiring, firing, promotions, transfers, reduction in force, etc."?

7. To what extent do teachers and administrators have similar opinions concerning the definition of seniority if seniority is used as the only criterion when determining the order of lay off among tenured teachers in reduction-in-force situations?

Significance of the Study

As school enrollment continues to decline, the necessity for reduction-in-force continues to increase. Decisions to terminate employment are made with respect to an increasing number of teachers each year.

According to Zirkel and Bargerstock (1981) in the NASSP Legal Memorandum on Reduction in Force, "The order of suspension or dismissal is statutorily specified in 16 states...the overwhelming majority of court decisions have granted tenured teachers a priority" (p. 4). "Where statutes (and contracts) are silent about the proper basis for retention among tenured and nontenured teachers, courts have tended to leave the matter to the board's discretion, and again, most boards have elected to use seniority as at least one factor" (p. 5). The same authors (1980) maintained that "The state legislature will continue to play an important role in establishing the rules for reducing the number of school
personnel" (p. 17). Left unanswered by the legislature and the courts (up to the present) is the question of what criteria are to be used in reduction-in-force decisions when all the teachers remaining in a district are tenured and reduction in force must continue.

As enrollment continues to decline, and reduction in force increases, the pressure to reach agreement regarding which criteria are to be used in RIF situations builds. Lack of agreement between teachers and administrators leaves open the possibility of increased numbers of grievances and lawsuits initiated by teachers who contest administrative decisions. This situation can be costly in terms of teacher morale, school district funds spent on attorney fees, and sometimes, diminished quality of learning opportunities available to the students.

Assumptions

The understanding of and rationale for this study rest upon the following assumptions:

1. Job security will continue to be a major concern of teachers' associations and their constituents.

2. Experience in teaching (seniority) may not be synonymous with competence.

3. Criteria used in reduction-in-force staffing decisions and actions that include teacher performance evaluation results are more likely to be educationally sound than are criteria that do not include teacher performance evaluation results.
Limitations of the Study

This study was confined to an investigation of the opinions of teachers and administrators within large (450 to 1,000 teachers), NEA-affiliated school districts within Connecticut. All of the districts within the sample had the following characteristics in common: (a) a substantial union membership (75%-98% of the teaching staff); (b) a state mandated teacher performance evaluation system mutually developed by teachers, union representatives, and administrators; (c) experience with reduction-in-force—although some had not yet found it necessary to make reductions within tenured staff; and (d) seniority, although variously defined, was one of the criteria used to determine the order of layoff among tenured teachers when reduction in force was necessary.

Because of the possible influence of the above-mentioned district attributes on the opinions of teachers and administrators, caution should be exercised when making inferences from the findings reported in this study to school districts that are not comparable, i.e., that have smaller or larger teaching staffs, are nonunion, have smaller NEA membership, have AFT membership, have teacher performance evaluation systems developed by administrative fiat, do not have state-mandated evaluation, have no experience with reduction in force, or do not recognize seniority as a criterion to be considered when making reduction-in-force staffing decisions.

Organization of the Study

Attention must first be paid to the existing issues concerning reduction in force; this need will be addressed in Chapter II. Chapter II
will include a review of the literature relevant to the legal issues surrounding RIF (issues of importance at the federal, state, local and bargaining unit levels) and to past and present teacher evaluation practices and problems. The research design, survey instrument, and procedures used in data collection and analysis will be presented and discussed in Chapter III. The findings from the study will be presented and critically examined in Chapter IV. Any inferences that are suggested will be discussed in Chapter V. Also in Chapter V, suggestions for possible future actions by school districts facing (or projected to face) reduction in force will be presented.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF PERTINENT LITERATURE

Permissible reasons for and causes of reduction in force, depending on state law, include the following: enrollment decline, financial exigency, changes in programs, consolidation of and/or reorganization of school districts, reduced teacher turnover, budget cutbacks, and elimination of positions (Phay, 1981; Piele, 1980; Zirkel & Bargerstock, 1980). Whatever the reasons for the reduction in force, when a person's employment is terminated, the school district may have to deal with several legal issues.

Legal Issues and Problems Involved.

Phay (1980b) opined that the initial issue involves determining whether the drastic action of laying off staff is necessary (p. 17). If this action is challenged, the school district must then prove that a need for reduction in force exists. The district must substantiate financial need to reduce staff or it must show why enrollment decline necessitates the dismissal of staff members. According to Piele (1981), "The courts generally will not interfere with the school board's discretion in such actions (releasing employees) made in good faith, supported by competent evidence, and carried out with required procedures" (p. 68). If the administrative decision regarding reduction in force is challenged, the employees may have redress through the Constitution, state statutes, and/or collectively bargained agreements.
Reduction in Force

Zirkel and Bargerstock (1980), in their comprehensive examination of legislation and litigation in reduction in force situations, stated that:

The primary source for legal requirements relating to RIF are state statutes which are found in 41 of the 50 states. The second basic source of relevant law is court decisions, primarily on the state level. Although not a part of the larger law on RIF, many locally adopted agreements on policies, including those reached through collective bargaining, may directly influence or determine the nature of RIF procedures and subsequent decisions, provided that they do not conflict with statutory requirements. (p. 48)

Piele, in the 1980 Handbook of School Law, suggested that "Most of the decisions in this area turn on the construction of teacher tenure laws or other state statutes, although in some instances both individual and union contract provisions come into play. There may also be claims of constitutional rights violations" (p. 68).

The issue of violation of constitutional rights may arise because "legally, a RIF is one type of 'dismissal for sufficient cause' and as such is subject to most rules for termination" (Noland, 1982, p. 29). As Zirkel and Bargerstock (1980) noted, the laws concerning dismissal vary considerably from state to state, yet the constitutional rights of all individuals are protected by due process. Due process is a constitutional right which guarantees fair procedural protection to all persons.

The federal constitutional protections afforded teachers most often cited in cases concerning reduction of force and the determination of whom to lay off are found primarily in the First, Fifth, and Fourteenth
Amendments and in Article 1, Section 10, which prohibits laws impairing contract rights. Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act enhanced previously established federal protections. Every federal, state and local statute, court decision, administrative policy, and contract agreement must be in compliance with the Constitution.

Corwin (1974) emphasized that "Due process requires that when a State seeks to terminate an interest it must afford notice and opportunity for a hearing appropriate to the value of the case before termination becomes effective" (p. 402). Lieberman (1979) added that "Where teachers have acquired an expectancy of reemployment, they may not be fired without due process. This protection is grounded in the federal constitution, not in state statutory enactments" (p. 416).

The procedural due process requirements that are applicable in reduction in force situations are much less demanding than those necessary for a discharge for cause such as a teacher's personal inadequacy or incompetence. Likewise, distinctions between the due process rights that must be afforded tenured and nontenured teachers were determined by various Supreme Court decisions in 1972; e.g., Board of Regents v Roth, 408 U.S. 564; and Perry v Sindermann, 408 U.S. 593. In most states, school officials do not have to state a reason or conduct a hearing before dismissing a probationary teacher unless a "liberty" or a "property" interest is lost as a result of a nonrenewal decision. Dolgin (1981) cited a 1974 Supreme Court decision, Buhe v Buffalo, which stated "a nontenured teacher who is fired is entitled to due process proceedings if the teacher can prove that being dismissed creates a stigma on one's reputation, or prevents one from getting a
job elsewhere" (p. 18). "Generally, only teachers with tenure are entitled to notice and a hearing before nonrenewal of contract" (Flygare, 1976, p. 20).

Gee and Sperry (1978) believed that the due process requirements are a valid mechanism to "assure some sort of reasoned decision-making, forcing each official to articulate the reasons and basis for any decision" (p. 98). However, they contended that in teacher dismissal actions the due process requirements were not clearly defined. Hazard (1978) concurred in regard to the ambiguous nature of due process in reduction in force situations:

When enrollment declines or a specific teaching post is abolished and the number of teachers must be reduced, tenured teachers may [emphasis added] be dismissed without the benefit of a hearing. However, provision is usually [emphasis added] made for dismissal on the basis of seniority, and preferred reemployment is guaranteed for a stated period of time. (p. 407)

Gatti and Gatti (1975) also acknowledged this lack of specificity when they concluded that "Abolition for financial reasons may [emphasis added] be valid grounds for termination" (p. 292) although a teacher is entitled to "due process and fundamental fairness. This is true whether or not a teacher has tenure" (p. 283). The nature of due process in reduction in force situations genuinely appears to be in considerable doubt.

Tenure

Tenure is a specific guarantee of due process. Tenure laws were developed to protect teachers against unfair and capricious treatment and to protect academic freedom and job security (Coursesn, 1980; Mix,
Tenure, once granted, does not guarantee lifetime employment, "it provides only an expectancy of continuation of employment—employment that cannot be terminated arbitrarily and capriciously at will" (Mix, 1978, p. 4).

Interrelationships

The relationships among tenure, job security, and reduction in force were addressed by Nassau (1978) in his position paper for the Journal of Law and Education in which he stated:

State tenure laws and other statutes usually provide little in the way of guidance to school administrators or protection for teachers when it comes to dealing with staff adjustments required by declining enrollment or other financial exigency. School boards are generally regarded as having the authority to lay off teachers for economic reasons regardless of whether or not they have been given the authority to do so expressly in the tenure statute. In some jurisdictions, the notice requirements and other procedural protections guaranteed to tenured teachers in disciplinary cases are unavailable to teachers who are being laid off. Even where the tenure statutes are applicable, they generally do little to provide any degree of certainty or clarity with regard to the procedures and rights involved in a layoff. And, of course, some nontenured faculty members have even less protection in these situations. (pp. 255-256)

The situation was succinctly stated by Mix (1978), "In instances where dismissal is for financial exigency, the safeguards provided by tenure remain to be fully determined" (p. 5). Mix continued, "there is little doubt that tenure is not enforceable if financial exigency is claimed and supported" (p. 10). Phay (1980b) determined that:

Most state statutes specifically authorize educational governing boards to dismiss a teacher if the school is faced with reduced enrollment and many situations also authorize dismissal in financial emergencies and because of district reorganization. . . . Court decisions have made
it clear that the authority to terminate employment, including the employment of persons with tenure is permissible when reduction in enrollment or financial exigency makes the act necessary. (p. 15)

To summarize, the following are the initial legal considerations in reduction in force situations:

1. The courts are involved in teacher dismissal only at the appeal stage. In most states, local school boards are empowered by state statutes with the authority to dismiss teachers after a due process hearing has been held. (Munnelly, 1979, p. 221)

2. Boards of education must use only those causes specified in their state's statutes and may use no other. However, they may make their case under the elastic "good and just clause." (Neill & Custis, 1978, p. 8)

3. An employee right may be found in a local ordinance, a state statute, the Federal Civil Rights Act, in one of the Amendments to the United States Constitution, or in an employer-employee contractual agreement. (Shulman, 1978, p. 47)

4. In general, due process is satisfied when administrators and boards invoke the principles of fair play and when they are reasonable, just and not arbitrary or capricious. The courts have refused to formulate an absolute definition of due process. Instead, due process is described as "developing by the gradual process of judicial inclusion." (Neill & Custis, 1978, p. 33)

When school administrators and the board of a district deem reduction in force to be a necessary action, the contention of Shulman (1978) appears to apply: "Whether the rights of the teacher will be held to be constitutionally protected will depend on the weight given the teacher's expressed right, as against the reasonableness of the state action needed to operate and manage the schools efficiently and effectively" (p. 47).
Criteria for Order of Layoff

Once the decision has been made that reduction in force is necessary and that decision has been sufficiently substantiated (or not challenged), the next questions involve which programs and which individuals within those programs will be cut. Serious consideration of the present and future program needs of the district is necessary in order that the schools can continue to provide appropriate learning opportunities for the students.

The questions of which programs to eliminate or cut back "are for the board to decide, and as long as it does not act arbitrarily, the courts will sustain its right to make this decision unilaterally" (Phay, 1980b, p. 19). The question of which individuals to dismiss within the cut or reduced program is not clearly addressed by the law nor easily answered by the administrators. However, Zirikel and Bargerstock (1980), in their comprehensive survey of the laws on reduction in force, found that "The courts generally have upheld the suspension or dismissal of nontenured over tenured teachers and, where there is a statutory basis, have followed seniority lines" (p. 49). "On the matter of the order for release between tenured and nontenured teachers, the overwhelming majority of courts have granted tenured teachers a priority" (p. 19).

If tenured teachers have a priority over nontenured teachers, what criteria will be used to determine the order of release when only tenured teachers are left in a district? According to Hollander (1978), "the identification may be set forth in the institution's own regulations, in a state statute, or in a collective bargaining agreement. Professional
standards of teachers and administrators may apply" (p. 169). The legality of establishing criteria for determining the order of dismissal was addressed by Zirkel and Bargerstock in their 1981 Legal Memorandum on Reduction in Force. Their memorandum to the National Association of Secondary School Principals stated the following:

Where statutes (and contracts) are silent about the proper basis for retention among tenured or nontenured teachers, courts have tended to leave the matter to the board's discretion, and again most boards have elected to use seniority as at least one factor [emphasis added]. In states where legislatures have mandated seniority as a criterion, courts have been fully supportive; focusing their attention on subsidiary matters such as the applicability and calculation of seniority credit. (p. 5)

In an earlier study of the law as it applies to reduction in force and criteria for making employment decisions (specifically the use of seniority among tenured teachers), Zirkel and Bargerstock (1980) found that, in states where the statutes omit mention of seniority, the courts have rendered tractable decisions concerning the use of seniority as a decision criterion when determining the order of dismissal of tenured teachers. The cases examined by Zirkel and Bargerstock (1980) illustrated a broad spectrum of court decisions. Examples of the variety of decisions handed down are as follows:

The Alabama Supreme Court stated: "We find nothing in the Tenure Act establishing a criterion for determining what particular tenure teacher's contract should be cancelled when there is a 'justifiable decrease in the number of teaching positions.' In such a situation, it seems to us that the right of selection is a matter resting entirely with the employing school board." (p. 21)

"Delaware's Supreme Court expressly abstained from voicing any opinion about the subject of seniority among tenured teachers" (p. 21). "A
number of other states, such as Pennsylvania and New York, have legislatively recognized and judicially reaffirmed seniority as a criterion for retention" (p. 21). The status of seniority as the criterion in reduction in force varies considerably and can be found in the legal framework of statutes, case law, and locally adopted agreements relating to RIF.

In addition to attending to state statutes, case law, and collectively bargained agreements, boards must establish criteria for reduction in force decisions which are in accordance with equal opportunity conciliation/affirmative action agreements. Kelley (1978) pointed out that "Seniority has conflicted with some recent anti-discrimination laws such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The conflict has centered on the advance in the labor market made by minorities and women, which were [sic] eroded when RIF was based on seniority" (p. 20). Moreover, Kelley believed that "Changes will most likely occur in the future because of interaction of laws, court rulings, negotiated agreement provisions, and equal employment conciliation agreements" (p. 22).

Recognition of a need for change was supported by the 1.8 million member National Education Association (NEA) in a resolution adopted by the 1981 Representative Assembly and reported in the 1980-1981 NEA Handbook. The Association asserted there that "It may be necessary to give preference in the hiring, retention, and promotion policies to certain racial groups or women or men [sic] to overcome past discrimination" (p. 228). In another resolution, one specifically addressing criteria for reduction in force and adopted the same year, the NEA stated the following:
The National Education Association believes that one of its basic responsibilities is job security and urges its affiliates to support legislation and/or to negotiate in master contracts criteria to be utilized should reduction in force (RIF) occur. Criteria should include seniority, objectivity, nondiscrimination, uniformity of application, and affirmative action. (p. 235)

The most frequent reason for using seniority as the criterion for reduction in force decisions was suggested by S. M. Johnson (1982), "seniority . . . is a useful standard by which layoff and transfer decisions can be made because it is an objective standard [emphasis added] that protects crucial job decisions from political interference or administrative abuse, and because it lends itself to orderly procedures" (p. 12). Moreover, as Zirkel and Bargerstock (1980) reported, decisions based on seniority usually are upheld by the courts (p. 49).

Seniority can be measured and defined in a number of ways, including the following: total years in the school system, years of service in a building, years of service in current department, years teaching current grade level, total years in the teaching profession, and/or any combination of the aforementioned (Bender, 1980; S. M. Johnson, 1980; Nassau, 1978). Nassau (1978) observed that there are myriad variables and considerations with respect to the use of seniority as the criterion for RIF decision making, and the use of seniority (however defined) may produce positive and/or negative effects on the educational program of the school district (p. 69). S. M. Johnson (1980) expanded the notion of the negative effects of using seniority as the criterion when she stated that "the criterion of seniority may not produce a diverse and flexible staff that demonstrates a range of teaching skills. It does not guarantee that schools can retain their best teachers" (p. 215).
Other criticisms offered for not using seniority as the selection criterion are that "using seniority results in the removal of young teachers, ignores professional competence, and limits the social and employment gains of ethnic minorities" (Bender, 1980, p. 38).

Although the use of seniority as a criterion in RIF decisions may engender negative consequences for the district, it seems clear that the concept of seniority is valuable and will continue to be used because of existing state statutes, case law, and collectively bargained agreements. If seniority is to be used, it appears appropriate that attention be given to the way it is used as well as to the manner in which it is defined and measured.

Seniority may be used alone or in a combination of other factors and it may be assigned varying weights when used in combination with other criteria. Assignment of special weight to seniority was illustrated by S. M. Johnson (1982). Her study of public schools in Massachusetts revealed three typical stipulations used in multiple criteria situations:

**Seniority provided**: "Seniority shall govern provided that teacher qualifications and performance are substantially equal" (p. 18).

**If equal, seniority**: "When length of service, ability, and qualifications are relatively equal, length of continuous service shall prevail" (p. 18).

**Seniority unless**: "Length of service will prevail unless the (senior) teacher has received two unfavorable ratings within the last five years" (p. 18), or "layoffs shall be effected in the inverse order of seniority within discipline with the exception of those instances..."
where a junior teacher holds a position within a discipline which no other teacher within the discipline is qualified to fill" (p. 18).

S. M. Johnson (1982) intimated that there may be alternative ways of dealing with seniority when she stated:

Management negotiators often assume that union demands for seniority-based layoffs are non-negotiable demands with the full force of the teacher membership behind them. In fact, though unions do press for straight seniority systems, teachers do not unanimously support them. Union interests and teacher interests do not necessarily coincide. (pp. 24-25)

Moreover, teachers as a group advocate seniority with some ambivalence. Those interviewed . . . emphasized that what they sought in supporting seniority was an assurance of fairness and protection against favoritism and administrative caprice. (p. 25)

S. M. Johnson (1982) concluded:

The teachers' concern about school quality and professional standards might well make them responsive to management proposals intended to ensure qualified staff for each teaching assignment, as long as the criteria for judgments were explicit. (p. 27)

Criteria (in addition to tenure, seniority, and affirmative action) that have been used or have been suggested for use in multiple criteria situations include the following: professional certification; academic qualifications/degree status; teacher performance as determined by evaluation; student performance; program needs of department, building, or district; and participation in extracurricular activities, such as sponsoring clubs, coaching teams, or serving on building or district committees (Bender, 1980; Greenwich Draft Policy, 1982; H. G. Johnson, 1976; S. M. Johnson, 1980; Nassau, 1978; NEA 1980-81 Handbook; Piele, 1980).

Although the choice of which criterion or combination of criteria is to be used for RIF decisions can be determined by state statute, case law,
district policy, and/or collectively bargained agreement, Zirkel and Bargerstock (1981) pointed out that "to the extent that they do not conflict with state statutes and constitutional rights, local policies and contracts can dictate the reasons and procedures for RIF" (p. 7). Furthermore, if RIF is a negotiable item (the courts have not agreed on this matter), then "RIF matters may be enforceably specified in a collective bargaining agreement" (p. 7).

Reduction-In-Force Policies and Procedures in Connecticut

The board of education of the local school districts has the right and power to reduce the number of teaching staff positions. In order to establish the nature of the reduction-in-force policies and procedures used in Connecticut school districts, a letter was sent to each of the district superintendents requesting a copy of the RIF policies and procedures used in the district. The reduction-in-force policies and procedures developed and implemented by the school boards of 121 districts in Connecticut that were reviewed reflected both the individuality and diversity of the local systems as well as consistent commitment to the retention of certified, tenured teachers.

Although each school board was free to develop its own policies and procedures, the processes used to identify the staff to be laid off and the procedures followed in the layoff process had to conform to all constitutional due process requirements and to state statutes related to the termination of professional staff. In addition, in districts where the reduction-in-force policies and procedures were included in the bargained agreement between the board of education and the local
education association (approximately 98% of the 121 districts studied),
the policies and procedures had to be consistent with the established
contract.
In each board policy or agreement reviewed the choice was made to
initially effectuate reduction in staff through voluntary retirements,
voluntary resignations, release of paraprofessionals and part-time
teachers, voluntary leaves of absence, and/or voluntary transfers. It
was only after further reductions in staff size became necessary that
variations in policies and procedures were evident. One consistency
among the variations was—although it is not mandated by state law—
tenured teachers were given prime consideration over nontenured teachers
within each district. Some districts chose to qualify this policy.
The following are examples of "qualified" policies:

Teachers who have acquired tenure will have first preference
for retention in positions for which they are certified and
qualified. (Hampton Public Schools)

Non-tenured teachers shall be terminated on a system-wide
basis before tenured teachers within the same certification
range. (Berlin Public Schools)

In cases where two or more affected non-tenure teachers
have equal certifications and qualifications...the criteria
of total years in the Litchfield School System, total
years of teaching experience, and degree status will be
considered in that order. (Litchfield Public Schools)

Determination of those non-tenured teachers to be released
shall be based on the following factors: skill and ability,
certification, seniority, qualifications wherein academic
degree status and prior teaching experience at or near the
grade level or the relevant subject areas are indicators.
The order of the factors is without significance or import.
(Beacon Falls-Prospect Public Schools)

Quality of instruction is the single most important factor
in the retention of non-tenure teachers who are certified
to teach in the same curriculum areas, subject, level or
program. (Trumbull Public Schools)
A number of districts preferred a less prescriptive policy:

Non-tenured teachers shall be laid off first. The Board may choose among non-tenured teachers at its own discretion without regard to seniority or certification. (Monroe Public Schools)

In the event the Board shall, in its sole judgment, decide to reduce professional staff, then it shall exercise its discretion with respect to non-tenured teachers. (Westport Public Schools)

An additional consistency among the variations was that tenured teachers with standard or permanent certification were usually given preference over tenured teachers with provisional certification.

When reductions were necessary within the tenured staff, school boards generally established two types of layoff units: system-wide (Shelton, Berlin, and Woodbury) or grade level groupings; i.e., K-6, 7-8, 9-12 (East Lyme, Litchfield and Westport). In one instance, the specified layoff unit was the school building or the department (Chaplin).

A review of the policies and procedures revealed that strict, system-wide seniority-based layoffs were rare. The only district policy that followed strict seniority was that of Waterbury: "The cut-back or elimination shall be done first on the basis of certification and then on the basis of City-Wide Seniority." However, seniority (variously defined) was always one of the criteria used in decision making. Multiple criteria (variously defined, or often not defined) were incorporated in many of the district policies.

In making staff reductions among tenured teachers, seniority within areas of reduction shall be the determining factor, except that the Board may retain a teacher who would otherwise be laid off in any given school year if his certification, teaching level experience, overall performance for the Windham
Public Schools (as evidenced by the contents of the teacher's personnel file), or qualifications (as determined by certification and teaching experience in the same subject area within the previous five (5) school years shall demonstrate that such teacher possesses overriding professional value as a teacher and therefore should be retained in preference to a more senior teacher. (Windham Public Schools)

Seniority prevails (total number of years of consecutive service in Enfield) except when a teacher has exhibited broad superiority in skill and ability (evaluations of the preceding five years will be the measure of skill and ability). (Enfield Public Schools)

The following criteria will be used to select those tenured teachers who are to be considered for termination: certification, seniority within the school system, skill and ability, qualifications wherein academic degree status and prior teaching experience at or near the grade level or the relevant subject area are indicators. The order of the factors is without significance or import. (Beacon Falls-Prospect Public Schools)

The criteria for dismissal of tenure teachers shall be: seniority and quality of instruction. (Trumbull Public Schools)

The decision shall be made on the basis of what is in the best interest of the school system. A teacher's length of service in the system shall be the prime factor, but not the sole factor in making such decisions. (Manchester Public Schools)

Seniority (total length of continuous service) providing doing so does not conflict with the best interest of the school system. (Montville Public Schools)

The strict application of seniority . . . may be modified in any individual case where it is necessary to maintain a specific educational program, as so demonstrated by the Superintendent. (Monroe Public Schools)

The following ordered (ordered means that "a" ranks first, "b" ranks second, and so on) criteria will be imposed first on non-tenured staff and then on tenured staff: (a) certification, (b) evaluation, (c) longevity in the system, (d) total years experience at level, (e) total years of teaching experience, (f) degree status. (Chaplin Public Schools)
Within the separate categories of tenure teachers and non-tenure teachers, the following criteria will be considered:
(a) areas of certification, (b) total years of experience in teaching, (c) qualifications and ability, as demonstrated by an objective evaluation of the teacher's performance. (Scotland Public Schools)

Determination of those who are to be released is to be made as follows: the staff member(s) least qualified on the basis of tenure, certification status, length and quality of experience shall be released first. (Pomfret Public Schools)

If it is necessary to reduce tenured staff, then the Board agrees, giving consideration to the level, subject and certification, it shall lay off tenured personnel in the reverse order of employment in the Westport System. (Westport Public Schools)

A review of the policies and contracts from districts in Connecticut established the following as criteria that are considered in reduction-in-force staffing decisions: tenure status; degree status; program needs of the district, building, or department, and seniority. Seniority was variously defined: total number of years teaching; total number of years teaching in the school district; total number of consecutive years teaching in the district; total number of years teaching at a particular grade level or in a subject area; or a combination of two or more of the definitions.

Teacher Evaluation Practices and Problems

The NEA (1980-81) formally urged "local affiliates to negotiate RIF policies that exclude performance evaluation from consideration in the reduction in force process" (p. 235); it did support the inclusion of certification, seniority, and tenure as criteria. The Association was reluctant to have performance evaluation as a criterion in RIF
decisions because it believed that performance evaluation, as it existed in most school districts at that time, did not provide for fair and equitable treatment of all teachers (p. 232).

On the other hand, since the NEA supported the development of "contractually defined evaluation procedures" (p. 256), it appeared that if evaluation procedures could be mutually developed and agreed upon by administrators and teachers—procedures that contribute to unbiased, fair, and equitable RIF decisions—the Association might be more receptive to the inclusion of performance evaluation results in reduction in force decisions. Although the NEA urged its affiliates to exclude performance evaluation as a criterion for RIF decisions, S. M. Johnson (1980) suggested that: "It is clear that teacher organizations are not invariably opposed to performance-based layoffs" (p. 20). Seniority may have been a criterion, not because the teachers favored seniority, "but because they lacked confidence in the system's evaluation procedures" (p. 20). It may be that the evaluation procedures—not the concept of evaluation—are opposed and mistrusted by teachers.

The problems associated with teacher evaluation are embedded in the basic requirements that the process itself be valid and reliable; the process must yield results that contribute to fair and equitable employment decisions. The overriding concerns, when evaluation results are used for administrative decision making in reduction in force situations, are fairness and due process. Specific problems associated with teacher evaluation will be examined in greater detail in the following pages.
Research has not progressed far enough at this point to support dogmatic conclusions regarding which evaluation techniques or procedures work or do not work, but one of the purposes of this study was to investigate the extent of agreement between teachers and administrators in regard to: (a) the use of evaluation results, (b) who should be involved in the evaluation process, (c) what evidence of performance should be collected, and (d) how performance evidence could be collected.

**Purposes of Teacher Evaluation**

The purpose of evaluation—whether of program, project, product, or personnel—is to contribute to sound, reasoned decisions based on accurate and adequate information. Within the context of education, teacher evaluation is generally understood to mean "appraising the quality, worth or effectiveness of the individual's work" (Kronk & Shipka, 1980, p. 7). The National Education Association recognizes a broader scope of teacher evaluation in that it directs its association bargainers to "keep in mind that a teacher's performance will be judged on the basis of work in the classroom and work outside the classroom" (Dunlop & McComb, n.d., p. 4).

Within the specific context of reduction in force situations, it is important to note the distinction made between quality (merit) and worth: merit is understood to mean "the excellence of an object as assessed by its intrinsic qualities of performance" (Joint Committee, 1981, p. 156); worth is understood to mean "the value of an object in relationship to its purpose" (Joint Committee, 1981, p. 156). Reduction in force situations may involve merit and/or worth. If two or more
teachers are judged to be of equal merit and have equal status in regard to other criteria that are used for making the employment decision, the final employment decision may be based on the perceived worth of each individual in relation to the needs of the district as it attempts to meet its broad educational goals. The NEA recognized and addressed this issue when it cautioned the Association bargainers to:

View evaluation in the broadest context, i.e., not simply as a formal procedure for assessing competency in instruction but as in fact any administrative judgment about a teacher's performance whether formally assessed or not . . . How well a teacher handles cafeteria supervision, or how many P.T.A. meetings a teacher attends, or a teacher's activities during a preparation period, or how well a teacher chaperones—these and more may be considered critical at some point by an administrator and become part of the record of a teacher's performance. (Dunlop & McComb, n.d., p.4)

Evaluation of teachers is done for two basic purposes: (1) formative evaluation (diagnosis) "as a means to improve the teacher's effectiveness in performing his or her duties" (Kronk et al., 1980, p.8), or (2) summative evaluation (judgment) "to serve administration decision making with respect to hiring, firing, promotions and tenure, assignments and salary" (Millman, 1981, p. 13). The nature of decision making and the specific information needed to make certain types of decisions suggest the existence of problems if one attempts to use a single evaluation process (or tool) to serve the disparate goals of formative and summative evaluation. Gruenfeld (1981) reported "there is increasing evidence that a single system may be unable to serve multiple purposes" (p. 1). Walker (1980) was of the opinion that: "A single system cannot serve the dual goals of performance evaluation and performance planning and review. The basic problem encountered by
supervisors in appraising teacher performance is the dual purpose of appraisals. Managers find it difficult to serve as both judge and counselor" (p. 217).

The purpose of evaluation should be made clear to all involved with the process. According to Thomas (1979), "What is more troublesome is the actual use of evaluation to terminate when the stated purpose is to help everyone to become better" (p. 21). Ferreira (1981) contended that fairness and equality for all can only be insured if procedures are designed and implemented which keep the two purposes of evaluation separate. Further, he linked the needs for fairness and equality to the basic concern for job security when he stated, "Teachers' jobs literally depend upon the adequacy of evaluation procedures. Decisions to rehire teachers, to grant tenure, or to terminate employment inevitably depend on evaluation results. Evaluation is usually a pass/fail decision" (p. 671).

As school enrollment declines and the necessity for reduction in force increases, this pass/fail decision is being made with respect to an increasing number of teachers each year. According to findings reported in the Neill and Custis (1978) study of 1,728 school districts (about 11% of the total surveyed), dismissals for both incompetence and reduction in force were underway in 40% of the districts responding in the Northeast, 33% of those in the Southeast, 23% in the Southwest, and 20% in the Northwest. A 1978 AASA "Critical Issues Report" suggested that secondary schools will serve an estimated 25% fewer students in 1990 than they did in 1976. Obviously, not all school districts will lose students in the coming years, but the majority will. Some school
districts already have had to cut professional staff by as much as 10% in 1 year because of major enrollment drops (Phay, 1980b, pp. 11-35).

Just the lawful treatment of teachers is a continuing concern for teachers' unions. The increased need to reduce staff in many districts has contributed to the NEA's position which specified employment security as the most fundamental interest of its members, and therefore, the most important concern for the organization (Dunlop & McComb, n.d., p. 1). Because teachers' unions have rejected the use of performance evaluation in administrative decision making in their struggle for job security, evaluation of teacher performance has recently come under increased judicial review.

The NEA supports the concept of formative evaluation:

The Association . . . believes that evaluations should be conducted for the purpose of improvement of performance and quality of instruction offered to pupils, based upon written criteria and following procedures mutually developed by and acceptable to the teacher association, the administration, and the governing board. (Dunlop & McComb, n.d., p. 217)

The NEA did not endorse teacher evaluation—as it is now practiced in most districts—as a criterion for administrative decision making which affects job security. "Simply put, a procedure may be valid for improving instruction but patently unfair if used to support managerial actions against a teacher" (Dunlop & McComb, n.d., p. 2). The position of the Association in regard to the use of formative evaluation procedures for employment decisions is perhaps best illustrated by the statement made in the NEA publication, The Fair Treatment of Teachers: Teacher Evaluation and Collective Bargaining, prepared by Dunlop and McComb (n.d.).
The problem . . . is that some evaluation procedures eliminate protections for teachers under the guise of improving instruction, [sic] it would be ideal to have two separate procedures, one entitled "evaluation" which would be used to ensure fair treatment for teachers being discharged, assigned, etc., and one entitled "improvement of instruction," which would be used only as a cooperative problem solving device under which judgments made about teachers would not be used in any way in employment security situations. This ideal is impossible. (p. 2)

In regard to the possible use of teacher evaluation results as one of the criteria in reduction in force employment decisions, S. M. Johnson (1980) reported that "While many educators advocate performance over seniority as the criterion for teacher layoffs, they express skepticism that it is possible in practice" (p. 215). Zirkel and Bargerstock (1980), in their summary of legislation and litigation concerning reduction in force, said that: "To date the issue of including job performance evaluations as one of the criteria for establishing priorities in layoff of professional personnel during RIF has received little attention either in state statutes or court decisions" (p. 50). In a later report, the same authors (1981) noted that "Merit is not statutorily mandated as the criterion [emphasis added] for RIF in any state. Pennsylvania had utilized merit in combination with seniority until 1979. This practice generated considerable litigation about merit ratings" (p. 5). The question of whether staff reductions should be based on seniority or on teacher competence (as determined through evaluations), or on some combination of these and other factors, is yet to be answered.
Teacher Evaluation and the Law

The legality of using teacher evaluation results as a criterion for employment decisions in general—and specifically in situations involving reduction in force—has recently been brought into question. Because an adverse evaluation may have a negative impact on a teacher's opportunity to gain a livelihood, all such decisions must be made within a legal context, with careful consideration of the issues involved. Protection for teachers and the legal aspects of summative evaluation were (and generally remain) a state matter; however, there are numerous cross-cutting legal concerns. Flygare (1976) indicated that "Legal rights of teachers depend upon a number of forces. To solve any particular problem it may be necessary to resort to the contract, the state or federal statutes, to Supreme Court decisions, to regulations of the State Board of Education" (p. 44).

When summative evaluations are used in making staffing decisions, due process (as defined in Amendments Five and Fourteen) protects against arbitrary actions by a state or its agents, i.e., the school board or its administrative representatives. The courts are not involved unless an adverse decision is appealed by either party; the stage is then set for court intervention. At that point, according to Fleming (1978), "dismissal is solely a matter of state jurisdiction unless the constitution rights of the individual have been violated" (p. 24).

In addition to the constitutional and statutory constraints which apply, assessment of merit and/or worth and the subsequent employment
decisions which are based on that assessment must be executed within guidelines established by the Equal Opportunity Employment Commission.

Holley and Field (1977) cautioned that although performance evaluation was not mentioned per se, several sections of the "Guidelines" do apply:

The definition of a "test" as used in the "Guidelines" is not limited to a measurement of cognitive domains such as abilities, aptitudes, and intelligence, but is extended to noncognitive domains such as interest, attitudes, personality and biographical data. Most performance evaluation systems within educational settings fall under the definition of a "test" as defined by the "Guidelines." (p. 431)

Holley and Field added that the "Guidelines" contain additional implications regarding content and application of performance evaluation methods:

The work behaviors or other criteria of employee adequacy which the test intended to predict or identify must be fully described and additionally, in the case of rating techniques, the appraisal form(s) and the instructions to the rater(s) must be included as part of the validation evidence. Such criteria may include measures other than actual work produced, such as training time, supervisory ratings, regularity of attendance, and tenure. Whatever criteria are used, they must represent major or critical work behaviors as revealed by careful job analysis. (p. 432)

H. C. Johnson (1976) explained that "What Congress has commanded is that any test used must measure the person for the job and not the person in the abstract" (p. 607).

According to Dunlop and McCobb (n.d.), "Historically, evaluation procedures were created to provide substantive and procedural guidelines for supervisors evaluating teachers" (p. 2). The major purpose was to help teachers to do a better job, i.e., to improve their teaching competencies. Declining enrollment, accountability demands, and general economic decline seem to have combined to shift the historical focus
of teacher evaluation from the formative to the present emphasis on summative. This change in purpose and use of evaluation without concurrent change in processes and procedures has stirred controversy.

The legal problems associated with the use of evaluation results in reduction in force decisions appear to be partially grounded in the lack of (and need for) a definition of competence. According to Hathaway (1980), there is no set of teacher competencies that have been empirically validated by research as essential for effective learning to take place" (p. 214). Coker, Medley, and Soar (1980) found that "Little evidence exists to show a relationship between mastery of a given set of competencies and effective teaching" (p. 149).

At the present time no agreement has been found at any level as to what comprises satisfactory teacher performance. It appears that local control over local education has engendered local standards. At the state level, evaluation standards and criteria, as they apply to performance evaluation, are partially structured and restricted by state tenure laws, certification laws, and collective bargaining agreements. Some commonalities do exist among the states with respect to these elements; nevertheless, they are state-specific. Downey (1978) maintained that, in reference to teacher evaluation, consensus regarding standards must be reached at the local level (pp. 23-26). Thomas (1979) reasoned, "What works in one school district may not be right for another. Each school district should tailor its performance evaluation program to the conditions and needs of that district. Models can illustrate but they can rarely be replicated in toto" (p. 9). Ferriera (1981) supported the view of Thomas:
The judicial standards emerging from legal and quasi-legal
decision (especially in teacher dismissal cases) assume that
teacher performance must meet minimum state standards. But
they affirm that the teachers should be judged relative to
the standards of a given school district (not to the profession,
the state, the region or the individual school). (p. 671)

It is through collectively bargained agreements between local
school boards and associations (unions) which represent teachers that
local evaluation criteria and standards are established. Reutter and
Hamilton (1976) noted that "The extent to which public employees in
general, and school boards in particular, may engage in collective
bargaining with employees has not been judicially determined in most
jurisdictions" (p. 428). Flygare (1977) found that "No legislation has
been passed by Congress to govern collective bargaining for public em-
ployees. Governance of labor relations for state and local employees
has been left entirely to the states" (p. 6). Jascourt (1980), after a
review of state statutes pertinent to this issue, concluded "there is
collective bargaining in every state, no matter how it is disguised"
(p. 95).

At the present time, individual state legislatures have the power
to determine what is (and what is not) negotiable. Wide variations
exist among the states as to what may be negotiated and what must be
negotiated. Jones (1980) explained:

Mandatory subjects of negotiation are defined as subjects
upon which a public employer is required by decisional law
or statute to negotiate with representatives of employees.
Permissive subjects of bargaining are those upon which
the employer is empowered to bargain, although not required
by law. (p. 118)

Sexton, Fox, and Potter (1977-78) reported that "No consistency was
found among states delineating negotiable and nonnegotiable items"
More recently, Cresswell and Murphy (1980) concluded that typically "law grants the union power of joint determination of school policy—wages, hours, and conditions of employment" (p. 166).

Beckham (1981) determined that teacher evaluation is generally held to be a "condition of employment." "While few states have permitted the negotiation of evaluative criteria, procedures and protocol relative to the teacher evaluation process have been held mandatory subjects for negotiation" (p. 47). Stone (1981) reported that "in many cases, evaluation designs are specified in collectively bargained agreements" (p. 407).

Grievance procedures have been developed within collectively bargained agreements in an attempt to reduce the costs (in time and money) of litigation; however, a grievance decided by an arbitrator may still end up in court. Grievance procedures resemble judicial procedures in their guarantees of due process to teachers. According to Stone (1981), "The 'just cause' clause assures that teachers will not be dismissed, demoted, suspended, nonrenewed, or otherwise adversely affected without reasons that are arguable before an arbitrator or court of law" (p. 407).

Legal considerations must be taken into account in all situations which involve adverse employment decisions for teachers. These include—but are not limited to—use of summative evaluation results in decisions to transfer, dismiss, withhold tenure, demote, and accomplish reduction in force. Valid and reliable means must be used to define and identify competency; realistic and reasonable performance standards must be established and performance must be appropriately measured; due process
guarantees must be strictly followed. These same guidelines—validity, reliability, and due process—apply when reduction-in-force decisions must be made.

As previously cited, Phay (1980b) reported that "The procedural due process requirements are much less demanding for reduction in force than for discharge for cause" (p. 14). Nevertheless, Bargerstock and Zirkel (1980) emphasized that according to recent court decisions a teacher who is terminated must be provided with a written statement explaining the rationale for the decision, i.e., the reasons for the RIF (p. 17). The growing necessity for developing a rationale for reduction in force decisions and the use of evaluation in making those decisions was illustrated by a 1978 survey in which Kowalski found a change in emphasis regarding the use of teacher evaluation results. Of the 97.9% of the surveyed school districts that reported using some type of teacher evaluation system:

A rank ordering by frequency responses indicates that school districts use the results of teacher evaluation for the following reasons: to help teachers improve their teaching performance; to decide on renewed appointments for probationary teachers, to recommend probationary teachers for tenure or continuing contract status; to recommend dismissal of unsatisfactory tenured or continuing contract teachers; to select teachers for promotion to supervisory or administrative positions; to qualify teachers for regular salary increments; to select teachers for special commendation; to select teachers for layoff during reduction-in-force; to qualify teachers for longevity pay increments; and to qualify teachers for merit pay increments. (p. vii)

The most frequently reported use of teacher evaluation was "to help the teachers improve their performance." However, many of the uses identified by Kowalski may be subsumed under the general category
of summative evaluation for administrative decision making. It appears as if school boards and state legislatures are beginning to require evaluation as a criterion in instances where administrative staffing decisions must be made. After reviewing the teachers' contracts of school systems throughout Massachusetts, S. M. Johnson (1980) "was surprised to find many included performance criteria in their reduction-in-staff provisions" (p. 215).

In an attempt to address the problems associated with the use of evaluation results in instances of administrative decision making in regard to continued employment, Beckham (1981) extrapolated precepts from existing case law and developed guidelines for teacher evaluation that emphasized the necessity for procedural and substantive criteria. Beckham's (1981) guidelines appear to represent the "state of the art" in regard to legal considerations in teacher evaluation; for this reason they are presented here in toto:

1. The evaluation process should be formalized in advance of implementation, consisting of written policies defining evaluation criteria that are reasonably related to the teacher's job performance and the school system's goals and objectives.

2. Criteria for evaluating teacher performance should be developed from a thorough job analysis and shown to be job related through content or empirical validation procedures.

3. Where possible, it is preferable that evaluation criteria be objective or where not obviously objective, susceptible to objective assessment.

4. Subjective criteria or ratings should be considered as but one component in an overall evaluation system and should not be relied on as conclusive in making employment decisions.
5. Evaluations should be based on frequent observations of job behaviors, undertaken by more than one observer, each of whom is trained to observe and rate teachers.

6. The administration and scoring of evaluation instruments should be uniform in application to all teachers and standardized so that weight to be given various measures is fixed for all teachers.

7. Teacher evaluation policies must not be invidiously discriminatory as to stated intent, application or consequence.

8. The language of evaluation instruments, including explanations and directions for use, should be simple, precise and uniform.

9. Teachers should be fully informed of the criteria and procedures associated with the evaluation process.

10. State statutory mandates, administrative rulings and collective bargaining agreements specifically establishing procedures and standards for the evaluation of teachers should be strictly followed.

11. Evaluations should be supported by substantiated observations of teacher performance, ratings and anecdotal records gathered systematically over a reasonable period of time.

12. The teacher should receive notice of the results of evaluation, emphasizing deficiencies, corrective action proposed and recommended improvements.

13. Following notice of the evaluation, the teacher should be permitted to review the personnel record and comment on his or her evaluation.

14. After notice of remedial deficiencies, the teacher should be given a reasonable time to make corrections and aid in remedying deficiencies before an adverse job decision is made.

15. Evaluation materials; including ratings, observations, anecdotal records, notice of evaluation policy, notice of evaluation results, and employee comments on evaluations should be maintained in a permanent record system in order to document elements of the evaluation process. (p. 48)

Beckham's guidelines are necessary but not sufficient for problem resolution. If strictly adhered to by administrators, these guidelines
should lessen the likelihood of personnel employment decisions, based on summative evaluation, being overturned in the courts. Analysis of developing case law should demonstrate if this assumption is true. However fair in form the guidelines may be, teacher evaluation (and its concomitant use in reduction in force employment decisions) may still be perceived as unjust by those affected by the process and the administrative decision. Beckham addressed the issue of appropriateness in the legal sense; appropriate and acceptable criteria for, and methods of, evaluation are yet to be determined.

McKenna (1981) cautioned that "Success in teaching, however defined and assessed, is highly contextual" (p. 23). Delineation of specific criteria to be used in teacher evaluation, determination of the weight to be assigned to an individual criterion, and establishment of acceptable standards of achievement are the responsibility of the local school district. Popham (1973) contended that "The teacher evaluation game demands personal and particular decisions, not general guidelines" (p. 35). The criteria selected depend upon the purpose of evaluation. Diverse approaches are called for in response to the particular needs and circumstances of the individual school district. The questions of why evaluate; who evaluates, how, when, and what to evaluate, and related concerns must be answered within the context of the local district.

Who Evaluates? How?

"In many cases, teachers who lose their jobs have challenged the use of teacher evaluations as a factor considered by the board in the reduction in force employment decision" (Beckham, 1981, p. 45). It
seems reasonable to expect that such challenges will increase as school districts are forced to make reductions within the ranks of tenured personnel. In spite of the challenges, the opinion of Howsam (1975) appears to be true: "It does little good to protest the limits of evaluation. The fact is that[,] given present circumstances at least, evaluation is both necessary and inevitable, regardless of its desirability, effectiveness, or consequences" (p. 40).

Teacher evaluation as a process is replete with problems. Perhaps Beckham (1981) best summarized the statelessness of the state of teacher evaluation: "There exists no model or instrument for teacher evaluation that is not open to criticism on the grounds that it lacks essential elements of reliability or validity" (p. 22). The problems associated with the development (or lack thereof) of valid and reliable evaluation models and instruments appear to be embedded in the lack of understanding of "learning" as a total process. Once the nexus between teaching and learning is clarified, it may be possible to develop truly valid and reliable teacher evaluation models and instruments. The works of Beecher (1979), Bloom (1976), Brophy (1979), Crenshaw and Hoyle (1981), Peterson (1979), Rosenshine (1979), Wynne (1981) and the Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study (BTES, 1979) appear to suggest that researchers are making progress toward a legitimate method of identifying and/or specifying effective teaching and the effective teacher. And, as the authors of the BTES (1979) said, "it is on a clear definition of teacher effectiveness that all evaluation must rest" (p. 5).

If we do not yet have a "clear definition of teacher effectiveness," if we have not yet caught the essence of teaching, how do we go about
evaluating teachers in a valid, reliable, and legal manner? Although the limited understanding we now have in regard to the connections between learning and teaching may retard the development of totally valid and reliable teacher evaluation procedures, we may already have procedures that are "good enough." If due process considerations are attended to, if the procedures yield results which are credible; i.e., are perceived as fair and equitable, then perhaps a school district already has—or could develop—teacher evaluation procedures that are "good enough" to be used in reduction in force employment decisions. The alternative—not using teacher evaluation as one of the criteria for RIF decisions—appears to be educationally, psychologically, and organizationally unsound.

The literature concerned with teacher evaluation and the problems associated with the process abounds with descriptive and prescriptive reports. Research based studies—quantitative or qualitative, experimental or naturalistic—are scarce. Although the question of "who evaluates what" is yet to be answered in a definitive way through empirical investigations, there appear to be a number of "who" and "what" elements that consistently appear in past and present evaluation literature. It was from the literature and from evaluation procedures known to the researcher that the "who" and "what" of this study were drawn. In addition, if the National Education Association was found to have taken a position in regard to a particular "who" or "what," the Association's stand is reported herein.

One of the most comprehensive reviews (1900-1952) of quantitative studies done on the identification and evaluation of the effective
instructor was commissioned by the United States government and completed in 1954 by Morsh and Wilder. They examined over 900 references drawn from the Educational Index and Psychological Abstracts, plus some 40 reviews and bibliographies, including the comprehensive Domas-Tiedman bibliography (Morsh & Wilder, 1954, p. 2). An examination of the 1954 findings and the views more recently reported by those active in the field of teacher evaluation are presented below.

Perceptions and findings stated under "Past" are paraphrased from Morsh and Wilder (1954) unless otherwise noted: The quoted NEA position on each element is from Dunlop and McComb (n.d.).

Instruments Used

**Past.** Surveys of rating scales in use failed to provide means for identifying the significant items used in setting up the instructor rating scales. Items on rating scales tended to be subjective, undefined, and varied, there being no consistency as to what traits an evaluator might be expected to observe and subsequently to evaluate.

**Recent.** Oldham (1975) quoted Shanker from the November 1973 The American Teacher:

All evaluation instruments are imperfect, probably the best would be a competent evaluator, competent in the discipline that he or she presumes to evaluate, armed with a blank piece of paper, and enough time and objectivity to ascertain, within the limits of human capabilities, what is going on in the classroom. (p. 18)

**NEA.** The narrative form of written evaluation is preferable to checklists for a number of reasons. First, the Association is not co-opted into accepting ambiguous phraseology on standards of performance that can prove troublesome in the future.
Second, the narrative form requires the evaluator to reflect more carefully than would a checklist that suggests areas not relevant or important. Third, the relevancy of the standards actually applied by the evaluator is more readily apparent when the evaluator is required to think of the standards, write them out, and provide supporting data. (pp. 6-7)

**Administrative Ratings**

**Past.** Administrative overall opinion constituted the most widely used measure of instructional competence. By and large, ratings made by the same person were apt to be contaminated by the halo effect.

**Recent.** A review of the studies of Chan (1973); McNeil and Popham (1973); Swartz (1975); Tuckman, Steber, and Hyman (1977); and Wilcox (1976) prompted Levin (1979) to assert that "serious questions exist about the validity and fairness of supervisor ratings of teachers as presently conducted" (p. 242). Cooley (1981) maintained the subjectivity of evaluators is inevitable and that it is important for all involved in the process to be aware of this inevitability and its possible negative consequence (p. 89). Concern for the confounding effects of specific rater biases—the halo effect, leniency, severity, central tendency, recency, and what McGregor (1957) called fear of playing God—was indicated by Glueck (1978) and Kearney (1978).

There is much research to indicate that evaluator training reduces rater error and that partial problem resolution appears possible (Bernardine & Walter, 1977; Latham, 1975; Smith & Kendall, 1963).

**NEA.** "The legal responsibility to appraise the performance of teachers rests with the board and its agents, the administrators" (p. 7).
Peer Ratings

Past. Peer ratings had been little used. For administrative purposes, they probably were not too helpful since teachers had certain misgivings about passing judgment on fellow teachers. The halo effect influenced peer ratings just as it did administrative ratings.

Recent. Peers are placed in the role of evaluators primarily, but not exclusively, at four-year colleges and universities. Peer review is widely used in the judgment of research scholarship, but its role in evaluating teaching has been largely ignored (Batista, 1976). Critics of peer evaluation allege that the process is fraught with politics and personalities and that unbiased judgments are the exception rather than the rule. Citing a 1975 study by Centra, Lazovik (1981) maintained "research has clearly indicated that, although discussion of teaching among colleagues following visitation can contribute to formative evaluation, peer ratings based on visitation are so lacking in reliability that they are useless for summative purposes" (p. 75).

NEA. The idea behind peer evaluation is that only other teachers similarly situated can understand and appraise teaching performance. This may be true in the abstract, but the realities of organizational security dictate otherwise. No association should bargain a peer evaluation clause that in effect allows one teacher to assume supervisory status over another teacher. A teacher who evaluates another or whose information and judgments about another teacher are used to support administrative actions against that teacher is acting as a supervisor. (p. 7)
Systematic Observation

Past. Systematic observation techniques to determine differences in performance of effective and ineffective instructors have been largely neglected in the research. Most observations made have been dependent upon subjective judgment of the observer/evaluator. No single, specific, observable teacher act had yet been found, the frequency or percentage of which was significantly correlated with student achievement.

Recent. In a comprehensive review of the then-current trends in school policies and programs, Oldham (1974) reported that:

The most common method of formal teacher evaluation is the classroom visitation . . . it is the foundation of the evaluation process . . . as generally practiced for the purpose of formal evaluation . . . classroom observation is of little value and can be more harmful than beneficial. (p. 16)

Gage (1972) questioned the validity and subsequent use of any data collected during teacher observation in teacher evaluation. He believed that an evaluation program based on teacher observation was unworkable.

McIntyre (1980), reporting on a 1974 study by Rogato, stated:

The presence of an observer resulted in significant differences in classroom attitude. The presence of an observer in the classroom resulted in positive teacher affective behavior and higher ratings of classroom attitude. The absence of an observer resulted in less positive affective behavior and lower ratings of classroom attitude. (p. 37)

The essence of the "observer effect" perhaps was best summarized by Rosenshine and Furst (1973) when they suggested that teacher behavior which occurs when an observer is present may or may not be comparable to what occurs when the observer is not present.
NEA. The NEA cautioned:

Keep in mind that "evaluation" is a judgment; an "observation" is part of the process leading to the judgment. The fundamental premise is . . . if a teacher's employment security is at stake (and it is whenever the administration is engaged in a process to assess the worth of that teacher), fair and reasonable observation of the classroom work of the teacher is important. The classroom is the major locus of the teacher's job responsibilities and an evaluation based upon short hit-and-miss observations, or upon no observations [..] is unfair. Such observations can warp perceptions. If an evaluation is to be a fair and reasonable appraisal of the work effort of a teacher, it must be preceded by observations of sufficient length and number so that the situations and circumstances of the teacher are reliably sampled. And if after this the teacher is found deficient, the administration should redouble its observation efforts. (pp. 9-10)

Student Ratings

Past. The use of student ratings of instructor effectiveness appeared to be growing. There was considerable expressed opinion but little research evidence that student ratings contributed to instructor improvement or could be used to improve supervisory ratings.

Recent. The use of student ratings of instructor effectiveness continues to grow, especially at the university and secondary school levels. Costin (1977), Lehman (1974), and Mintzes (1977), opined that a number of highly reliable student rating tools are now available and supported their use in the teacher evaluation process. Conversely, Levin (1979), in a review of the work of Swartz (1975) and Morrow (1977), drew the following conclusion: "When student ratings of teachers are compared with ratings by supervisors or other teachers, the student ratings are substantially different from these others" (p. 243).
Few would quarrel with any teacher who freely and voluntarily conducts student evaluations for his or her own use and improvement. But a problem arises when these evaluations are used to support administrative actions affecting the employment security of a teacher. Students are poorly qualified from a substantive fair treatment standpoint to judge the worth and efficiency of a teacher. They lack the maturity, experience, and technical expertise to make valid judgments on teaching skill and knowledge. (p. 7)

Self-Ratings

Past. Self-ratings showed negligible correlation with administrative ratings, student ratings, or measures of student gains.

Recent. Seldin (1975), in a review of the then-current practices, found that self-evaluation was not widely utilized in considerations for contract renewal, tenure decisions, or promotions. Self-evaluation is primarily used for self-understanding and as a guide to instructional improvement (formative evaluation).

NEA. This is a classic example of two worthwhile objectives creating conflicts. Self-appraisal is a legitimate tool of self-improvement. However, to compel a teacher to make a self-appraisal and then to use it against him or her in denying a promotion, transfer, or assignment or in supporting any other administration action against that teacher is patently unfair and will defeat any possible good arising from self-evaluation. (p. 7)

Administrative, peer, student, and self-ratings are all possible elements of the “who” in regard to teacher evaluation. The inclusion of additional evaluators contributes to the validity of the total evaluation; yet each has a particular bias or shortcoming associated with it. Ryans (1960) suggested that an individual’s perception of what constitutes a good teacher is shaped by his/her values, beliefs, acculturation, and those aspects of the teaching process which are
important to him/her at any given time; e.g., cognitive demands, needs for nurturance. McNeil (1971) reached a similar conclusion: "It is clear that the idea of a great teacher is in the eye of the beholder" (p. 28).

What Is to be Evaluated?

The "what" of teacher evaluation is concerned with the choice of measures/indicators that might serve as criteria to be considered in teacher evaluation systems. Although the literature concerning the "what" to evaluate is broad in scope and appears to be somewhat bound by time and place (whatever the researchers considered the "essence" of effective teaching to be), there appear to be general ideas in regard to choice of indicators that consistently recur.

The first of those recurring ideas was stressed by Oldham (1974):

To evaluate a teacher it is necessary for the local school administrators and teachers to determine and agree on the characteristics of an effective teacher and on the ingredients of effective instruction. Yet few among the experts and practitioners agree on characteristics or how they can be measured. (p. 11)

Ryans (1960) and Medley (1973) suggested that there is no single set of skills, attitudes, interests, and abilities that all good teachers have and all bad teachers lack. Wynne (1981), subsequent to his 10-year study of 140 schools, concurred with the views held by Oldham and suggested that the criteria used to delineate meritorious staff performance are more obscure than the criteria used to depict exemplary student achievement (p. 381).
Brophy (1979), in a review of research findings concerned with aspects of the teaching process, reported that teachers do make a difference. However, he also concluded "there is no support for the notion of generic teaching skills . . . few, if any specific teacher behaviors are appropriate in all contexts" (pp. 33-38). Beecher (1979) related the analogous view of Shanker, "We simply do not know with any degree of assurance what teacher skills, traits, behaviors, or modes of performance will 'work' for all children . . . or for some" (p. 515). Investigators such as Rosenshine (1971) and Heath and Nielson (1974) also contended that no one criterion is complete; however, they did suggest that there may be cogent and valid competencies upon which teacher performance appraisal should be based.

According to Crenshaw and Hoyle (1981), "Teacher personality remains the dominant criterion for determining teacher effectiveness" (p. 42). In relation to this, R. A. King (1981) cautioned that "many of the criteria used in rating teacher performance do not fall within categories identified in the literature as related to teaching effectiveness" (p. 26). Seldin (1975) perhaps summarized the situation when he stated, "It is easy to document a large number of cases . . . in which the evaluative criteria are whimsical and have little to do with the teacher's performance" (p. 11).

The essence of recent findings such as those of Beecher (1979), Brophy (1979), Crenshaw and Hoyle (1981), Peterson (1979), and Rosenshine (1979) pertaining to relevant criteria for teacher evaluation is encapsulated in Wynne's (1981) reflections drawn from his study of the characteristics that distinguished successful schools from unsuccessful schools:
In good schools the staff—especially the supervisors and even the students and parents involved—have a clear idea of what constitutes good performance. They all understood that a good teacher "cares"; even more important, they knew that caring is displayed in observable conduct, e.g., regular and timely attendance, well organized lesson plans, reasonably orderly classes, routinely assigned and appropriately graded homework, friendly but authoritative relations with students, purposeful use of class time, and supportive relations with colleagues. (p. 177)

According to Robinson and Lee (1978), "Everyone seems to agree on the many different concepts to be evaluated; however, they do not agree on the specific criteria to be observed. This issue should be resolved if evaluations are to be meaningful and consistent" (p. 16). The multiple responsibilities of teachers suggest multiple, relevant criteria for teacher evaluation. As Glueck (1978) stated, "The evidence is very clear that single performance measures are ineffective because success is multifaceted; most studies indicate that multiple criteria are necessary to measure performance completely" (p. 299).

A second recurring idea found in evaluation literature concerns the specific criteria that have been (or are being) used as part of evaluation systems: teacher testing was (is) one of those criteria. The testing of teachers as a method of teacher evaluation was not addressed in the Morsh and Wilder (1954) study. However, concomitant with the growth of the accountability movement of the 1970's was the development of a plethora of teacher competency tests. Those instruments were designed to measure teacher knowledge of subject matter and, in some instances, teaching ability. The 1971 Supreme Court decisions in the Griggs v Duke Power case served to slow the spread of the teacher competency movement. Validating the instrument, i.e., showing the
direct correlation between questions on the test and job performance, proved to be more costly in terms of time and money spent than the purported benefits of using the tests. The NEA strongly opposed the use of such tests;

The Association believes that examinations such as the National Teacher Examination must not be used as a condition for employment, placement, or promotion of teachers. The Association is convinced that no test in existence is satisfactory for such usage. (NEA, 1980, p. 218)

Many of the early researchers, working under the assumption that the purpose of teaching was to bring about specific changes in the student, concentrated on identifying the effectiveness of the teacher in producing such changes. Research studies concerned with pupil growth and achievement in relation to teacher performance were reviewed by Ackerman (1954); Symonds (1955); Morsh, Burgess, and Smith (1956); and Medley and Mitzel (1957). Two problems common to that type of research were identified: (1) the difficulty of obtaining valid and reliable measurements of student gains in designated areas and (2) the difficulty of determining just how much of the measured change(s) was attributable to the teacher. The Morsh and Wilder (1954) review suggested that, within the limits of the measures used, the relationship between administrative opinion of an instructor's competence and the amount of subject matter that the instructor imparted to the students could not be predicted.

Research by Brophy (1976), Shavelson and Dempsey (1975), and Soar and Soar (1975) suggested that using student gains on tests for summative evaluation purposes is not particularly desirable because of questions of stability of teachers' effects on long term learning. Glass (1974)
asserted that "Evaluating teachers by measuring their pupils' gain from September to June on commercially available tests is patently invalid and unfair" (p. 15). This is not to suggest that Glass believed that using student gains to evaluate teachers would always present such problems; he merely called for sounder instruments and further research.

The NEA position on the use of student test results as a possible criterion in teacher evaluation was addressed in the Dunlop and McComb (n.d.) publication:

The argument in support of this focus is that teachers are in the business to increase the skills of a student in a given area. The degree to which the student increases his or her skill or measures up to set standards becomes the basis for determining the effectiveness of the teacher. The traditional means for measuring the student's skill level is the standardized test. Consequently, how well students do on a test will be the basis for appraising teacher performance.

Two types of tests are offered as measuring devices. One is the standardized (norm-referenced) tests. The well-known achievement tests which measure how well a student does in relation to other students are of this variety. The other is the criterion-referenced (objectives-referenced) test which purports to measure a student's attainment of desired performance objectives which have been stated in behavioral terms. Both tests raise significant questions about substantive fair treatment. (p. 8)

Whether or not the use of student gains is desirable as a possible criterion for consideration in teacher evaluation (especially in reduction in force situations) is certainly debatable.

Another recurring idea found in the literature deals with the use of personality traits as a criterion for evaluation. The recent work of Madaus, Airasian, and Kellegan (1980) summarized the work and conclusions to date regarding the nexus between teacher traits and student achievement.
It is reasonable to expect that the teacher is a big factor in student achievement, and indeed in the Colemen survey there was evidence that a teacher's verbal ability was related, albeit not very strongly, to student achievement. One looks in vain however, for evidence of a consistent and significant relationship between any teacher trait and student achievement. . . . The search for the teacher personality characteristics that are consistently related to pupil achievement has not been more successful than the search for critical factors in teaching. (pp. 98-99)

The multiple concerns, different foci of research, and divergent beliefs of the researchers of the 1970s can be inferred from the statement by Bolton (1973):

Recent emphasis on accountability has tended to focus attention to the product, i.e., evidence of student learning. However, the emphasis on accountability was preceded by a considerable period when most research stressed investigation of the procedures used in the classroom and, more recently, self-evaluation of classroom interaction. Therefore, it is natural to consider evaluation of both the product of teaching and the procedures used to effect these outcomes in specific situations. (p. 141)

What Bolton appears to suggest is that both the "products" and "procedures" used by the teacher in the classroom may be appropriate criteria for teacher evaluation.

In spite of the dearth of well grounded information about the basic teaching task and the factors that lead to effectiveness, teacher evaluation goes on. Reduction-in-force employment decisions are made on the basis of the information at hand. Because careers are at stake, it is imperative that the evidence collected and the information used in summative employment decisions (such as those in reduction-in-force situations) be as valid, reliable, and bias free as the methods and procedures will allow. Each of the indicators cited in the literature, and others that are used by practitioners, have a specific degree of validity and reliability associated with it.
Summary

The literature associated with the law as it applies to reduction in force and the practices and problems associated with teacher evaluation appears to suggest the following:

1. The legal issues associated with reduction in force are not definitive on the state, local, or district level.
2. District personnel may use their discretion when determining the criteria and order of layoff as long as the RIF decisions do not contradict basic guarantees of due process.
3. Teacher evaluation is replete with problems. Nevertheless, teachers appear to accept the process of evaluation if the results are used for formative purposes.
4. Public pressure for accountability appears to suggest the use of teacher evaluation results as one of the criteria to be used in reduction in force decisions.
5. If teacher evaluation results are used for summative purposes such as RIF decisions lack of agreement between teachers and administrators in regard to who evaluates, what is evaluated, and how the evaluation is undertaken may contribute to increased legal action by teachers.

In light of the analysis of relevant literature, the purpose of this study was to investigate the areas and extent of teacher and administrator agreement in regard to criteria that should be used in reduction-in-force decisions and, concomitantly, to determine whether the development and use of two separate and distinct teacher evaluation
systems (one for formative purposes and one for summative purposes), i.e., a change in the nature of existing evaluation systems, might affect the acceptance of teacher evaluation in reduction-in-force staffing decisions.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The focus in this chapter is on the design of the study and the methodology used to conduct it. Specifically, the purpose of the study, the research hypotheses tested, the operational definitions used, the design, the development of the instrument, the population and the sample, the sample selection procedures, the data collection methods, and the data analysis techniques are discussed.

Purpose of the Study

The intent in doing this study was to investigate the areas of agreement between teachers' and administrators' opinions in regard to criteria that should be considered in reduction-in-force staffing decision. In order to: (a) investigate the areas of agreement and (b) determine the possible impact of a change in the nature of existing teacher evaluation systems, i.e., a change in the type of indicators used and participants included, on acceptance of evaluation as a criterion in RIF staffing decisions, the following hypotheses were submitted for study:

1. There is a relationship between one's position—i.e., administrator or teacher—and one's choice of criteria to be considered in making reduction-in-force staffing decisions.
2. There is a relationship between one's position—i.e., administrator or teacher—and the importance accorded each criterion in reduction-in-force staffing decisions.

3. There is a relationship between one's position—i.e., administrator or teacher—and one's choice of "performance indicators" to be used in designing and using teacher evaluation systems that are solely to help the teachers to improve their effectiveness.

4. There is a relationship between one's position—i.e., administrator or teacher—and one's choice of "performance indicators" to be used in designing and using teacher evaluation systems that are to serve administrative decision making with respect to hiring, firing, promotions, transfers, reduction in force, etc.

5. There is a relationship between one's position—i.e., administrator or teacher—and one's choice of "who" should participate in the teacher evaluation process when the results are to be used solely to help the teachers to improve their effectiveness.

6. There is a relationship between one's position—i.e., administrator or teacher—and one's choice of "who" should participate in the teacher evaluation process when the results are to be used to serve administrative decision making with respect to hiring, firing, promotions, transfers, reduction in force, etc.

The complex issue of seniority—what it is, how to define it, and how/if to use it in reduction-in-force staffing decisions—was investigated using the following hypothesis:

7. There is a relationship between one's position—i.e., administrator or teacher—and one's preferred definition of "seniority" if
seniority is used as the only criterion when determining the order of layoff among tenured teachers in reduction-in-force situations.

**Operational Definitions**

The following terms are found in education and legal literature related to reduction in force. The explanations provided are those generally acceded to by the education and legal professions, and they are presented as they were used in this study.

**Administrator**

An administrator is:

Any employee, the majority of whose employed time is devoted to service as a supervisor, vice principal or director of a department or the equivalent, or a superintendent, deputy superintendent, or assistant superintendent of any district, whose duties and job description assigned by the district involve the implementation of policies and the coordination of planning, instruction or support services of the district, and who holds an administrative certificate if required for the position. (Oregon Department of Education, 1981, p. 9)

**Affirmative Action**

Affirmative action is:

District policy and implementation procedures adopted by the Board to meet the federal and state statutes and regulations regarding the employment, promotion, and retention of employees without regard to race, national origin, religion, sex, age, handicap, or marital status. (Oregon Department of Education, 1981, p. 9)
Case Law

Case law is "unwritten law." Unwritten law is not the result of statutory or constitutional provisions; it is the result of the doctrine of "stare decisis"; i.e., the courts were guided by earlier decisions in reaching judgments in similar cases (Gatti & Gatti, 1983, p. 335; Reutter & Hamilton, 1970, p. 2; Shaver, 1978, p. 281).

Collective Bargaining

Collective bargaining is a process of negotiations between employer and the representative of employees (usually a union) for determining employment relations in regard to the conditions of work; e.g., wages, hours, job duties, evaluation systems, reduction-in-force policies and procedures.

Common Law

Common law is the general universal law of the land. This law is not derived from state statutes, but is developed through court decisions over hundreds of years. Common law prevails in England and the United States and is the controlling law unless abrogated or modified by state or federal statutes. It should also be noted that common law may also be abrogated or modified by a constitutional amendment or decision by a higher court which adjudicates a constitutional issue (Gatti & Gatti, 1983, p. 89). "Common law is law that emerges from case decisions—'case law'" (Reutter & Hamilton, 1970, p. 1).
Due Process

Due process of law is a fundamental right guaranteed to citizens of the United States under the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution. This amendment provides that: "No state shall . . . deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without due process of law; . . ." Basically, due process is a course of proceedings following established rules which assure enforcement and protection of individual rights. (Gatti & Gatti, 1983, pp. 152-153)

There are two types of constitutional guarantees that may influence court decisions: procedural due process and substantive due process.

"Procedural due process refers to the procedures and methods used to carry out regulations. Generally, procedural due process can be thought of as an individual's right to notice and a hearing" (Neill & Custus, 1978, p. 33). "Procedural due process protects one against arbitrary actions by public officials" (Dolgin, 1981, p. 18). "Substantive due process refers to the fairness of the law or regulation. The extent and definition of substantive due process are based largely on the due process clause of the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution and on comparable provisions in state statutes" (Neill & Custus, 1978, p. 33). "Substantive due process provides the protection of such basic rights as speech, press, religion, assembly, and equal protection of the law as listed in the First, Thirteenth, and Fourteenth Amendments" (Dolgin, 1981, p. 18).

Supreme Court decisions handed down in 1972 differentiated between the due process rights that must be provided to tenured teachers and those provided to nontenured teachers. A hearing is not required when a nontenured teacher's contract is not renewed unless the nonrenewal decision deprives the teacher of either "liberty" or "property" interests.
Due process procedures must be followed when a tenured teacher is dismissed because the teacher is considered to have a "property" interest in continued employment (Leichner & Blackstone, 1977, pp. 51-69).

**Grievance**

According to the NEA in its Fair Treatment of Teachers position paper, a grievance is "a claim by a teacher that there has been a violation, misinterpretation, misapplication, of the contract agreement or any rule, order or established practice of the Board" (Dunlop & McComb, n.d., p. 11).

**Job Description**

The basic job description merely defines the tasks that make up the job and may indicate the skills required. For the purposes of this study, the suggestion of Gruenfield (1981) was adopted; i.e.,

For the purposes of performance appraisal, job descriptions require the establishment of the scope of responsibility and accountability and performance standards. The description should focus on important aspects of the job, omit nothing crucial [sic] but remain manageable in size. (p. 4)

**Just Cause**

"Just cause is a term used to express the judgment or opinion of an individual or a group as to the rightness or reasonableness of a matter or a question that is being or has been decided" (Boles, 1983, p. 13). Just cause is a catch-all category used as a reason for dismissal; its nature varies from state to state, from district to district, and often it is used as a reason for reduction-in-force actions.
Reduction in Force (RIF)

In the terse terms of Nolte (1976), reduction in force occurs when "Falling enrollments and rising costs force the school board to 'rif' half the staff...slang: bust, pink slip, fire" (p. 26). Phay (1980c) provided a more complete definition when he described what he referred to as the "Depression-era phrase." Reduction in force is a result of:

- lowered enrollments;
- reduced turnover among teachers;
- a steady movement of students from public to private schools;
- greater unwillingness by weak teachers to resign when pressured to do so;
- change in program; and
- reduced school budgets because of inflation, reduction in tax revenues, and unexpected elimination of federal or other funding. (p. 1)

In the legal sense, perhaps reduction in force has been best defined by the Oregon State Department of Education (1981) as "A process by which a local district administration and Board proceed in an orderly manner to reduce the number of employees" (p. 10); "Layoff and RIF are frequently used interchangeably. RIF does not intend permanency when initially implemented" (p. 3).

Seniority

Seniority is generally understood to mean the according of precedence or priority due to an individual's length of service. Thus, the fundamental idea of seniority as used within educational settings is that teachers with more years of service to a school district deserve priority over those with fewer years of service. In her 1982 study of Massachusetts school districts, S. M. Johnson perceived several underlying assumptions that are often cited by advocates of seniority as it is applied to RIF employment decisions:
Competence increases with experience; seniority provisions are said to appropriately reward workers for their loyalty to an employee over time; seniority provisions are favored by unions, and often by management as well, because they set forth objective standards by which employment disadvantages, i.e., overtime, layoffs, can be divided among workers. (p. 4)

Counter arguments were also presented:

Competence does not necessarily increase with experience. . . . While loyalty may deserve recognition, neither industry nor schools can reward loyalty alone, particularly during financially difficult times when a force of loyal and secure workers may be only moderately productive. (p. 4)

Finally, "The objective application of seniority rules may upset what racial balance has been achieved during the last decade of affirmative action" (p. 4). The potential benefits and shortcomings of the use of straight seniority-based reduction in force actions are self-evident.

Kelley (1978) suggested the use of a modified seniority system as a means of retaining essential faculty. A modified system might include:

Consideration of all previous and present employment and/or length of service in a particular building, department, grade level, or combination of these.

Teachers

Teachers are "All employees in the public schools who have direct responsibility for instruction" (Oregon State Department of Education, 1981, p. 2).

Teacher Performance Evaluation/Appraisal

Teacher performance evaluation in education was defined by Holley and Field (1977) as "any means, either formal or informal, subjective
or objective, through which information is obtained for the purpose of making personnel decisions within an educational setting" (p. 427). In this present study, emphasis was on formal, objective teacher evaluation. Moreover, teacher evaluation also implied inclusion of judgments that are made as well as the processes by which they are made. However, the influence of informal, subjective evaluation on administrative decisions was recognized.

Tenure

Tenure is generally understood to mean length of employment in a position. Under varying state laws, a teacher usually attains continuing tenure by satisfactorily serving a probationary period, ranging from 60 days in one state to 5 years in others. The courts have rules that once a teacher has tenure, one has a "property" interest in continued employment and, for that reason, cannot be dismissed—that is, deprived of that property—without due process.

Design of the Study

Survey, as a method of empirical research, was selected as an appropriate means for exploring and describing the opinions and attitudes of teachers and administrators in regard to reduction-in-force staffing decisions and to the concomitant choice of criteria to be used in those decisions. The survey was cross-sectional in nature, measuring a sample from the population at one point in time. Mailed questionnaires (teacher and administrator) were used for data collection. Confidentiality was
assured in order to reduce bias that might result from the sensitive nature of answers to specific questions.

Instrumentation

The review of literature, including reduction-in-force policies and procedures from Connecticut school districts, established the following as reasonable and tenable criteria for personnel decisions in reduction-in-force situations: affirmative action, area of certification, participation in extracurricular activities, teacher evaluation results, seniority, years of experience at grade level or in subject area, program needs, and tenure status. An examination of extant evaluation instruments, found in a review of relevant evaluation literature, yielded the following performance indicators: attendance at professional meetings, classroom environment, teacher performance plans and objectives, observations of classroom teaching, personal attributes, teacher-pupil relations, student gain scores, teacher command of subject matter, and teacher volunteer service. Through the review of relevant literature and an examination of reports of existing teacher evaluation practices, the following were identified as potential participants in the evaluation process: central office personnel, department chairpersons, parents, peers, principals, school board members, self, students, superintendents, and teacher union or association representatives.

It was necessary for the researcher to develop an instrument that would yield data relevant to the topic under investigation. The choices of criteria for use in reduction in force and teacher evaluation were based on the reviewed literature and they reflected criteria currently in use.
Development

Using the information gathered through the review of the literature, the investigator compiled "as exhaustive a list as possible" (Babbie, 1973, p. 135), of the legal and presently utilized criteria for RIF decisions and some choices of "who," "what," and "how" in regard to teacher evaluation. The instrument was designed using the dual goals of clarity of wording and ease of response. Each item on the questionnaire reflected a possible criterion to be used in regard to reduction-in-force staffing decisions and teacher evaluation.

Pilot Test

The validity of the criteria and the clarity of the item wordings, as well as the appropriateness of the design of the questionnaire, were evaluated by having six practicing teachers and six administrators from the Portage, Michigan, Public Schools respond to the following questions:

1. **Clarity:** Is the statement clear and concise?
2. **Redundancy:** Is the item redundant vis-a-vis the content of other items?
3. ** Appropriateness of criterion placement:** Is the item placed correctly according to the dimension specified at the beginning of each of the groups of statements?
4. **Favorability:** Does a response of "strongly agree" indicate a positive attitude toward inclusion of the criterion in RIF decisions and/or evaluation?
5. **Response stimulus:** Is the item a proper stimulus for a "strongly agree" or "strongly disagree" response?

6. **Content validity:** Does the item relate to RIF and teacher evaluation as described in the literature and as observable in present practice?

7. **Inclusion:** Does the statement possess sufficient validity to be included in the instrument?

8. **Importance:** How important is each item relative to other items pertaining to the same dimension? Each item was rated on a 3-point importance scale: (3) high, (2) medium, or (1) low.

The decision rules for item retention were: (a) agreement of nine out of the 12 teachers and administrators on Items 1 through 7, e.g., clarity, favorability, and content validity, and (b) a mean of 1.5 on Item 8, i.e., importance. A mean of 1.5 for each item was selected in order to retain the item unless the judgments were strongly negative.

The specific instructions provided to the teachers and administrators and the decision rules for item retention are displayed in Appendix A. Comments and suggestions from those professional educators were used to reword and/or clarify items. In accordance with the stipulated decision rules, each item on the teacher questionnaire was retained. The level of agreement for each item on Criteria 1 through 7 and the mean score for Criterion 8 are displayed in Appendix B.

Two mailed questionnaires were used to collect the data, one for teachers and one for administrators. Except for items specific to position characteristics (teacher or administrator) and five attitudinal items, the teacher and administrator forms were identical. For each
item on the questionnaire that addressed the choice of criteria to be used in RIF decisions, "who" should participate in teacher evaluation, and what "indicators" should be used in teacher evaluation, expression of an opinion on a 5-point Likert-type scale was called for. The questionnaire items that dealt with the existence of a bargaining unit, the designers of the formal evaluation system, and the existence and development of RIF policies and procedures allowed for a straightforward yes/no/unsure reply.

Population

The population investigated was the 169 school districts in Connecticut. Connecticut was chosen for this study because of the diversity of school districts with respect to size, complexity, financial resources, bargaining units, teacher evaluation systems, and reduction-in-force pressures. It was believed that this diversity would contribute to the generalizability of the findings from this study.

Sample Selection Procedures

An introductory letter requesting specific data relevant to the particular school system was mailed to the superintendent of each of the 169 school districts in Connecticut (see Appendix C). The letter explained the status of the researcher and stated why it was necessary to gather the requested information. Two weeks after the first mailing, a follow-up letter was sent to the nonrespondents. Each mailing was done on College of Education, Western Michigan University, stationery, was signed by the researcher and endorsed by her committee chairperson,
and included a preaddressed, stamped envelope for the convenience of
the respondent.

Subsequent to the return of the introductory letters by the super-
intendents (see Appendices C and D) (71.5% usable returns), the districts
were ranked according to size, i.e., number of teachers. Analysis of
the returns revealed: (a) of the 121 responding districts, the 18 larg-
est contained 48.8% of the teachers; (b) the larger districts were ex-
periencing reduction-in-force pressures to a greater extent than the
smaller districts; (c) the approximate teacher-to-administrator ratio
was 15:1 regardless of district size; and (d) the National Education
Association held a 3:1 margin over the American Federation of Teachers
in teacher union membership throughout the 121 responding districts.

In view of the above-cited findings, the decision was made to
select the sample of five districts (three NEA and two AFT) from the
largest districts, based on an assumption that because the larger dis-
tricts were experiencing reduction in force, the teachers and adminis-
trators within those districts would be more likely to have opinions
regarding criteria to be used in reduction-in-force staffing decisions
than would their counterparts in districts where RIF was not a threat.
In addition, sampling from three NEA and two AFT districts would reflect
the actual union membership affiliation of teachers, 3:1 NEA to AFT,
found throughout the 121 responding districts.

The superintendents of the five districts randomly selected from
the 18 largest for inclusion in the study were then contacted by letter
(see Appendix E). Their cooperation in obtaining the names and addresses
of all teachers and administrators within their districts was requested.
When cooperation was not forthcoming, alternate districts were randomly selected from the appropriate list of 18 eligible districts.

Due to political pressures and practical constraints the design and sample selection procedures that would have yielded the appropriate NEA to AFT union member proportions (3:1) could not be followed; i.e., the two AFT affiliated districts withdrew from participation in the study, leaving only the three NEA districts. However, the approximate 15:1 teacher-to-administrator ratio prevalent throughout most districts in the state was maintained.

From the lists provided by the three cooperating superintendents, a systematic sample of the predetermined number of teachers and administrators was drawn. Table 1 displays the number of teachers and administrators sampled from each district.

Table 1
Sample Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Number of teachers</th>
<th>Number of administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Collection

The materials forwarded to each educator included: a cover letter explaining the nature of the study (see Appendix F), the appropriate form of the questionnaire (see Appendix F), and a preaddressed, stamped envelope. Subsequent follow-up material (a new cover letter, questionnaire, and preaddressed, stamped envelope) was sent to the nonrespondents at 1-month intervals (see Appendix G). The third and final follow-up packet contained both an additional copy of the original questionnaire and a nonrespondent form that allowed the individual to report why he/she did not wish to complete the questionnaire (see Appendix H). The nonrespondent form—to some extent—allowed for the detection of possible response bias. Financial constraints prohibited further nonrespondent follow-up.

Data Analysis

Statistical Analysis

The responses that dealt with the items related to the research questions were recorded on a 5-point Likert-type scale. Although the "strongly agree" and "agree" responses were collapsed into one category, and the "disagree" and "strongly disagree" were collapsed into another, the additional categories were originally included in order to increase the likelihood of total responses and decrease the number of "uncertain" responses.

The decision was made to employ the Mann-Whitney U Test to test the major hypotheses. This relatively powerful nonparametric statistical
test was chosen because: (a) it requires only that at least the ordinal level of measurement be reached, and (b) it tests whether the distributions are significantly different in respect to their central tendency. Descriptive statistics were employed wherever additional information could be derived from this method of analysis.

Because of the potential diversity of responses in regard to the preferred definition of seniority in reduction-in-force situations, the decision was made to use descriptive statistics, i.e., a comparison of the percentages of teachers and administrators choosing each of five definitions of seniority or any combination of the five, as an appropriate method of analysis of the data.

Content Analysis of Respondents' Comments

In order to better understand the response choices of teachers and administrators, their voluntary comments were requested concerning the choice of criteria to be used in reduction-in-force staffing decisions, particularly in respect to the use of teacher evaluation results and seniority (last page of teacher questionnaire and last page of administrator questionnaire). The process of content analysis suggested by Fox (1969, p. 649) was chosen as an appropriate method by which to analyze the comments of the teachers and administrators. The unit of content to be analyzed was determined and categories in which to place the comments were established.

The decision was made that any comment which addressed the issues of reduction in force and the concomitant issues of seniority and performance evaluation would be accepted provided it was relevant to the
research questions under investigation. Each response was categorized as that of either a teacher or an administrator and then was sorted according to the nature of the response, i.e., whether positive or negative in regard to the nature and use of seniority and/or performance evaluation results in reduction-in-force staffing decisions.

Summary

The purpose of the study, the operational definitions of relevant terms, and an outline of the methodology used to conduct it were presented. Sample selection procedures and rationale were presented and described. A complete list of research questions used for data collection and analysis purposes was presented. An outline of procedures used in the development of the instrument was provided. It was reported that questionnaires were sent to a systematic sample of 320 teachers and 20 administrators from three large districts randomly selected from the 18 largest in the state of Connecticut. Finally, procedures adopted for data analysis were discussed.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

The results of this study are presented within four main categories: (1) survey response is reported and discussed, (2) the sample is described in terms of self-reported professional characteristics and attributes, (3) responses to "knowledge questions" in regard to teacher evaluation and reduction in force are reported, and (4) the research findings are presented in the order of the questions from the instrument as they relate to the research questions and the findings. Information presented in the tables that follow is in the form of the numbers and percents based on the adjusted frequencies of the responses.

Survey Respondents

During the period from May 13, 1983, through August 26, 1983, 220 usable teacher responses and 17 usable administrator responses were received from the three participating school districts (as mentioned earlier, two large districts withdrew from the study and could not be replaced). Two follow-up letters with questionnaires were sent to the selected teachers and administrators at approximately 1-month intervals subsequent to the initial mailing. The second follow-up mailing contained a "nonrespondent form" in addition to a letter and a copy of the appropriate questionnaire. A summary of the returns—categorized by position, i.e., teacher or administrator—grouped according to school districts, is presented in Table 2.
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Table 2
Numbers and Percents of Responses Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>District A</th>
<th></th>
<th>District B</th>
<th></th>
<th>District C</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The teachers’ responses represent 11%, 16.6%, and 14% respectively, of the total teachers in each district. The administrators’ responses represent 22%, 19%, and 14%, respectively, of the total administrators in each district.

Examination of Table 2 indicated the following: (a) the administrator response rate was greater than the teacher response rate in each district, (b) the district with the highest administrator response rate had the lowest teacher response rate, and (c) the low number of administrators surveyed probably limits the generalizability of the findings.

Table 3 contains a summary of the number of returns of the “nonrespondent” form.

Although they were unwilling to take the time necessary to complete the questionnaire, 14 teachers indicated: (a) the number of years they had been teaching (more than 90% for over 15 years); (b) 63.6% were union members; (c) 81.8% felt secure in their jobs in spite of RIF pressures; (d) 54.5% agreed with the teacher evaluation system used in
Table 3

Summary of Nonrespondent Returns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>District A</th>
<th>District B</th>
<th>District C</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

their district; and (e) 54.5% agreed with the reduction-in-force policies used in their district. When asked to give a reason for not participating in the study, one respondent chose "I never participate in research studies;" two chose "I am not interested in the topic;" five selected "I am just too busy;" one believed "my opinion doesn't matter;" an additional five chose "research findings never change actual practices in the schools;" and a final reason stated was "too complicated."

Professional Characteristics and Attributes

In order to understand the nature of the sample and to determine (to some degree) the limits of the findings in regard to generalizability, the professional characteristics of the responding teachers, e.g., years of teaching in present system, total years teaching, highest academic degree, etc., are exhibited in Table 4. Similar information in regard to the responding administrators is displayed in Table 5.
Table 4
Percent of Teacher Respondents Indicating
Selected Professional Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>District A</th>
<th>District B</th>
<th>District C</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level presently teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N = 60</td>
<td>N = 75</td>
<td>N = 77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years served in present system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15 years</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N = 61</td>
<td>N = 81</td>
<td>N = 78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N = 60</td>
<td>N = 79</td>
<td>N = 78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>District A</th>
<th>District B</th>
<th>District C</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years teaching in present assignment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15 years</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of years teaching</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15 years</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest academic degree earned</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A. or B.S.</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. or M.S.</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist's degree</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.d or Ph.D. degree</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>N</strong></th>
<th><strong>N</strong></th>
<th><strong>N</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>District A</th>
<th>District B</th>
<th>District C</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certified to teach in more than one subject area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 59</td>
<td>N = 81</td>
<td>N = 78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified to teach at more than one grade level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>96.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 61</td>
<td>N = 80</td>
<td>N = 78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience teaching more than one subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 60</td>
<td>N = 81</td>
<td>N = 78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience teaching at more than one grade level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 61</td>
<td>N = 81</td>
<td>N = 78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>District A</th>
<th>District B</th>
<th>District C</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Union affiliation and membership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of local bargaining unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

Percent of Administrator Respondents Indicating Selected Professional Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>District A</th>
<th>District B</th>
<th>District C</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. chairperson</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum coordinator</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant superintendent</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic</td>
<td>District A</td>
<td>District B</td>
<td>District C</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central office staff</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>N = 7</td>
<td>N = 5</td>
<td>N = 5</td>
<td>N = 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest academic degree earned</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A. or B.S.</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. or M.S.</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist's</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D. or Ph.D.</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>N = 7</td>
<td>N = 5</td>
<td>N = 5</td>
<td>N = 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years in present school system</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15 years</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>N = 7</td>
<td>N = 5</td>
<td>N = 5</td>
<td>N = 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inspection of Table 4 suggested the following in regard to the professional characteristics of the teachers: (a) The majority of the teachers were highly educated, i.e., 24% of the teachers had either a Specialist's or a Doctor's degree; (b) the majority of the teachers had substantial years of service within the profession, within their particular school district, and their particular grade level or subject area; (c) the majority of the teachers were certified and had experience at more than one grade level and/or in more than one subject area; and (d) the majority of teachers were union members.

Examination of Table 5 suggested the following in regard to the professional characteristics of the administrators: (a) The majority of the administrators were highly educated, i.e., 88% had either a Specialist's or a Doctor's degree; and (b) the majority of the administrators had substantial years of service within the particular school districts in which they were employed when reporting.

Knowledge of Existing Policies and Practices

In an attempt to determine whether the attitudes of the teachers and administrators were possibly influenced by their perceptions of current practices in their school districts, they were asked the following "knowledge questions":

1. Did the teacher bargaining unit participate in the development of your district's teacher evaluation system?

2. Are the teacher evaluation policies and procedures part of the teachers' master contract?
3. Does your district have policies and procedures to follow when reduction in force becomes necessary?

4. Did the teacher bargaining unit participate in the development of your district's reduction-in-force policies and procedures?

5. Are the reduction-in-force policies and procedures part of the master contract?

6. If your district has established policies and procedures to use in reduction-in-force situations, are the results of teacher evaluation used when determining the order of layoff among tenured teachers?

7. If your district has established policies and procedures to use in reduction-in-force situations, is seniority the only criterion used when determining the order of layoff among tenured teachers?

A summary of the teachers' and administrators' responses to Questions 1 through 7 are presented in Table 6.

Inspection of the data contained in Table 6 indicated that 75.8% of the teachers and 94.1% of the administrators are aware that the teachers' union participated in the development of the teacher evaluation system. Mutually developed evaluation systems are mandated by Connecticut State Law (Appendix I).

Although only Districts B and C found it necessary to make reductions among tenured staff, each district had to reduce staff during the past 5 years. Obviously the majority of teachers (95.4%) and administrators (100%) were aware that there were policies and procedures in place for handling this situation. Review of the data in Table 6 suggested that accurate knowledge of who participated in the development of these RIF policies and procedures was less well known, especially by
Table 6

Number and Percent of Responses to Knowledge Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of question and response</th>
<th>District A</th>
<th>District B</th>
<th>District C</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the bargaining unit participate in the development of the teacher evaluation system?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 59</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the teacher evaluation policies and procedures specified in the master contract?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 6—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of question and response</th>
<th>District A</th>
<th>District B</th>
<th>District C</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your district have policies and procedures to follow when reduction in force becomes necessary?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 61</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the teacher evaluation policies and procedures specified in the master contract?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of question and response</th>
<th>District A</th>
<th>District B</th>
<th>District C</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Does your district have policies and procedures to follow when reduction in force becomes necessary?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N = 61</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>81</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>77</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>219</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unsure</strong></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Did the bargaining unit participate in development of reduction-in-force policies and procedures?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N = 61</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>81</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>77</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>219</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unsure</strong></td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of question and response</th>
<th>District A</th>
<th>District B</th>
<th>District C</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the reduction-in-force policies and procedures specified in the master contract?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are the results of teacher evaluations used when determining the order of layoff among tenured teachers?

<p>|                                | Yes | 11.5 | 14.3 | 61.3 | 80.0 | 2.6 | 20.0 | 26.7 | 35.3 |
|                                | No  | 67.2 | 71.4 | 17.5 | 20.0 | 84.2| 80.0 | 54.8 | 58.8 |
|                                | Unsure | 21.3 | 14.3 | 21.3 | 0.0 | 13.2 | 0.0 | 18.4 | 5.9 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of question and response</th>
<th>District A</th>
<th>District B</th>
<th>District C</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is seniority the only criterion used when determining the order of layoff among tenured teachers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the teachers in District B. In District B, only 42.0% of the teachers knew that their union had participated in the development of the RIF policies and procedures. Union representatives had participated in all districts. Analysis of the information in Table 6 indicated an additional area of confusion in regard to the inclusion of RIF policies and procedures in the master contract. Although reduction-in-force policies and procedures were included in the master contract of each district, only 54.6% of the teachers and 82.4% of the administrators were aware that these policies and procedures were part of each master contract.
Moreover, teachers and administrators appeared to be unaware (in some cases) of the criteria that were used in their school districts for reduction-in-force decision making. Review of reduction-in-force policies and procedures from each district indicated that: (a) District A did not use the results of teacher evaluation when determining the order of layoff—seniority within levels was the prime consideration. However, "superior skill and ability" (based upon evaluations of the preceding 5 years) could supersede seniority in order to meet specific program needs; 67.2% of the teachers and 71.4% of the administrators in District A were aware that the results of teacher evaluations were not generally used in RIF staffing decisions. (b) District B used seniority as the basis for an elaborate reduction-in-force procedure that assigned points to various criteria—including seniority and results of teacher evaluation. In District B, 61.3% of the teachers and 80.0% of the administrators had accurate knowledge regarding the use of evaluation results in RIF staffing decisions. (c) District C adhered to reduction-in-force policies and procedures based on seniority within instructional area. A majority of the educators, 84.2% of the teachers and 80.0% of the administrators, in District C were aware that evaluation results were not used in RIF staffing decisions.

The teachers and administrators were queried regarding their satisfaction with the evaluation and reduction-in-force policies and procedures that exist in their respective school districts. They were also asked to indicate their satisfaction with the manner in which these policies and procedures were developed. Table 7 contains the percent of respondents that were satisfied (yes), were not satisfied (no), and those that were unsure about how they felt.
Table 7
Numbers and Percents of Responses to Questions Regarding the Development and Use, and Satisfaction With, Teacher Evaluation and RIF Policies and Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of question and response</th>
<th>District A</th>
<th>District B</th>
<th>District C</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature of question and response</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you in general agreement with the teacher evaluation system?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 61</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you satisfied with the way the teacher evaluation policies and procedures were developed?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 61</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of question and response</th>
<th>District A</th>
<th>District B</th>
<th>District C</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you in general agreement with the reduction-in-force policies and procedures?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong> = 59</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you satisfied with the way in which the reduction-in-force policies and procedures were developed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong> = 58</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In view of the apparent misunderstandings that existed in regard to the previously mentioned areas, i.e., what is or is not in the master contract and who participated in the development of teacher evaluation and reduction-in-force policies and procedures, care should be taken when interpreting the responses associated with these questions related to "satisfaction with . . ." and "in general agreement with . . . ."

The lack of satisfaction by the teachers with the way the teacher evaluation (35% not satisfied, 19.4% unsure) and reduction-in-force policies and procedures (48.6% not satisfied, 16.7% unsure) were developed and the lack of agreement with the existing policies and procedures, 45.6% not satisfied, 10.1% unsure, was possibly due to lack of accurate knowledge about the development of the procedures and the components of the master contract.

In response to the question "Are you generally satisfied with the way the union represents your concerns and ideas to the administration?" 73.4% of the union members responded affirmatively. When asked "Do you believe that the teachers are generally satisfied with the way the union represents their concerns and ideas to the administration?" 88.2% of the administrators reported they believed that the teachers were satisfied.

In an attempt to interpret the findings associated with the specific research questions regarding criteria to be used in reduction-in-force decision making, the educators were asked the following questions: (a) Do you believe that some form of "seniority" should be used when determining the order of layoff among tenured teachers; (b) do you believe that some form of "teacher evaluation" should be used when determining
the order of layoff among tenured teachers; and (c) do you agree with
the way seniority is defined in the reduction-in-force policies and
procedures of your school district?

The percents of teachers and administrators who responded to the
choices of "yes," "no," or "unsure" are presented in Table 8.

Inspection of the data contained in Table 8 showed that 92.2% of
the responding teachers and 94.1% of the responding administrators be-
lieved that some form of "seniority" should be used when determining
the order of layoff among tenured teachers despite the fact that only
42.4% of the teachers and 76.5% of the administrators agreed with the
way seniority was defined in their district's reduction-in-force policies
and procedures. Although 48.9% of the responding teachers did not
agree with what they believed to be the teacher evaluation system used
in their districts (Table 7, page 94), 71% of those teachers and 94.1%
of the administrators believed that some form of "teacher evaluation"
should be used when determining the order of layoff among tenured
teachers.

It should be noted that the preceding positive responses were in re-
gard to the general statement "Do you believe some form ... ." Whether
the positive attitude expressed would extend to particular definition
of seniority for a teacher evaluation system was undetermined.

Research Questions and Findings

Seniority

The complex issue of seniority—what it is, how to define it,
how/if to use it in reduction-in-force staffing decisions, and whether
Table 8

Numbers and Percents of Responses Regarding Specific Factors to be Used in Reduction-in-Force Decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of question and response</th>
<th>District A</th>
<th>District B</th>
<th>District C</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you believe that some form of seniority should be used in reduction-in-force decisions?</td>
<td>96.7 100.0</td>
<td>85.2 80.0</td>
<td>96.1 100.0</td>
<td>92.2 94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7 81 5</td>
<td>77 5 220 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0 0.0</td>
<td>7.4 20.0 3.9 0.0</td>
<td>4.1 5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>3.3 0.0</td>
<td>7.4 0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>3.7 0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you believe that some form of teacher evaluation should be used in reduction-in-force decisions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>District A</th>
<th>District B</th>
<th>District C</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>73.8 100.0</td>
<td>75.9 80.0</td>
<td>63.6 100.0</td>
<td>71.0 94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23.0 0.0</td>
<td>19.0 20.0 26.0 0.0</td>
<td>22.6 5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>3.3 0.0</td>
<td>5.1 0.0 10.4 0.0</td>
<td>6.5 0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of question and response</th>
<th>District A Teachers</th>
<th>District A Administrators</th>
<th>District B Teachers</th>
<th>District B Administrators</th>
<th>District C Teachers</th>
<th>District C Administrators</th>
<th>Total Teachers</th>
<th>Total Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree with the way seniority is defined in your district's reduction-in-force policies and procedures?</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the teachers and administrators agree on definition—was investigated using the following research hypothesis: There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., teacher or administrator—and one's preferred definition of "seniority" if seniority is used as the only criterion when determining the order of layoff among tenured teachers in reduction-in-force situations. The diversity of responses given by the teachers and administrators was analyzed through examination of a frequency table. The numbers and percents of responses of the teachers
and administrators in regard to their preferred definitions of seniority are contained in Table 9.

The "combination" and "other" category choices elicited the following responses from individual teachers and administrators:

Teachers:

1. Total years in the system combined with total years as a teacher.

2. Total years in the system, total years teaching a particular subject, and total years teaching at a particular grade level.

3. Total years as a teacher combined with total years teaching a particular subject.

4. Total years in the system combined with areas of certification.

5. Total years in the system combined with total years at a particular grade level.

6. Total years in the system combined with total years teaching a particular subject.

7. Total years teaching a particular subject combined with total years teaching at a particular grade level.

8. Total years in a particular building in combination with total years teaching a particular subject.

9. Total years as a teacher and ability as determined by evaluation.

10. Total years in the system, total years in a particular building, total years teaching at a particular grade level, and total years teaching a particular subject.

11. Total years as a teacher, total years teaching at a particular grade level, and total years teaching a particular subject.

12. Total years as a teacher, total years in the system, and total years teaching a particular subject.
Table 9

Numbers and Percents of Responses Regarding Preferred Definition of Seniority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of question and response</th>
<th>District A</th>
<th>District B</th>
<th>District C</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If seniority were to be used as the only criterion when determining the order of layoff among tenured teachers in reduction-in-force situations, how do you believe seniority should be defined?

- *N = 61*
  - Years in school system: 42.6, 14.3, 37.5, 100.0, 59.7, 20.0, 46.8, 41.2
  - Years in a particular building: 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0
  - Years teaching a particular subject: 3.3, 14.3, 5.0, 0.0, 7.8, 40.0, 5.5, 17.6
  - Years teaching at a particular grade: 6.6, 14.3, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 20.0, 1.8, 5.9
Table 9—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of question and response</th>
<th>District ATeachers</th>
<th>District B Teachers</th>
<th>District C Teachers</th>
<th>Total Teachers</th>
<th>District A Administrators</th>
<th>District B Administrators</th>
<th>District C Administrators</th>
<th>Total Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total years as a teacher</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some combination of the above</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Total years as a teacher, total years in the system, total years teaching a particular subject, and total years at a particular grade level.

Administrators:

1. Total years in the system in combination with total years as a teacher.

2. Total years teaching at a particular grade level combined with total years in a particular building.

3. Total years in the system and areas of certification.
Examination of Table 9 and consideration of the relatively large percentages of teachers and administrators who chose the "other" and/or "combination" categories as their preferred definition of seniority suggested that the level of agreement between teachers and administrators and among teachers is relatively low—except when seniority is defined as "years in school system." However, it was apparent that teachers (46.8%) favored seniority being defined as "years in a school system" more than did administrators (41.2%).

**Teacher Evaluation Systems**

As may be seen in Table 8, page 98, 71% of the responding teachers and 94.1% of the responding administrators believed that some form of teacher evaluation should be used when determining the order of layoff among tenured teachers. In an attempt to determine if a change in the nature of the existing evaluation systems would increase the acceptance of evaluation as a criterion in reduction-in-force staffing decisions, the educators were asked: If two separate and distinct teacher evaluation systems were to be developed and used in your district (one specifically designed to help the teacher improve his/her effectiveness and one specifically designed to serve administrative decision making), would you be more likely to accept teacher evaluation as a criterion to be used when determining the order of layoff among tenured teachers in reduction-in-force situations than if just one evaluation system were used? A tabulation of the responses is presented in Table 10.

The findings reported in Tables 8 and 10 indicated that although the majority of the educators (72.0% of teachers and 94.1% of the
Table 10

Percents of Responses Regarding the Use of Two Separate Evaluation Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of question and response</th>
<th>District A</th>
<th>District B</th>
<th>District C</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of purpose-specific evaluation system</td>
<td>N = 57</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administrators favored the use of some form of teacher evaluation in RIF decisions, only 45.7% of the teachers and 64.7% of the administrators responded that they would be more likely to accept teacher evaluation as a criterion in RIF decisions if the evaluation system were specifically designed to serve administrative decision making.
Criteria to be Used in Reduction-in-Force Staffing Decisions

The original question—"When reduction in force is necessary, what extent of agreement between teachers and administrators in regard to which criteria should be considered in the RIF decisions?"—engendered the following hypothesis: There is a relationship between one's position—i.e., administrator or teacher—and one's choice of criteria to be considered in making reduction-in-force staffing decisions. This hypothesis was investigated by testing the following null hypotheses:

1. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., teacher or administrator—and one's choice of affirmative action needs of the district as a criterion to be considered in reduction-in-force staffing decisions.

2. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., teacher or administrator—and one's choice of area(s) of certification as a criterion to be considered in reduction-in-force staffing decisions.

3. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., teacher or administrator—and one's choice of degree status as a criterion to be considered in reduction-in-force staffing decisions.

4. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., teacher or administrator—and one's choice of participation in extracurricular activities (building level committees, sponsor clubs, coaching, etc.) as a criterion to be considered in reduction-in-force staffing decisions.

5. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., teacher or administrator—and one's choice of program needs of department,
building, school district, etc. as a criterion to be considered in reduction-in-force staffing decisions.

6. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., teacher or administrator—and one's choice of quality of job performance as determined by some form of teacher evaluation as a criterion to be considered in reduction-in-force staffing decisions.

7. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., teacher or administrator—and one's choice of seniority as a criterion to be considered in reduction-in-force staffing decisions.

8. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., teacher or administrator—and one's choice of specific experience at grade levels or in subject areas as a criterion to be considered in reduction-in-force staffing decisions.

9. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., teacher or administrator—and one's choice of tenure status as a criterion to be considered in reduction-in-force staffing decisions.

The Mann-Whitney U Test (corrected for ties, two-tailed at the .05 significance level) was applied to each hypothesis concerning position and criteria for RIF. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 11.

Consideration of the results contained in Table 11 allowed the null hypothesis of no relationship between position and criteria to be used in reduction-in-force staffing decisions to be rejected only in regard to position and the criterion of "participation in extra-curricular activities (building level committees, sponsor clubs, coaching, etc.)."
Table 11

Results of the Mann-Whitney U Test on the Relationship Between the Variables of "Position" and "Criteria to be Used in RIF"

| Indicator variable                                      | Position and number of respondents | Position and Mean Rank | 2-tailed |   |
|---------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|----------|
|                                                          | Teachers                           | Administrators         | U        | P |
| Affirmative action                                      | 210 17                             | 114.49 107.97 1682.5   | .5746    |
| Areas of certification                                  | 216 17                             | 117.11 115.56 1811.5   | .8390    |
| Degree status                                           | 211 17                             | 114.30 116.97 1751.5   | .8469    |
| Participation in extracurricular activities             | 214 17                             | 119.28 74.76 1118.0    | .0036*   |
| Program needs                                          | 214 17                             | 117.31 99.56 1539.5    | .1266    |
| Results of performance evaluation                       | 215 16                             | 117.07 101.66 1490.5   | .1929    |
| Seniority                                               | 216 17                             | 116.56 122.65 1740.0   | .5372    |
| Experience at grade level/subject area                  | 212 17                             | 115.74 105.82 1646.0   | .4031    |
| Tenure status                                           | 211 17                             | 114.14 118.76 1721.0   | .7033    |

*p ≤ .05.
The administrators favored the use of this criterion while the teachers strongly opposed its consideration in RIF decisions. All the other null hypotheses were retained.

In order to investigate the relationship between position and the importance accorded each criterion, the percents of responses using the adjusted frequencies of teachers and administrators in each category were examined. The "strongly agree" and "agree" responses were collapsed into one category, and the "strongly disagree" and "disagree" were collapsed into another. The results are presented in Table 12.

Table 12

Percents of Responses Regarding Choice of Criteria for Reduction-in-Force Staffing Decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion and Response</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative action</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N = 220</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>N = 17</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion and Response</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Areas of certification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 216</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 211</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation in extracurricular activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 214</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program needs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 214</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion and Response</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of job performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>215</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seniority</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>216</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experience at grade level or subject area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>88.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>212</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>76.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>211</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The percent of respondents choosing each criterion was used as an indicator of the importance accorded that criterion. The combined percent of respondents who selected either of the categories "strongly agree" or "agree" for each criterion was used as the basis for ranking the criteria in descending order of importance. The order of ranking is displayed (according to position) in Table 13.

Consideration of the data displayed in Table 13 allows one to conclude that teachers and administrators are willing to accept multiple criteria as the basis for RIF staffing decisions. Except for affirmative action, over 50% of the responding administrators agreed that each of the criteria should be considered in reduction-in-force staffing decisions. Over 50% of the responding teachers agreed that all but affirmative action and participation in extra-curricular activities should be criteria to be considered. Over 80% of the teachers and administrator agreed that areas of certification, program needs, quality of job performance as determined by some form of evaluation, and seniority should be considered when reduction-in-force staffing decisions are necessary.

Performance Evaluation

In order to investigate whether a change in the nature of existing evaluation systems would affect the acceptance of evaluation as a criterion in reduction-in-force staffing decisions, the teachers and administrators were asked to respond to the following questions: If two separate and distinct teacher evaluation systems were to be developed
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Table 13

Rank Order of Importance Accorded Each Criterion in Reduction-in-Force Decisions Based on Percent of Respondents Who Strongly Agreed or Agreed With the Use of Each Criterion to be Used in RIF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Areas of certification</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>Areas of certification</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniority</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>Program needs</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of job performance</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>Quality of job performance</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program needs</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>Experience at grade/subject</td>
<td>88.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience at grade/subject</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>Participation in extracurricular activities</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure status</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>Seniority</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree status</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>Tenure status</td>
<td>76.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in extracurricular activities</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>Degree status</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative action</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>Affirmative action</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and used in your district (one specifically designed to help improve your effectiveness and one specifically designed to serve administrative decision making), would you be more likely to accept teacher evaluation as a criterion to be used when determining the order of layoff among
tenured teachers in reduction-in-force situations than if just one evaluation system were used?

Of the 227 educators who responded, 47.1% answered yes, 27.3% said no, and 25.6% were unsure. Their responses (by position) are presented in Table 14.

Table 14
Percent of Responses in Regard to Use of Single Purpose Evaluation Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 210 N = 17

In order to determine if discrete changes in the nature of evaluation systems would be acceptable to the teachers and administrators, the responses of the educators were sought in regard to the inclusion of specific indicators and the inclusion of specific participants in the evaluation process. The indicators and participants were specified as those to be used in two separate evaluation systems, i.e., one solely to help teachers improve their effectiveness (formative evaluation), and the other to serve administrative decision making (summative evaluation).
The results of this portion of the study are reported in the sections titled: (a) indicators to be considered in teacher evaluation systems, (b) participants in teacher evaluation systems, and (c) components of single purpose evaluation systems.

Indicators to be Considered in Teacher Evaluation Systems

Formative evaluation. The hypothesis that stated "There is a relationship between one's position—i.e., administrator or teacher—and one's choice of 'performance indicators' to be used in designing and using teacher evaluation systems that are solely to help the teachers improve their effectiveness" was investigated by testing the following null hypotheses:

1. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., teacher or administrator—and one's choice of attendance at professional meetings as an indicator to be considered when designing and using teacher evaluation systems that are solely to help teachers improve their effectiveness.

2. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., teacher or administrator—and one's choice of classroom environment as an indicator to be considered when designing and using teacher evaluation systems that are solely to help teachers improve their effectiveness.

3. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., teacher or administrator—and one's choice of individual performance objectives as an indicator to be considered when designing and using teacher evaluation systems that are solely to help teachers improve their effectiveness.
4. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., teacher or administrator—and one's choice of lesson plans as an indicator to be considered when designing and using teacher evaluation systems that are solely to help teachers improve their effectiveness.

5. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., teacher or administrator—and one's choice of observation of classroom teaching as an indicator to be considered when designing and using teacher evaluation systems that are solely to help teachers improve their effectiveness.

6. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., teacher or administrator—and one's choice of personal attributes (voice, health, attire, etc.) as an indicator to be considered when designing and using teacher evaluation systems that are solely to help teachers improve their effectiveness.

7. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., teacher or administrator—and one's choice of pupil-teacher relations as an indicator to be considered when designing and using teacher evaluation systems that are solely to help teachers improve their effectiveness.

8. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., teacher or administrator—and one's choice of student gain scores as an indicator to be considered when designing and using teacher evaluation systems that are solely to help teachers improve their effectiveness.

9. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., teacher or administrator—and one's choice of teacher command of subject matter
as an indicator to be considered when designing and using teacher evaluation systems that are solely to help teachers improve their effectiveness.

10. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., teacher or administrator—and one's choice of volunteer service on school committees as an indicator to be considered when designing and using teacher evaluation systems that are solely to help teachers improve their effectiveness.

The Mann-Whitney U Test (corrected for ties, two-tailed at the .05 significance level) was applied to each hypothesis concerning position and an indicator to be used in formative evaluation. The results are presented in Table 15.

Examination of the findings presented in Table 15 indicated that the null hypotheses of no relationship between position and the indicators of attendance at professional meetings, lesson plans, personal attributes, student gain scores, and volunteer service on school committees could be rejected in each case. The null hypothesis could not be rejected in regard to position and the following: classroom environment, individual performance objectives of classroom teaching, pupil-teacher relations, and teacher command of subject matter.
Table 15
Results of the Mann-Whitney U Test on the Relationship Between the Variables "Position" and "Indicators to be Used for Formative Evaluations"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator variable</th>
<th>Position and number of respondents</th>
<th>Position and Mean Rank</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>2-tailed p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at professional meetings</td>
<td>214 17</td>
<td>118.38 86.09</td>
<td>1310.5</td>
<td>.0316*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom environment</td>
<td>215 17</td>
<td>116.82 112.50</td>
<td>1759.5</td>
<td>.4194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual performance objectives</td>
<td>215 17</td>
<td>117.12 108.65</td>
<td>1694.0</td>
<td>.4502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson plans</td>
<td>215 17</td>
<td>118.44 91.91</td>
<td>1409.5</td>
<td>.0419*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations of classroom teaching</td>
<td>214 17</td>
<td>116.68 107.50</td>
<td>1674.5</td>
<td>.2286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal attributes</td>
<td>215 17</td>
<td>118.61 89.85</td>
<td>1374.5</td>
<td>.0402*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil-teacher relations</td>
<td>214 17</td>
<td>116.75 106.50</td>
<td>1657.5</td>
<td>.2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-gain scores</td>
<td>214 17</td>
<td>118.84 80.24</td>
<td>1211.0</td>
<td>.0145*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p ≤ .05.
Table 15—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator variable</th>
<th>Position and number of respondents</th>
<th>Position and Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher command of subject matter</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer service on school committees</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P ≤ .05.

In order to further understand the responses to this portion of the study, the percent of responses using the adjusted frequencies of teachers and administrators choosing each category were examined. The "strongly agree" and "agree" responses were collapsed into one category and the "strongly disagree" and "disagree" were collapsed into another. The results are presented in Table 16.
Table 16

Percent of Responses Regarding Choice of Indicators for an Evaluation System Designed and Used Solely for Formative Purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator and Response</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attendance at professional meetings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 214</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classroom environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 215</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual performance objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 215</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lesson plans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 215</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator and Response</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observation of classroom teaching</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 214)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal attributes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 215)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pupil-teacher relations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 214)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student gain scores</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 214)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator and Response</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher command of subject matter</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volunteer service on school committees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to more clearly understand the degree of agreement (and implied disagreement) between teachers and administrators in regard to indicators to be used in evaluations for formative purposes, the indicators were ranked according to the percent of each group who strongly agreed or agreed with the inclusion of each indicator. The results are presented in Table 17.

Analysis of the findings found in Tables 15, 16, and 17 suggested:

(a) Although the difference between the choices of teachers and administrators in regard to attendance at professional meetings, lesson
Table 17

Rank Order of Preferred Indicators to be Used in Formative Evaluations Based on Percent of Respondents Who Strongly Agreed or Agreed With Inclusion of Each Indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred indicator</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%  N</td>
<td>%  N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom environment</td>
<td>96.3 215</td>
<td>100.0 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command of subject</td>
<td>95.8 215</td>
<td>100.0 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations of classroom</td>
<td>92.1 214</td>
<td>100.0 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil-teacher relations</td>
<td>91.1 214</td>
<td>100.0 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual performance objectives</td>
<td>81.9 215</td>
<td>94.1 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson plans</td>
<td>72.1 215</td>
<td>88.2 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal attributes</td>
<td>65.6 215</td>
<td>88.2 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at prof. meetings</td>
<td>54.2 214</td>
<td>82.4 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student gain scores</td>
<td>35.0 214</td>
<td>92.4 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. service on school committees</td>
<td>26.0 215</td>
<td>53.0 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
plans, personal attributes, student gain scores, and volunteer service on school committees was statistically significant, only the indicators student gain scores and volunteer service on school committees may be of any practical import since over 50% of the teachers and administrators agreed that attendance at professional meetings, lesson plans, and personal attributes should be included in formative evaluations.

(b) Over 80% of the teachers and administrators agreed that the classroom environment, teacher command of the subject matter, observations of classroom teaching, pupil-teacher relations, and individual performance objectives should be used as indicators for evaluating a teacher's performance when the evaluation results will be used to help the teacher improve his/her effectiveness. (c) The discrepancy between teachers and administrators in regard to the use of volunteer service on school committees as an indicator is significant in both a statistical and a practical sense, i.e., 54.9% of the teachers disagreed with its use while 82.4% of the administrators favored its inclusion. (d) The use of student gain scores elicited the greatest number of "uncertain" responses from both teachers (23.8%) and administrators (41.2%). Although the differences between the teachers and administrators were found to be statistically significant, the large response rate in the uncertain category suggests the need for further investigation before definitive statements are made in regard to any real differences between groups of educators.

Summative evaluation. The hypothesis that stated "There is a relationship between one's position—i.e., administrator or teacher—
and one's choice of 'performance indicators' to be used in designing and using teacher evaluation systems that are to serve administrative decision making with respect to hiring, firing, promotions, transfers, reduction in force, etc. was investigated by testing the following null hypotheses:

1. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., teacher or administrator—and one's choice of attendance at professional meeting as an indicator to be considered when designing and using teacher evaluation systems that are to serve administrative decision making with respect to hiring, firing, promotions, transfers, reduction in force, etc.

2. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., teacher or administrator—and one's choice of classroom environment as an indicator to be considered when designing and using teacher evaluation systems that are to serve administrative decision making with respect to hiring, firing, promotions, transfers, reduction in force, etc.

3. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., teacher or administrator—and one's choice of individual performance objectives as an indicator to be considered when designing and using teacher evaluation systems that are to serve administrative decision making with respect to hiring, firing, promotions, transfers, reduction in force, etc.

4. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., teacher or administrator—and one's choice of lesson plans as an indicator to be considered when designing and using teacher evaluation systems that
are to serve administrative decision making with respect to hiring, firing, promotions, transfers, reduction in force, etc.

5. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., teacher or administrator—and one's choice of observations of classroom teaching as an indicator to be considered when designing and using teacher evaluation systems that are to serve administrative decision making with respect to hiring, firing, promotions, transfers, reduction in force, etc.

6. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., teacher or administrator—and one's choice of personal attributes (voice, health, attire, etc.) as an indicator to be considered when designing and using teacher evaluation systems that are to serve administrative decision making with respect to hiring, firing, promotions, transfers, reduction in force, etc.

7. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., teacher or administrator—and one's choice of pupil-teacher relations as an indicator to be considered when designing and using teacher evaluation systems that are to serve administrative decision making with respect to hiring, firing, promotions, transfers, reduction in force, etc.

8. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., teacher or administrator—and one's choice of student gain scores as an indicator to be considered when designing and using teacher evaluation systems that are to serve administrative decision making with respect to hiring, firing, promotions, transfers, reduction in force, etc.
9. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., teacher or administrator—and one's choice of teacher command of subject matter as an indicator to be considered when designing and using teacher evaluation systems that are to serve administrative decision making with respect to hiring, firing, promotions, transfers, reduction in force, etc.

10. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., teacher or administrator—and one's choice of volunteer service on school committees as an indicator to be considered when designing and using teacher evaluation systems that are to serve administrative decision making with respect to hiring, firing, promotions, transfers, reduction in force, etc.

The Mann-Whitney U Test (corrected for ties, two-tailed at the .05 significance level) was applied to each hypothesis concerning position and indicators to be used in summative evaluations. The results are presented in Table 18.

Examination of the information contained in Table 18 allowed the null hypothesis to be rejected in regard to the questions that addressed the relationship between position and the criteria of attendance at professional meetings, personal attributes, student gain scores, and volunteer service on school committees. The null hypothesis was retained in regard to position and the following indicators: classroom environment, individual performance objectives, lesson plans, observations of classroom teaching, pupil-teacher relations, and teacher command of subject matter.
Table 18

Results of the Mann-Whitney U Test on the Relationship Between the Variables "Position" and "Choice of Indicators to be Used for Summative Evaluations"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator variable</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Mean rank</th>
<th>Mean rank</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>2-tailed p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at professional meetings</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>117.75</td>
<td>74.21</td>
<td>1108.5</td>
<td>.0041*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom environment</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>116.48</td>
<td>109.94</td>
<td>1716.0</td>
<td>.4712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual performance objectives</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>116.21</td>
<td>106.65</td>
<td>1660.0</td>
<td>.4383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson plans</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>117.75</td>
<td>93.91</td>
<td>1443.5</td>
<td>.0891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations of classroom teaching</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>116.23</td>
<td>106.32</td>
<td>1654.5</td>
<td>.3191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal attributes</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>119.18</td>
<td>82.59</td>
<td>1251.0</td>
<td>.0146*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil-teacher relations</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>115.94</td>
<td>110.03</td>
<td>1717.5</td>
<td>.5771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-gain scores</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>118.47</td>
<td>78.32</td>
<td>1178.5</td>
<td>.0104*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p ≤ .05.
An examination of the percent of responses using the adjusted frequency of the responses given by the teachers and the administrators in regard to the indicators to be considered when evaluation results would be used for administrative decision making provided an additional way to examine the responses. The "strongly agree" and "agree" responses were collapsed into one category and the "strongly disagree" and "disagree" into another. Table 19 contains this information.
Table 19

Number and Percents of Responses Regarding Choice of Indicators for an Evaluation System Designed and Used Solely for Summative Purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator and Response</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at professional meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 211</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 214</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual performance objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 213</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 19—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator and Response</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lesson plans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 214</td>
<td>N = 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observation of classroom teaching</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 213</td>
<td>N = 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal attributes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 215</td>
<td>N = 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pupil-teacher relations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 213</td>
<td>N = 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator and Response</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student gain scores</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 213</td>
<td>N = 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher command of subject matter</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>94.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 213</td>
<td>N = 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volunteer service on school committees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 212</td>
<td>N = 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The degree of agreement (and implied disagreement) between teachers and administrators concerning which indicators should be included in summative evaluations was clearly observable when the indicators were ranked according to the percent of respondents who strongly agreed with
the use of each indicator. The results of this ranking procedure are presented in Table 20.

Analysis of the findings presented in Tables 18, 19, and 20 suggested: (a) Although attendance at professional meetings, personal attributes, student gain scores, and volunteer service on school committees were deemed to be statistically significant and the null hypothesis of no difference was rejected in each case, since over 50% of the teachers and administrators agreed that personal attributes should be considered when evaluations are for summative purposes, perhaps the statistical difference is of little practical importance in regard to this criterion. (b) Over 80% of the educators agreed that teacher command of subject matter, classroom environment, observation of classroom teaching, pupil-teacher relations, individual performance objectives should be considered as indicators for evaluation when the results will be used for administrative decision making. (c) The largest discrepancy between teachers and administrators was again in regard to the use of volunteer service on school committees as an indicator to be used in evaluation for administrative decision making, i.e., 59% of the teachers disagreed, 82.4% of the administrators agreed. (d) The use of student gain scores was again the indicator that elicited the largest number of uncertain responses from both teachers (21.6%) and administrators (41.2%). (e) While 70.6% of the administrators favored the inclusion of attendance at professional meetings as an indicator, only 39.3% of the teachers agreed. Since 47.8% of the teachers disagreed with its use, the discrepancy between the opinions
Table 20

Rank Order of Preferred Indicators to be Used in Summative Evaluations Based on Percent of Respondents Who Strongly Agreed or Agreed With Inclusion of Each Indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred indicator</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command of subject</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom environment</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations of classroom</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil-teacher relations</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual performance objectives</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson plans</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal attributes</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at prof. meetings</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student gain scores</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. service on school committees</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of teachers and administrators is almost as large as that associated with volunteer service on school committees.

Participants in Teacher Evaluations System

Formative evaluation. In order to investigate the hypothesis that stated "There is a relationship between one's position—i.e., administrator or teacher—and one's choice of who should participate in the teacher evaluation process when the results are to be used solely to help teachers improve their effectiveness," the following null hypotheses were used:

1. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., administrator or teacher—and one's choice of the inclusion of central office personnel in the evaluation process when the results are to be used solely to help teachers improve their effectiveness.

2. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., administrator or teacher—and one's choice of the inclusion of the department chairperson in the evaluation process when the results are to be used solely to help teachers improve their effectiveness.

3. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., administrator or teacher—and one's choice of the inclusion of parents in the evaluation process when the results are to be used solely to help teachers improve their effectiveness.

4. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., administrator or teacher—and one's choice of the inclusion of peers in
the evaluation process when the results are to be used solely to help teachers improve their effectiveness.

5. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., administrator or teacher—and one's choice of the inclusion of principals in the evaluation process when the results are to be used solely to help teachers improve their effectiveness.

6. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., administrator or teacher—and one's choice of the inclusion of school board members in the evaluation process when the results are to be used solely to help teachers improve their effectiveness.

7. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., administrator or teacher—and one's choice of the inclusion of self in the evaluation process when the results are to be used solely to help teachers improve their effectiveness.

8. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., administrator or teacher—and one's choice of the inclusion of students in the evaluation process when the results are to be used solely to help teachers improve their effectiveness.

9. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., administrator or teacher—and one's choice of the inclusion of the superintendent in the evaluation process when the results are to be used solely to help teachers improve their effectiveness.

10. There is no relationship between one's position—i.e., administrator or teacher—and one's choice of the inclusion of union or association representative in the evaluation process when the results are to be used solely to help teachers improve their effectiveness.
The results of the application of the Mann-Whitney U test (corrected for ties, two-tailed, .05 significance level) on each hypothesis regarding position and choice of who should participate in evaluation systems designed and used solely for formative purposes are presented in Table 21.

Based on analysis of the findings contained in Table 21, the null hypothesis was rejected in regard to position and the participation of central office personnel and position and the participation of union representatives in formative evaluations. The null was retained in all other cases.

An analysis of the percent of responses based on the adjusted frequencies of the responses of the teachers and administrators in regard to their choices of who should participate in a teacher evaluation system designed and used solely to help teachers improve their effectiveness provided additional information. Once again, the "strongly agree" and "agree" responses were collapsed into one category and the "strongly disagree" and "disagree" into another. The percents based on adjusted frequencies are presented in Table 22.

The teachers' and administrators' choices in regard to who should participate in evaluation designed to help the teachers to improve their effectiveness (formative evaluation) were ranked according to the percent of the respondents from each group who strongly agreed or agreed with the inclusion of each participant in the evaluation process. The results of this ranking procedure are contained in Table 23.

Inspection of the findings presented in Tables 21, 22, and 23 indicated: (a) although the null hypothesis of no relationship was
Table 21

Results of the Mann-Whitney U Test on the Relationship Between the Variables of "Position" and "Choice of Who Should be Involved" in Formative Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Variable</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Mean Rank Teachers</th>
<th>Mean Rank Administrators</th>
<th>2-tailed P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central office personnel</td>
<td>216 17</td>
<td>119.79</td>
<td>81.53</td>
<td>1233.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department chairperson</td>
<td>217 17</td>
<td>118.24</td>
<td>108.00</td>
<td>1683.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>215 16</td>
<td>117.30</td>
<td>98.59</td>
<td>1441.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>216 16</td>
<td>117.11</td>
<td>108.22</td>
<td>1595.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>215 17</td>
<td>117.17</td>
<td>108.00</td>
<td>1683.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School board members</td>
<td>215 16</td>
<td>115.00</td>
<td>129.50</td>
<td>1504.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>218 17</td>
<td>117.38</td>
<td>125.94</td>
<td>1718.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>215 16</td>
<td>116.30</td>
<td>112.00</td>
<td>1656.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>217 15</td>
<td>115.60</td>
<td>129.33</td>
<td>1432.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union or association representative</td>
<td>215 16</td>
<td>112.68</td>
<td>160.59</td>
<td>1007.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p \leq .05.
Table 22
Percents of Responses Regarding the Choice of Who Should be Involved in Formative Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants and Response</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central office personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 216</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department chairperson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 217</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>50.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 215</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 216</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants and Response</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 215</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School board members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 215</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 218</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>75.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 215</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants and Response</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Superintendent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 217</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Union or association representative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 215</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23
Rank Order of Preferred Participants (Based on Percent of Respondents Who Strongly Agreed or Agreed With Participation of Each Individual) as a Participant in Formative Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Participant</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>Dept. chair</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. chair</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>82.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>Central office personnel</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central office personnel</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union repr.</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>Union repr.</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School board</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>School board</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

rejected concerning position and central office personnel and position and union or association representative, only the difference in regard to participation of central office personnel may be of practical importance since over 50% of each group rejected the participation of the union representative in the formative evaluation process; (b) over 80% of the teachers and administrators agreed that the individual teacher,
the principal, and the department chairperson should be involved in the evaluation process; (c) the majority of educators (over 50%) were also in agreement that school board members, parents, and the superintendent should not be involved with evaluation systems designed to help teachers improve their effectiveness; (d) the greatest discrepancy between teachers and administrators concerned the participation of union or association representatives (i.e., 33.5% of the teachers agreed that the union representatives should participate, while 87.5% of the administrators rejected union participation), but it should also be noted that 50.2% of the teachers also rejected the notion of union participation; (e) the participation of central office personnel was an additional area of disagreement (70% of the administrators favored their input while only 33.8% of the teachers were willing to have central office personnel included); (f) the question of whether students should be involved in formative evaluation was answered affirmatively by the administrators with 75.1% favoring student participation, while teachers did not agree among themselves—40.5% agreed, 40.5% disagreed, and 19.1% were uncertain.

Summative evaluation. In an attempt to investigate the hypothesis that stated "There is a relationship between one's position—i.e., administrator or teacher—and one's choice of who should participate in the teacher evaluation process when the results would be used to serve administrative decision making, i.e., hiring, firing, transfers, and reduction in force," the following hypotheses were tested.
1. There is a relationship between one's position—i.e., administrator or teacher—and one's choice of the inclusion of central office personnel in the evaluation process when the results would be used to serve administrative decision making.

2. There is a relationship between one's position—i.e., administrator or teacher—and one's choice of the inclusion of department chairperson in the evaluation process when the results would be used to serve administrative decision making.

3. There is a relationship between one's position—i.e., administrator or teacher—and one's choice of the inclusion of parents in the evaluation process when the results would be used to serve administrative decision making.

4. There is a relationship between one's position—i.e., administrator or teacher—and one's choice of the inclusion of peers in the evaluation process when the results would be used to serve administrative decision making.

5. There is a relationship between one's position—i.e., administrator or teacher—and one's choice of the inclusion of principals in the evaluation process when the results would be used to serve administrative decision making.

6. There is a relationship between one's position—i.e., administrator or teacher—and one's choice of the inclusion of school board members in the evaluation process when the results would be used to serve administrative decision making.

7. There is a relationship between one's position—i.e., administrator or teacher—and one's choice of the inclusion of self in the evaluation process when the results would be used to serve administrative decision making.
evaluation process when the results would be used to serve administrative decision making.

8. There is a relationship between one's position—i.e., administrator or teacher—and one's choice of the inclusion of students in the evaluation process when the results would be used to serve administrative decision making.

9. There is a relationship between one's position—i.e., administrator or teacher—and one's choice of the inclusion of the superintendent in the evaluation process when the results would be used to serve administrative decision making.

10. There is a relationship between one's position—i.e., administrator or teacher—and one's choice of the inclusion of union or association representative in the evaluation process when the results would be used to serve administrative decision making.

The Mann-Whitney U test (corrected for ties, two-tailed at the .05 significance level) was applied to each hypothesis concerning position and choice of who should be involved in summative evaluations. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 24.

The results reported in Table 24 allowed the null hypothesis to be rejected in regard to the hypotheses concerned with position and central office personnel and position and union or association representatives. The null was retained in all other cases.

So that additional meaning might be made from the data collected, the percents of responses using the adjusted frequencies of the responses of the teachers and administrators in regard to the choice(s) of who should participate in an evaluation system designed and used specifically
Table 24

Results of the Mann-Whitney U Test on the Relationship Between the Variables of "Position" and "Choice of Who Should be Involved in Summative Evaluations"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Variable</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Mean Rank Teachers</th>
<th>Mean Rank Administrators</th>
<th>2-tailed U</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central office personnel</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>119.35</td>
<td>67.24</td>
<td>990.0</td>
<td>.0007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department chairperson</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>117.12</td>
<td>101.00</td>
<td>1480.0</td>
<td>.1108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>116.16</td>
<td>113.91</td>
<td>1686.0</td>
<td>.8705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>114.01</td>
<td>113.87</td>
<td>1588.0</td>
<td>.9928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>114.96</td>
<td>115.60</td>
<td>1596.0</td>
<td>.9491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School board members</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>115.77</td>
<td>119.09</td>
<td>1670.5</td>
<td>.7909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>117.16</td>
<td>121.82</td>
<td>1771.0</td>
<td>.6551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>116.59</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>1478.0</td>
<td>.2992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>115.07</td>
<td>121.60</td>
<td>1521.0</td>
<td>.6911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union or association</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>111.97</td>
<td>152.79</td>
<td>1159.0</td>
<td>.0071*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05.
to serve administrative decision making were examined. The "strongly agree" and "agree" responses were collapsed into one category and "strongly disagree" and "disagree" into another. Table 25 contains this information.

Once again the responses of the teachers and administrators were ranked in order to obtain a clearer understanding of the degree of agreement between the two groups in regard to the participation of specific personnel in evaluations designed to contribute to administration decision making (summative evaluation). The results of this ranking process are presented in Table 26.

Inspection of the results of the analyses contained in Tables 24, 25 and 26 suggested: (a) the null hypotheses were rejected in regard to position and participation by central office staff and by union or association representative, but since the administrators appeared relatively united while the teachers were substantially divided, the choice of whether to include such individuals probably will be decided by the administrators; (b) over 80% of the educators agreed that principals, department chairpersons, and the individual teacher should all be involved in teacher evaluation systems that are designed and used for administrative decision making; (c) participation by school board members and parents was vetoed by over 50% of the teachers and the administrators; (d) the largest disagreement between the teachers and the administrators involved the participation of central office personnel in summative evaluation (45% of the teachers did not want the central office staff to participate, while 88% of the administrators desired input from the central office staff); (e) the teachers were divided among
Table 25
Percent of Responses Regarding the Choice of Who
Should be Involved in Summative Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants and Response</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central office personnel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 213</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department chairperson</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 215</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 215</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 212</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 25—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants and Response</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>86.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 214</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School board members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 215</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 217</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 217</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 25—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants and Response</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>N = 215</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 15</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union or association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>N = 212</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 17</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 26

Rank Order of Preferred Participants (Based on Percent of Respondents Who Strongly Agreed or Agreed With Participation of Each Individual) as a Participant in Summative Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Participant</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Preferred Participant</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>Dept. Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. Chair</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>Central office personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union repr.</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central office personnel</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>Peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>Union repr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>School board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School board</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>Parents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

themselves as to whether union representatives should participate in summative evaluations (38.7% did not desire union participation, while 49.6% did, and 11.8% were uncertain), but the administrators (70.6%) rejected the participation of union representatives; (f) the question of whether students should participate in summative evaluations was
answered negatively by 60.8% of the teachers and 43.8% of the administrators, while about 25% of each group (23.4% teachers, 25% administrators) favored student participation and 31.3% of the administrators and 15.9% of the teachers were unsure.

Components of Single-purpose Evaluation Systems

**Indicators for evaluation systems.** Examination of the percentages of teachers and administrators who agreed or disagreed with the inclusion of specific indicators in evaluation systems for formative or summative purposes revealed that although the specific percentages of educators who either agreed or disagreed with the inclusion of an indicator may have changed, acceptance or rejection of the indicators fluctuated minimally (less than 10.0%) in most cases. The greatest change among the teachers was in regard to the indicator of attendance at professional meetings: 54% of the responding teachers were willing to include it as an indicator for evaluations designed to help them to improve their effectiveness, only 39.3% agreed to the use of this indicator when the evaluation system was designed to serve administrative decision making.

The responding administrators made choices similar to those made by the teachers. The greatest change in acceptance or rejection of an indicator was in regard to the use of lesson plans and attendance at professional meetings. For formative purposes, 94.1% endorsed the inclusion of lesson plans and 82.4% endorsed the inclusion of attendance at professional meetings. When the purpose of the evaluation shifted from formative to summative, support for the inclusion of these indicators fell to 82.3% and 70.6%, respectively.
Participants in evaluation systems. A review of the responses of the teachers revealed that their choices in regard to who should be involved in evaluation systems for formative or summative purposes did not differ substantially in most cases as the purpose of the evaluation changed.

Inspection of Tables 20 and 22 indicated: (a) an increase in the percentage of teachers who accepted specific participants when the purpose of the evaluation shifted from formative to summative occurred in regard to central office personnel (33.8% to 41.3%), union or association representative (33.3% to 49.6%), and superintendents (27.2% to 38.6%); (b) the percentage of teachers who agreed to peer involvement dropped from 50.5% for formative purposes to 38.6% for summative purposes; (c) teachers' interest in having student involvement also waned as the purpose of the evaluation changed—i.e., 40.5% agreed to involve students in formative evaluation while only 23.4% agreed to student participation in evaluations for administrative decision making.

The percentage of administrators choosing to accept or reject the participation of specific individuals in formative and summative evaluations fluctuated slightly as the stated purpose of the evaluation changed. One of the largest deviations was in regard to the acceptance of students as participants in the evaluation process: In an evaluation system designed to help the teachers to improve their effectiveness, 75.7% of the responding administrators agreed that students should participate. However, when the purpose of the evaluation was administrative decision making, only 20% agreed to student involvement.
When the purpose of evaluation is to be formative, 13.3% of administrators indicated that superintendents' participation is desirable, and 70.5% approved input from central staff. This contrasted to 40.0% who approved the participation of superintendents and 88.2% who favored input from the central staff when evaluation is summative (see Tables 22 and 25).

With the findings from the three previous sections in mind, one can answer the question posed earlier: Would a change in the nature of existing evaluation systems--i.e., a change in the indicators used and the individuals involved--affect the acceptance of evaluation as a criteria in reduction-in-force staffing decisions?

In answering the question posed, the following should be considered: when asked to respond to the inclusion of "quality of job performance as determined by some form of teacher evaluation" as a criterion in RIF, 93.8% of the administrators and 80.0% of the teachers agreed with its inclusion, while when asked whether some form of teacher evaluation should be used in determining the order of layoff among tenured teachers in RIF situations, 94.1% of the administrators and 71.0% of the teachers responded "yes." These findings suggest that both administrators and teachers are willing to accept the concept of evaluation as an important criterion to be used in RIF situations. This acceptance is even more striking when we consider that only 48.9% of the teachers and 88.2% of the administrators agreed with the evaluation systems used in their districts. However, consideration of the findings associated with the choices of indicators and participants for
single purpose evaluation systems (either formative or summative) appears to suggest that the educators would not make many substantive changes in choice of indicators or participants based upon the purpose of the evaluation (see Tables 16, 19, 22, and 25).

Content Analysis of Respondents' Comments

It is important to note that after taking the time to respond to a relatively long questionnaire (36 major items with an additional 44 sub-items), 59% of the administrators and 39% of the teachers responding to the instrument volunteered additional comments. Content analysis of their comments revealed no substantial differences between the views held by administrators and those held by teachers, i.e., position within the school system did not appear to systematically influence opinions in regard to seniority and/or performance evaluation as criteria in reduction-in-force staffing decisions.

Presented below are relevant excerpts from comments offered by teachers and administrators in response to the following statement: "No structured questionnaire can completely take into account the complexity of your personal circumstances. Please feel free to add your comments concerning the choice of criteria to be used in reduction-in-force staffing decisions, particularly in respect to the use of teacher evaluation results and seniority."

The responses have been categorized as those of either a teacher or an administrator. Moreover, the excerpts have been grouped to reflect: (a) positive opinions in regard to the use of seniority and
the concomitant negative opinions in regard to the use of performance evaluation, (b) positive opinions in regard to the use of performance evaluation and the concomitant negative opinions in regard to the use of seniority, and (c) comments that suggest possible combinations of criteria or reflect other relevant concerns.

The specific sources of the listed quotations are not identified in order to preserve the confidentiality of the respondents.

Administrators' Comments

Positive seniority/negative performance evaluation.

1. Initially seniority seemed a cop-out, but the deeper we go into the tenured ranks locally the more its use becomes our touchstone with sanity.

2. The use of seniority offers the best single objective criteria [sic] for the termination of teachers. Evaluation involves judgments which would be difficult, if not impossible, to substantiate in court.

3. The system does not provide for subtle and/or abstract differences between and among satisfactory performers . . . therefore, the realistic and heavy reliance on seniority in matters of RIF. Obviously there are problems with seniority—all well known.

Positive performance evaluation/negative seniority.

1. RIF must not be based on seniority but must be based on the ability to teach. The hazard of an average, stable, comfortable, in-tenure staff far outweighs the evaluation problem.

Combination/relevant concerns.

1. Any teacher evaluation system should evaluate its teachers based on mutually agreed upon objectives.
A combination of seniority and teacher evaluation results should be part of the criteria.

2. We need a system that combines the security of a strict "first in—last out" plan and the fairness of one that recognizes especially valuable teachers.

3. Areas of certification and experience are essential components of RIF decisions. Successful teaching experience confirmed through a comprehensive evaluation should be a consideration. Seniority is, of course, important but shouldn't be the the exclusive consideration.

4. On behalf of the students, we must keep the exciting and challenging teachers regardless of seniority. On the other hand, on behalf of the teaching staff, we must provide some protection to those who have been doing their job well over many years and are nearing retirement age.

5. My solution would be to combine an evaluatory RIF plan with an early retirement incentive plan. The RIF evaluation would go well beyond the present year to include contributions the teacher has been making over a 5-10 year period.

Teachers' Comments

Positive seniority/negative performance evaluation.

1. Seniority should be the sole criteria [sic] used in reduction of teachers due to budget cutbacks. There is no objective means of evaluation of a teacher's performance.

2. Seniority is the only way. Favoritism by the administration makes seniority the only feasible way of handling RIF.

3. Job security is as important today as how much money you earn. For this reason I feel that seniority should be the deciding factor. I also feel it is the fairest way because it is less political. Seniority should be within the subject area.

4. Seniority should count in subject area only.
5. The only time seniority and performance evaluation should be used is when two teachers sign contracts on the same day.

6. Seniority is the most objective way to reduce the staff.

7. I find that without a strict seniority clause, you are open to a lot of grievances. Strict seniority is the most practical way to RIF. It's something that everyone understands, and is willing to accept.

8. After 21 years of teaching I am no longer naive enough to believe that any system of evaluation will work when it comes to riffing. Only strict seniority should be used when determining the staffing of existing positions. There really is no other objective criteria.

9. I feel that any system that is not based on seniority will be subjective and lead to politicking among staff and administration with a certain decline in morale.

10. The only fair way to RIF is straight seniority. It takes away all bias and discrimination. It has obvious flaws but seems to be the only fair way.

11. I would find it very difficult to accept any administrative decision based on subjective criteria.

12. Seniority is the only fair way. Too many things that look good on paper fail in reality. Teacher evaluations as a means to RIF teachers is laden with flaws. Too subjective—who will evaluate? Too subject to playing favorites and politics. There are too many politics already. I am in favor of loyalty and seniority.

13. Seniority may not be the best way of determining layoffs, but it beats anything else yet devised. Too often teachers' evaluations tell more about the evaluator than about the teacher. I distrust them for that reason. It should be possible to devise an evaluation system more objective than those now in place, but it takes time, money, and a willingness to forego the shameless fudging that now goes on.

14. For many years I had felt a RIF procedure—taking into account evaluation for retaining quality personnel was the ideal. However, it isn't practical. There are too many differing standards among people involved in the
evaluation process for it to work in practice. I have come to more and more feel that seniority is the fairest process for riffing.

15. Although in theory I believe the "best" should be retained, there are many problems with an evaluation system. My conclusion is that until such a system can be developed, one that is unbiased, objective, etc., seniority is best.

16. I feel very strongly about seniority in the system being the basis for RIF. I do not think good and bad should enter into it because then it becomes a personal thing and if you were not in agreement with the philosophy, etc., of your immediate superior, you would be in trouble. With seniority, RIF policies are safe from political influence.

17. Since evaluation is so subjective and usually different in the viewpoint of each individual observer, it is quite unlikely that any system can be used to fairly terminate teachers other than seniority. The only criteria for RIF should be seniority and certification.

18. I believe a form of evaluation and seniority should be used in riffing, but due to policies in many school systems seniority may be the fairest way.

19. I do not think that there is any one fair "good" way to RIF. Seniority seems to be the fairest. I also do not think that teacher evaluation (for whatever purpose) should be the sole province of the department chairperson, because they are often swayed by personal factors.

20. It seems to me that no procedure is truly fair to teachers nor to the school system in general. Although I have never been in favor of straight seniority, after observing what happens to people when the system we had was implemented, seniority, with all its faults, at least allows teachers to leave a system with their heads held high.

21. There is no objective measure of the teaching act. There is no way to "add up" the positive effectiveness to compare with another teacher's. There is no observer who is present at all times. There is no way to evaluate when the student groups are not alike. When one's livelihood is at stake, any criteria for RIF other than seniority damages the "RIFFED" teacher irreparably.
22. In a RIF situation it would seem to me that seniority is the only way to go. That is assuming that all teachers are meeting the standards set up. If they do not, they should be out anyway. Among the competent seniority is fair.

23. The criterion for RIF should be seniority. The problem has always been that evaluations are usually done by people who seldom observe the teacher or know little about the specific area of expertise. With an honest, working evaluation system that fires the inept teacher—no matter how many years in the school system—I see no reason why seniority could not be used as a means to reduce the work force when necessary.

24. Using evaluation results would REDUCE TEACHERS TO BROWN NOSING; PUT THEM TO THE MERCY OF ADMINISTRATORS . . . MANY OF WHOM ARE INCOMPETENT. It would mean constant concern for what's in the teacher's best interest rather than concern for what's in the best interest of the student.

25. Ideally there should be separate tools for administrative decision making and improving instruction. My experience and the experiences of other teachers I come in contact with is that the evaluation process despite all the rhetoric is a sham.

26. I think the present processes of evaluation are a disaster. My main concern with evaluation is my belief that those in charge of this often do not have the skills to make it work or the credibility.

27. Unfortunately, human evaluation in education is extremely fallible since politics and prejudice inevitably rear their ugly heads.

28. My administration, above the principal, have never come into the classroom to say "hello"—let alone to watch me teach. I feel they are not capable of judging me on any merits.

29. Teacher evaluation will never be effective until we demand that those who are going to evaluate us must walk in our mocassins at regular intervals throughout the year.

30. Teacher evaluations are subjective and meaningless. Many administrators do not take them seriously; therefore do not evaluate seriously or in a professional
manner. Good evaluations have been given to appease or reward teachers; poor evaluations have been given for poor personal relationships. Most administrators do not know how to properly evaluate.

31. Teacher evaluation is as popular as the plague, because teachers have already experienced the effects of annual evaluations by less than professional administrators.

32. There is no way that evaluation of teachers can be guaranteed to be impartial and free of politics if used to evaluate teachers for reduction in force. If it starts out being fair it will eventually deteriorate into who knows who or who is related to who.

Positive performance evaluation/negative seniority.

1. If we as teachers expect to be recognized as a profession, we must accept the responsibility of all which that term implies. Any reduction in force which does not take in account teacher competency/effectiveness—then what will ultimately occur is a "rising tide of mediocrity." Tenure laws make it "impossible" to remove anyone but the most negligent teacher. Poor reduction in force provisions—those based on seniority—achieve the same end.

2. I have always been a strong believer in the seniority system; however, after observations of the effectiveness of some teachers who are at the top of the seniority list, I now believe more weight should be given to evaluations in order to retain those teachers who are hard working professionals who can motivate students to learn. Seniority gives rise to complacency—and education cannot afford complacent teachers.

3. To regain our status as professionals tenure should be eliminated. We must protect our young teachers with a fair and honest system of evaluation which is free from politics. Only the best teachers should be kept in the system.

4. The example of the real world should be used for RIF procedures. "The best remain"... similar to business and industrial organizations. The only problem that this procedure could bring is who will evaluate and make judgments for RIF?
5. Tenure should be eliminated and quality teachers kept . . . by demonstrated performance.

6. It is important that townspeople know that the staff teaching their children is there because of quality, not just age.

7. Administrators are too easy with teachers. We all should come back to making people work to keep their jobs.

8. RIF procedures should include evaluations, and drive, and accomplishment, and the constant upgrading of the teacher.

9. Included in a performance oriented RIF policy should be a pay structure fashioned after it. If the best teachers were better paid, the profession as a whole would not have the poor report card it has today.

10. I feel evaluations should determine who stays and who leaves. I do believe a good deal more supervision would be necessary prior to writing the evaluation.

Combinations/relevant concerns.

1. No one absolute system should be used. As is usually the case, each situation is unique unto itself. A combination will always be used.

2. Seniority seems to be the only completely objective tool for RIF. Used alone however, it can only guarantee the oldest but not necessarily the best teaching staff. The addition of performance and effective-teaching based set of criteria seems more idealistic than realistic. I would advocate both teachers and administrators searching for a mutually agreeable set of criteria for evaluation that can be used along with seniority to establish something fair, equitable, and beneficial to our school system.

3. I am caught between two feelings about RIF. On the one hand, years of service to a community is worth great consideration by that community. On the other hand, the public and our own profession demands high quality performance from each teacher. Seniority and quality of performance must be considered—somehow!
4. I'm in favor of a combination of seniority by categories, i.e., 0-5 years, 6-10 years, etc. and good teacher evaluation procedures. There is no easy way—there are no easy answers.

5. Seniority and competency both need to be used in the rifting process. I would suggest that school systems begin withholding step increments for teachers who do not respond to constructive criticism.

6. I believe that the criteria regarding RIF should be based on the total service to the teaching profession, and an equitable assessment (by the building administrator) of that teacher's performance in the role. It is the combination of these two factors that would serve as the fairest way to determine RIF. Herein lies a BIG problem. . . . Not too many administrators are willing to be or are decisive.

7. Specialized skills which do not correspond with certification should be taken into account, e.g., teaching the gifted, alternate ed. programs, etc.

8. Of course teacher evaluation should be objective and that is most difficult when as many different personalities as people are involved. This is why I believe seniority should be the first consideration in RIF decisions. Other considerations should also be weighed.

9. Job performance should certainly be a criteria for one to keep a teaching position. However, poor performing teachers should be dismissed whether or not a RIF is necessary. It should not be a part of a RIF policy.

10. I do not feel that seniority should be the sole criterion, but I do feel that the burden of proof should be on the administration to definitely show the superiority of the teacher being kept over the senior member being let go.

11. Seniority should be used in the RIF policy. However, I also strongly feel that a strong evaluation system should be carried out to keep teachers on their toes and effective consistently in the classroom at all times. Outside activities are an extra and do not necessarily make a good teacher. I feel effectiveness in the classroom is where all the emphasis should be placed—this is where education takes place.

12. Measures must be taken to insure the smooth and educationally sound organization of the school and its
programs. No program that has proved to be highly successful should be jeopardized because the teachers involved have little or no seniority.

13. I have no problems with the criteria used in teacher evaluation. I do have problems relating to how the system works and is implemented. The system of due process breeds mediocrity at times.

14. All staff should be evaluated in some way, using same criteria, i.e., evaluators have different standards. Perhaps staff should select 1 evaluator, and administration select 1 evaluator . . . combine the results of the two evaluators.

15. A better instrument for evaluating all aspects of a teacher's job needs to be developed—one that can be fairly applied to all and based on a common standard.

16. Implementation of evaluation system varies from school to school . . . hard to make an evaluation system uniform.

17. The problem with evaluation and RIF is who is going to take the time to evaluate a teacher? The more people involved in evaluation of a teacher's performance would give a much clearer and exact evaluation.

18. Although seniority is easily established it should not be the sole basis upon which RIF decisions are made. Other criteria should be used. Their use should not be limited to final decisions made in cases of "ties" in seniority.

19. I believe that criteria used in reduction in force should be peers and students along with self-evaluation. The problem with department heads and administration is personality conflicts. I feel seniority should be a decisive factor along with teacher performance. Too many older teachers are not doing the job and are kept on the staff on seniority basis only. If their performance were a factor, they would do a better job.

20. Bureaucratic bull leaves a teacher without any qualified evaluator except the students (past and present). Recent graduates are more qualified to evaluate than all administrators combined. Students can be objective and honest.

21. Although any teaching professional knows good teaching when he/she sees it—I do not believe any system can be developed to quantify those attributes.
22. If teacher evaluation results are to be used in RIF decisions there must be a great change in the evaluations themselves. On the basis of 2 or 3 visits a year, I do not believe they should hold all that much weight.

23. Teacher observations should not be the sole factor. There may be one or two people against a teacher and force him out this way.

24. I think evaluation of other life experiences is a meaningful component and should be considered. A person who has had varied teaching or other related job experiences might serve kids more effectively.

25. There is not an RIF policy anywhere that will be entirely fair. However, once the policy is set and interpreted and accepted by those involved, it should be followed.

26. "Vague language" should be eliminated from contracts regarding RIF policies, so that the administration cannot change these RIF decisions according to their every whim.

27. Working together . . . Board of Education, Superintendent of Schools, teachers, and parents to reach equitable solutions to the RIF question.

28. Reduction in force is depressing. Teachers are reduced, student population goes down, but supervisors, chairpersons, administrators don't get reduced.

29. There is no satisfactory RIF policy.

30. An RIF policy is always going to hurt someone, but it shouldn't be the students.

It is evident that the merits of seniority—i.e., objective, understood by all, defensible in court, unbiased, free of political pressures, etc.—were the fundamental reasons for choosing "seniority" as either the only criterion or as a criterion in combination with others in reduction-in-force staffing decisions. The reasons for not choosing performance evaluation results as a criterion appear to be grounded in perceived problems with the process (design and implementation) rather than an outright rejection of the concept of evaluation. Perceived process
problems included: lack of valid and reliable measurement instruments and techniques, less than desirable evaluator credibility and training, and lack of common standards between administrators/evaluators.

Summary

The results of this investigation indicated substantial agreement between teachers and administrators in regard to factors to be considered when it is necessary to make reductions among tenured staff. Both groups endorsed the use of multiple criteria. The administrators more strongly favored the inclusion of participation in extracurricular activities (building level committees, sponsoring clubs, coaching, etc.) and program needs (of departments, schools, and district) than did the teachers. Many of the educators expressed uncertainty about the inclusion of affirmative action needs of the district as a criterion to be considered.

Considerable agreement was found concerning the inclusion of seniority and performance evaluation results as factors to be considered in reduction-in-force staffing decisions. However, there was little agreement about the definition of seniority (beyond that of total years in school system) that should be used.

Administrators favored the development and use of two separate and distinct evaluation systems (formative and summative) to a greater extent than did the teachers. Analysis of the choices of indicators and participants to be included in each evaluation system suggested few substantive differences between those chosen for formative evaluations and those chosen for summative purposes.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, UTILITY OF THE FINDINGS, AND SUGGESTIONS

This section contains an overview of the study and a discussion of the possible utility of the findings for professional educators and others concerned with establishing fair and equitable reduction-in-force policies and procedures while at the same time maintaining quality educational opportunities for students during periods of declining enrollment and/or financial exigency. Suggestions for future studies are also provided.

Summary of the Study

Background

The main question investigated in this study was whether teachers and administrators are in agreement in regard to criteria that should be considered in reduction-in-force staffing decisions. Since seniority and performance evaluation are criteria traditionally linked with order of layoff and quality of educational opportunity, the nature of those criteria was examined in depth. Also investigated was the question of whether a change in the nature of existing evaluation systems, i.e., from generic systems used for multiple purposes to single-purpose systems designed and used for specific purposes, would affect the acceptance of evaluation as a criterion in RIF staffing decisions.
The necessity of establishing fair, equitable and educationally sound criteria upon which to base reduction-in-force staffing decisions was established in Chapter I. The continuing decline in enrollment in certain geographic areas, increased teacher and union concern with job security, elimination and/or reduction of funds for special programs, and continued public concern with teacher competency each contributes to the need for agreement among educators in regard to reduction-in-force policies and procedures.

Literature Review

Since "legally, RIF is one type of 'dismissal for sufficient cause'" (Noland, 1983, p. 29), the review of the literature began with an investigation of the legal issues involved. Zirkel and Bargerstock (1980) determined that "the primary source for legal requirements relating to RIF are state statutes" (p. 48). In specific situations, both individual and union contracts may be additional sources of legal requirements.

In regard to criteria for the order of layoff, it was found that tenured staff were generally favored over nontenured staff, and most school boards chose to use seniority as at least one of the factors in the decision-making process. In some instances, seniority conflicted with antidiscrimination, equal opportunity/affirmative action agreements. The review of the literature revealed that in addition to tenure, seniority and affirmative action, the following criteria have been used in RIF decisions: professional certification, academic qualifications/
public pressure for accountability and concern for quality education, teachers will continue to be evaluated. The literature associated with teacher evaluation (and personnel evaluation in general) suggested that the single evaluation system used in many school districts may be unable to serve the multiple purposes of helping the teacher to improve, professional competence and personal growth, and to assist the school district in meeting the needs of minorities (Bender, 1980).

4. In spite of the plethora of problems associated with teacher evaluation, "The fact is that given present circumstances...evaluation is both necessary and inevitable regardless of its desirability, effectiveness, or consequences" (Howsam, 1975, p. 40).

5. There is increasing evidence that a single evaluation system may be unable to serve the multiple purposes of helping the teacher to

Specific problems associated with using the results of performance evaluation as a criterion for administrative decision making (as in an RIF situation) were identified as: lack of a definition of competence (Hathaway, 1980); having invalid procedures for the purposes for which they were used, i.e., the results of formative evaluation being used to make summative decisions (Dunlop & McComb, n.d.; Ferreira, 1981; Walker, 1980); lack of essential elements of reliability and/or validity in existing models and instruments (Beckman, 1981). An examination of past studies (Morsh & Wilder, 1954) and more recent views expressed by those active in the area of teacher evaluation identified a number of elements of the "who evaluates what" issue in regard to teacher performance evaluation. Types of evaluations carried out, whether by administrators (McNeil & Popham, 1973), peers (Lazovik, 1981), students (Levin, 1979), self (Seldin, 1975), etc., each had a particular bias or shortcoming associated with it. Reports concerned with the use of multiple indicators such as student gain scores (Glass, 1974), personality traits (Nadaus, Airasian, & Kellegan, 1980), observation of classroom teaching (Gage, 1972), etc., also suggested both contributions to and limitations on the validity and reliability of the processes and products of evaluation.

In spite of the recognized (and unrecognized) limits of evaluation and the problems associated with it, it seems clear that due to both
public pressure for accountability and concern for quality education, teachers will continue to be evaluated. The literature associated with teacher evaluation (and personnel evaluation in general) suggested that the single evaluation system used in many school districts may be unable to serve the multiple purposes for which evaluation is sought (Gruenfeld, 1981; Walker, 1980).

The questions investigated in this study—and the specific hypotheses tested—were a result of the practical need to develop legal, fair, and educationally sound criteria for reduction-in-force staffing decisions. The primary purpose of the study was related to literature that suggested:

1. Seniority can be measured and defined in a number of ways (Bender, 1980; S. M. Johnson, 1980).

2. The use of seniority as the only criterion may produce positive and/or negative effects on the educational program of the school district (Nassau, 1978).

3. The use of seniority as the only criterion ignores professional competence and may limit the employment gains made by minorities (Bender, 1980).

4. In spite of the plethora of problems associated with teacher evaluation, "The fact is that given present circumstances . . . evaluation is both necessary and inevitable regardless of its desirability, effectiveness, or consequences" (Howsam, 1975, p. 40).

5. There is increasing evidence that a single evaluation system may be unable to serve the multiple purposes of helping the teacher to
improve his/her effectiveness in performing job related duties and serving administrative decision making, e.g., transfers, promotions, and RIF decisions (Millman, 1981).

6. To the extent that local policies and contracts do not conflict with state statutes or constitutional rights, the local contracts can determine policies for reduction in force (Zirkel & Bargerstock, 1981).

Procedures

A mailed survey was conducted among randomly selected teachers and administrators from three districts (drawn randomly from the 18 largest in Connecticut). The Mann-Whitney U test was used in testing the major hypotheses. Descriptive statistics, based on percentages of responses in each category, were used when appropriate. The choices of teachers and administrators in regard to criteria for RIF decisions, indicators to be used in formative and summative evaluation systems, and participants in formative and summative evaluations were ranked based on adjusted frequencies of respondents who "strongly agreed" or "agreed."

Findings

Substantial agreement was found between teachers and administrators regarding criteria to be considered in making decisions in reduction-in-force situations. The majority (over 50% of each group) endorsed the use of multiple criteria, i.e., areas of certification; degree status; program needs of building, school, or district; quality of job performance as determined by some form of teacher evaluation; seniority; specific
experience at grade level or in subject area; and tenure status. The educators were divided among themselves in regard to the inclusion of affirmative action needs as a criterion. In each group approximately 26% favored its inclusion, 37% did not want it to be considered, and approximately 24% expressed uncertainty. The largest discrepancy between teachers and administrators concerned the use of participation in extracurricular activities as a consideration in the decision-making process: 82.4% of the administrators endorsed the use of this criterion while 45.8% of the teachers rejected its use with an additional 12.6% uncertain about how they felt.

Teachers and administrators agreed (92.2% of the teachers and 94.1% of the administrators) that some form of seniority should be considered in RIF decision making. However, there was no definition of seniority that was agreeable to a majority (over 50%) of each group. The educators also agreed (71.1% of the teachers and 94.1% of the administrators) that some form of teacher evaluation should be a criterion in RIF situations.

Although the administrators were more in favor of developing and using two separate evaluation systems (64.7% agreed) than were the teachers (45.7% agreed), neither group indicated a strong desire to alter their acceptance of stipulated indicators or of participants in the process as the stated purpose of the evaluation changed. More than 50% of each group was willing to accept classroom environment, individual performance objectives, lesson plans, observations of classroom teaching, personal attributes, pupil-teacher relations, and teacher command of sub-
ject matter as indicators to be considered for both formative and summative evaluations. The greatest discrepancy between the groups was in regard to the use of "volunteer service on school committees" as an indicator: over 55% of the teachers rejected the inclusion of the indicator in either type of evaluation system; over 70% of the responding administrators were in favor of using this indicator in both formative and summative evaluations.

Conclusions

The responses of both teachers and administrators indicated a variety of criteria that are mutually acceptable in RIF situations. Use of the criteria of program needs, experience at grade level or in subject area, results of evaluations, and areas of certification could contribute to the maintenance of quality educational programs in times of retrenchment. The utilization of the criteria of tenure, mutually developed seniority systems, and degree status could contribute to the perceived and actual fairness and equitability of the reduction-in-force process.

It seems clear—recognizing the limits on generalizability—that straight seniority (defined as length of service in the school district) need not be the only criterion upon which to base the order of layoff among tenured teachers. The present use of straight seniority-based layoffs may be an unnecessary constraint imposed by erroneous perceptions concerning the desires of the teachers. As Moore (1978) stated, "If we are willing to try some permutations of the seniority system, we
may disclose better strategies for teacher retrenchment which also assure no erosion of the quality of education" (p. 330). The link between the definition of seniority and the "unit of reduction," i.e., subject area, grade level, and building, is complex; the present lack of agreement among teachers and between teachers and administrators may be important in regard to meeting established or future program needs.

The teachers and administrators accepted a wider range of indicators, e.g., command of subject, classroom environment, observations of classrooms, pupil-teacher relations, individual performance objectives, lesson plans, etc., in the evaluation process than is presently used in many school districts. Use of mutually acceptable multiple indicators could contribute to the validity of the evaluation results and to the credibility of those evaluations.

Inclusion of a variety of evaluators in the evaluation process was also accepted by each group. Use of an increased number of evaluators could alleviate (to some degree) the problems of halo effect and rater bias. This change might also contribute to the validity and credibility of the results of the evaluations. However, consideration of the findings associated with the choices of indicators and participants for single-purpose evaluation systems (either formative or summative) appears to suggest that the educators would not make many substantive changes in choice of indicators or participants based upon the purpose of the evaluation.

Analysis of the findings from this study also indicated a lack of knowledge and understanding on the part of teachers and administrators
concerning: (a) the nature of the RIF policies and procedures and teacher evaluation systems used in their districts, and (b) the manner in which the RIF policies and procedures and teacher evaluation systems were developed. Open communications and explanation of existing policies and practices may to some extent alleviate the fears and stress experienced by teachers and administrators in regard to reduction in force and teacher evaluation.

Suggestions for Further Research

Naturally, it might be useful to duplicate this study in school districts that have profiles similar to the profiles of the districts in this study: Increased input from teachers and administrators from similar districts might contribute to the validity and eventual generalizability of the findings.

It could also be valuable to do comparison studies between school districts with similar and differing characteristics. Results of such studies might indicate that we are able to predict areas of agreement between teachers and administrators in regard to acceptable RIF criteria and acceptable indicators and participants in the evaluation process from knowing specific district attributes. Prediction might facilitate negotiations between the groups concerning preferred definitions of seniority, RIF layoff procedures and policies, and teacher evaluation systems.

Further study appears warranted in regard to the criterion of "meeting the affirmative action needs of the district." If we could
determine "why" the educators sampled responded as they did, we could possibly educate the educators, i.e., assist them in understanding and accepting the need for meeting those affirmative action needs so that we might provide positive role models for all our nation's children. Moreover, if negative or uncertain responses were due to personal fears concerning job security, perhaps RIF procedures could be developed that address this legitimate concern, at the same time including provisions for meeting affirmative action needs.

Participation in extracurricular activities as a criterion to be used in RIF decisions and volunteer service on school committees as an indicator in evaluation systems were both rejected by teachers but favored by administrators. Those findings suggest a need to examine, from the points of view of both the teachers and the administrators, the perceived job descriptions/job responsibilities of teachers. Unless the perceptions of both groups coincide or accommodation is reached, any RIF procedure or evaluation system that includes those criteria (either overtly or covertly) may be perceived as blatantly unfair by the teachers.

Until learning as a total process is better understood, until the nexus between teaching and learning is clarified and the role of the teacher in this dyad is defined, we will not be able to evaluate teachers in a totally valid manner. It is evident that we must continue to attempt to define and identify "good" teaching and "good" teachers—sound evaluation rests upon such definitions. The results of this study indicated that the teachers are willing to accept the concept of evaluation. Fur-
ther research is necessary in order to determine what they legitimately should be accountable for and evaluated on.

We must also decide/determine whether it is sufficient to be good in the classroom (merit) or whether we should consider the value of the teacher to the school district as a whole (worth). How we answer these questions will influence the criteria that we choose for determining the order of layoff in times that require staff reductions.

Further research is necessary to determine how our schools can continue to provide quality educational opportunities during times of retrenchment while at the same time making staff reductions that are fair and equitable to all affected. As a teacher who participated in this study stated, "An RIF policy is always going to hurt someone, but it shouldn't be the student."
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Appendix A

Instructions to the Validation Panel
Instructions to the Validation Panel of Administrators and Teachers for Item Retention on the Teacher Questionnaire

As school enrollments continue to decline, as financial resources become more scarce, reduction in force (RIF) continues to increase, and the pressure to reach agreement among professional educators regarding which criteria to use in reduction-in-force staffing decisions builds. As a professional educator you are aware that lack of agreement between teachers and administrators leaves open the possibility of increased numbers of grievances, lowered teacher and administrator morale, increased stress, and possibly diminished quality of learning opportunities available for your students.

As part of a doctoral research project, I am investigating some issues associated with reduction in force. The purpose of this exploratory research is to investigate the existing level of agreement between teachers and administrators regarding criteria to be used in RIF staffing decisions. My hope is that the results of this study will suggest some mutually acceptable criteria which can be used in RIF situations: criteria which are educationally sound and fair and equitable to all involved.

Before I begin the actual research project (which will be carried out in Connecticut), I need your help in order to determine whether the items on the proposed questionnaire represent valid and appropriate choices in regard to teacher evaluation and reduction-in-force issues. Please render a personal judgment for each item.
on the forms provided using the following criteria:

**CLARITY** Is the statement clear and concise? Indicate either yes (Y) or no (N).

**REDUNDANCY** Is the item redundant vis-a-vis the content of other items? Indicate either yes (Y) or no (N).

**APPROPRIATENESS OF VARIABLE DIMENSION PLACEMENT** Is the item placed correctly according to the variable dimension specified at the beginning of each of the groups of statements? Indicate either yes (Y) or no (N).

**FAVORABILITY** On the opinion items, does a response of "strongly agree" indicate a positive attitude toward inclusion of the criterion in RIF decisions and/or in the teacher evaluation process/procedures? Indicate either yes (Y) or no (N).

**RESPONSE STIMULUS** Is the item a proper stimulus for a strongly agree or strongly disagree response? Indicate either yes (Y) or no (N).

**CONTENT VALIDITY** Does the item relate to reduction in force and/or teacher evaluation as described in the literature or observed in practice? Indicate either yes (Y) or no (N).

**INCLUSION** Does the item possess sufficient validity to be included in the instrument? Indicate either yes (Y) or no (N).

**IMPORTANCE** If, in your judgment, the item should be included in the instrument, rate its importance relative to other items pertaining to the same dimension. Use a three-point scale as follows: (3) high, (2) medium, (1) low.

In any case where your judgment was not favorable, please indicate your reason(s). I would greatly appreciate any additional comments or suggestions which you believe are appropriate.

Thank you very much for your valuable assistance in the development of this instrument. If you have any questions in regard to the
study, or if you would like to receive a summary of the findings when the study is completed, please feel free to contact me:

Lorraine A. Marcantonio
Educational Leadership Department
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008
(616) 383-1997
Appendix B

Validation Panel Results
**Validation Panel Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Clarity</th>
<th>Redundancy</th>
<th>Variable Placement</th>
<th>Favorability</th>
<th>Response Stimulus</th>
<th>Content Validity</th>
<th>Inclusion</th>
<th>Importance (Mean of panel responses)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>Redundancy</td>
<td>Variable Placement</td>
<td>Favorability</td>
<td>Response Stimulation</td>
<td>Content Validity</td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Importance (Mean of panel responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 12</td>
<td>12 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>11 1</td>
<td>11 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 12</td>
<td>12 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>11 1</td>
<td>11 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 12</td>
<td>12 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>12 0</td>
<td>12 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 12</td>
<td>12 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>11 1</td>
<td>11 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 12</td>
<td>12 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>11 1</td>
<td>11 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 12</td>
<td>12 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>12 0</td>
<td>12 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 12</td>
<td>12 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>12 0</td>
<td>12 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 12</td>
<td>12 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>12 0</td>
<td>12 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 12</td>
<td>12 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>11 1</td>
<td>11 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 12</td>
<td>12 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>11 1</td>
<td>11 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 12</td>
<td>12 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>12 0</td>
<td>12 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 12</td>
<td>12 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>12 0</td>
<td>12 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>Redundancy</td>
<td>Variable Placement</td>
<td>Favorability</td>
<td>Response Stimulus</td>
<td>Content Validity</td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Importance (Mean of panel responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y or N</td>
<td>Y or N</td>
<td>Y or N</td>
<td>Y or N</td>
<td>Y or N</td>
<td>Y or N</td>
<td>Y or N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Validation Panel Results--Continued

Criteria

Importance (Mean of panel responses) (3) High, (2) Med., (1) Low
Appendix C

Introductory Letter to Superintendents
Dear

I am a former teacher at Greenwich High School, Greenwich, Connecticut, and am presently engaged in doctoral studies at Western Michigan University. The population being studied as part of my dissertation research is the 169 school districts in Connecticut. In order to determine the nature of my population and to draw an appropriate sample, I need your assistance in procuring the most current data available.

Please answer—on this form—the following questions as they apply to your school district:

1. Size of district
   1.1 Number of students __________
   1.2 Number of teachers __________
   1.3 Number of administrators __________

2. Does your school district recognize and work with a teacher bargaining unit? _______
   2.1 What is the bargaining unit; i.e., NEA, AFT, other? _______
   2.2 Approximately what percentage of the teachers are members of the bargaining unit? _______

3. Does your school district have a formal teacher evaluation system? _______
   3.1 What is the main purpose of the teacher evaluation system?
      (a) To help teachers to improve _______
      (b) To contribute information for decision making in promotion, transfer, tenure, and similar situations _______
      (c) A combination of (a) and (b) _______
3.2 Are portions (or all) of the evaluation system incorporated into the master contract; i.e., is at least a portion of the evaluation system negotiable? 

3.3 Do teachers, through their representatives, participate in the development/refinement of the evaluation system? 

3.4 How long has the present evaluation system been used within your district? 

4. Has your school district been faced with the necessity to reduce the size of your teaching staff? 
   If yes, when did reduction begin? 

4.1 Has it been necessary to make reductions among tenured faculty? 

4.2 Does your district have written policies and procedures to follow in reduction-in-force situations? 

4.3 Did teachers, through their representatives, participate in the development of the reduction-in-force policies and procedures? 

4.4 Are the reduction-in-force policies and procedures part of the master contract? 

4.5 Are the results of teacher evaluations considered when determining the order of layoff among teachers? 

I would greatly appreciate receiving your reply as quickly as possible so that I might begin the data collection process. I would also appreciate it if you would forward a copy of your evaluation and reduction-in-force policies and procedures. If I choose to include your district in the research project, and if you are interested in participating in the project, I will contact you.

Thank you for your assistance, consideration, and cooperation. If you have any questions concerning the nature of my study, please feel free to contact me:

Harold W. Beles  
Professor

Lorraine A. Marcantonio  
Doctoral Candidate

c

COPY
Appendix D

Follow-up Letter to Superintendents
Dear

Approximately two weeks ago you received a request for information pertaining to your school district. I realize that at this time of year your professional responsibilities place great demands upon your already tight time schedule; it is easy to put aside requests from educators outside of your district. Nevertheless, I really need your assistance in obtaining the most current information about your school district in order to draw an appropriate sample from the 169 districts in Connecticut.

Please take the five or ten minutes necessary to answer—from this form—the following questions as they apply to your situation.

1. Size of district
   1.1 Number of students ____________
   1.2 Number of teachers ____________
   1.3 Number of administrators ____________

2. Does your school district recognize and work with a teacher bargaining unit? ____________
   2.1 What is the bargaining unit; i.e., NEA, AFT, other? ____________
   2.2 Approximately what percentage of the teachers are members of the bargaining unit? ____________

3. Does your school district have a formal teacher evaluation system? ____________
   3.1 What is the main purpose of the teacher evaluation system?
      (a) To help teachers to improve ____________
      (b) To contribute information for decision making in promotion, transfer, tenure, and similar situations ____________
      (c) A combination of (a) and (b) ____________
3.2 Are portions (or all) of the evaluation system incorporated into the master contract; i.e., is at least a portion of the evaluation system negotiable?  

3.3 Do teachers, through their representatives, participate in the development/refinement of the evaluation system?  

3.4 How long has the present evaluation system been used within your district?  

4. Has your school district been faced with the necessity to reduce the size of your teaching staff?  
If yes, when did reduction begin?  

4.1 Has it been necessary to make reductions among tenured faculty?  

4.2 Does your district have written policies and procedures to follow in reduction-in-force situations?  

4.3 Did teachers, through their representatives, participate in the development of the reduction-in-force policies and procedures?  

4.4 Are the reduction-in-force policies and procedures part of the master contract?  

4.5 Are the results of teacher evaluations considered when determining the order of layoff among teachers?  

I would greatly appreciate receiving your reply as quickly as possible so that I might begin the data collection process. I would also appreciate a copy of your evaluation and reduction-in-force policies and procedures. If you are interested in participating in the project, and if your district is one of the sample for the research project, I will contact you further.  

Thank you for your assistance, cooperation, and consideration. If you have any questions concerning the nature of the study, please feel free to contact me.  

Harold W. Boles  
Professor  
Lorraine A. Marcantonio  
Doctoral Candidate  

COPY
Appendix E

Letter to Teachers and Administrators
Dear Educator:

As school enrollments continue to decline and as financial resources become more scarce, the need for reduction in force continues to increase. Also, the pressure for agreement among professional educators regarding criteria for reduction-in-force decisions builds.

I am investigating the level of agreement existing between teachers and administrators regarding criteria to be used in reduction-in-force decisions. The enclosed questionnaire provides you an opportunity to express your opinion in regard to this important issue. My hope is that the results of this study will suggest some mutually acceptable criteria that can be used in reduction-in-force situations: Criteria which are educationally sound as well as fair and equitable to all involved.

Copies of this questionnaire have been sent to randomly selected teachers and administrators in the 169 school districts in Connecticut. Your opinion, as a representative of the professional educators within Connecticut, is extremely important to the accuracy of any conclusions which may be drawn from the data collected.

PLEASE take some time from your busy schedule to complete the questionnaire. Your replies will be held in strictest confidence: Neither your school, your district, nor you as an individual will be identified in reporting the results of the study.

A stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience. PLEASE complete the questionnaire and return it as soon as possible. If you have any questions in regard to the study, or would like to receive a summary of the findings, please feel free to contact me.

Thank you for taking the time to complete the questionnaire. I realize that at this time of year the multiple demands on your time make each moment precious, but I really need your opinion to make this study accurate. I appreciate your cooperation, assistance, and contribution to the validity of this study.

Sincerely,

Carmine A. Marcantonio
Doctoral Candidate

Harold W. Boles
Professor
Appendix F

Questionnaires
TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Your response to this questionnaire will be treated in the strictest confidence. The code number in the top right-hand corner is for follow-up identification purposes only. When questionnaires are returned and numbers are checked, identifying code numbers will be destroyed.

1. Please indicate at which level you are presently teaching.
   ___ Primary
   ___ Elementary
   ___ Middle School (Please specify subject area(s))
   ___ High School (Please specify subject area(s))

2. How many years have you served in your present school system?
   ___ Less than 1 year
   ___ 1-5 years
   ___ 6-10 years
   ___ 11-15 years
   ___ more than 15 years (Please specify)

3. Have you been granted tenure while teaching in your present district?
   ___ Yes ___ No

4. How many years have you been teaching in your present assignment?
   ___ Less than 1 year
   ___ 1-5 years
   ___ 6-10 years
   ___ 11-15 years
   ___ more than 15 years (Please specify)

5. What is the total number of years that you have been teaching?
   ___ Less than 1 year
   ___ 1-5 years
   ___ 6-10 years
   ___ 11-15 years
   ___ more than 15 years (Please specify)

6. What is your highest academic degree?
   ___ B.A. or B.S.
   ___ M.A. or M.S.
   ___ Specialist's Degree
   ___ Ed.D. or Ph.D.
   ___ Other (Please specify)

7. Are you certified to teach in more than one subject area?
   ___ Yes   ___ No   ___ Unsure

8. Are you certified to teach at more than one grade level?
   ___ Yes   ___ No   ___ Unsure

9. Have you had experience teaching at more than one grade level?
   ___ Yes   ___ No

10. Have you had experience teaching more than one subject?
    ___ Yes   ___ No

11. What is the bargaining unit for your school district?
    ___ NEA affiliate   ___ AFT affiliate

12. Are you a member of the local bargaining unit?
    ___ Yes   ___ No
13. If you are a member, are you generally satisfied with the way the union represents your concerns and ideas to the administration?  
   __________ Yes __________ No  

14. Did your bargaining unit participate (through teacher representatives) in the development of your district’s teacher evaluation system?  
   __________ Yes __________ No __________ Unsure  

15. Are the teacher evaluation policies and procedures part of the teachers’ master contract?  
   __________ Yes __________ No __________ Unsure  

16. Are you in general agreement with the teacher evaluation system that was developed?  
   __________ Yes __________ No __________ Unsure  

17. Are you satisfied with the way the teacher evaluation policies and procedures were developed?  
   __________ Yes __________ No __________ Unsure  

18. Does your school district have policies and procedures to follow when reduction in force becomes necessary?  
   __________ Yes __________ No __________ Unsure  

19. Did the bargaining unit participate (through teacher representatives) in the development of your district’s reduction in force policies and procedures?  
   __________ Yes __________ No __________ Unsure  

20. Are the reduction in force policies and procedures part of the teachers’ master contract?  
   __________ Yes __________ No __________ Unsure  

21. Are you in general agreement with the reduction in force policies and procedures that were developed?  
   __________ Yes __________ No __________ Unsure  

22. Are you satisfied with the way in which the reduction in force policies and procedures were developed?  
   __________ Yes __________ No __________ Unsure  

23. If your district has established policies and procedures to be used in reduction-in-force situations, are the results of teacher evaluations used when determining the order of lay off among tenured teachers?  
   __________ Yes __________ No __________ Unsure  

24. If your district has established policies and procedures to be used in reduction-in-force situations, is seniority the only criterion used when determining the order of lay off among tenured teachers?  
   __________ Yes __________ No __________ Unsure  

25. Do you believe that some form of seniority should be used when determining the order of lay off among tenured teachers in reduction-in-force situations?  
   __________ Yes __________ No __________ Unsure  

26. Do you believe that some form of teacher evaluation should be used when determining the order of lay off among tenured teachers in reduction-in-force situations?  
   __________ Yes __________ No __________ Unsure  

27. If seniority were to be used as the only criterion when determining the order of lay off among tenured teachers in reduction-in-force situations, how do you believe that seniority should be defined? (Check only one)  
   27.1 ______ Years in the school system  
   27.2 ______ Years in a particular building  
   27.3 ______ Years teaching a particular subject  
   27.4 ______ Years teaching at a particular grade level  
   27.5 ______ Total years as a teacher  
   27.6 ______ Some combination of the above (Please specify) __________________________________________________________________________  
   27.7 ______ Other (Please specify) __________________________________________________________________________  

28. Do you agree with the way seniority is defined in the reduction-in-force policies and procedures of your school district?  
   __________ Yes __________ No __________ Unsure
29. Evaluation of teachers is done for two basic purposes: (1) "to improve the teacher's effectiveness in performing his or her duties" and, (2) "to serve administrative decision making with respect to hiring, firing, promotions, transfer, reduction in force, etc."

29.1 What is the stated purpose of your district's teacher evaluation system?
1 ______ To improve teacher effectiveness
2 ______ To serve administrative decision making
3 ______ A combination of (1) and (2)
4 ______ Unsure

29.2 If the stated purpose of your district's teacher evaluation system is to improve teacher effectiveness, do you believe that this same system should be used to serve administrative decision making?
______ Yes ______ No ______ Unsure

29.3 If the stated purpose of your district's teacher evaluation system is to improve teacher effectiveness and to serve administrative decision making, do you believe that this single evaluation system is adequate to serve the two basic purposes of evaluation?
______ Yes ______ No ______ Unsure

29.4 If two separate and distinct teacher evaluation systems were to be developed and used in your district (one specifically designed to help you improve your effectiveness and one specifically designed to serve administrative decision making), would you be more likely to accept teacher evaluation as a criterion to be used when determining the order of lay off among tenured teachers in reduction-in-force situations than if just one evaluation system were used?
______ Yes ______ No ______ Unsure

30. The following numbered items are criteria that have been suggested for use when reduction-in-force staffing decisions are necessary. Please react to the inclusion of EACH of the following as a consideration in RIF decisions. Use a scale of:

1 = Strongly Agree (SA)
2 = Agree (A)
3 = Uncertain (U)
4 = Disagree (D)
5 = Strongly Disagree (SD)

30.1 Affirmative action needs of the district
30.2 Area(s) of certification
30.3 Degree status
30.4 Participation in extracurricular activities (building level committees, sponsor clubs, coaching, etc.)
30.5 Program needs of department, building, school district, etc.
30.6 Quality of job performance as determined by some form of teacher evaluation
30.7 Seniority
30.8 Specific experience at grade levels or in subject areas
30.9 Tenure status
30.10 Other (Please specify) ___________________________________________

31. If you were terminated due to reduction in force, would you be more likely to accept the decision, i.e., not "grieve" it, if provided with a detailed explanation of criteria used?
______ Yes ______ No ______ Unsure

32. If you or your teacher representative had been involved in establishing the criteria used in determining the order of termination, would you be more likely to accept the administrative decision than if you or your representative were not involved?
______ Yes ______ No ______ Unsure
33. It has been suggested that multiple measures (indicators) should be considered in teacher evaluation systems. If the results of a teacher evaluation system were to be used ONLY "to improve teacher effectiveness," please react to the inclusion of EACH of the following measures (indicators). Use a scale of:

1 = Strongly Agree (SA)
2 = Agree (A)
3 = Uncertain (U)
4 = Disagree (D)
5 = Strongly Disagree (SD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at professional meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual performance objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations of classroom teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal attributes (voice, health, attire, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil-teacher relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student gain scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher command of subject matter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer service on school committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. If the results of a teacher evaluation system were used ONLY "to serve administrative decision making," i.e., used in hiring, firing, promotions, transfers, RIF, please react to the inclusion of EACH of the following measures (indicators). Use a scale of:

1 = Strongly Agree (SA)
2 = Agree (A)
3 = Uncertain (U)
4 = Disagree (D)
5 = Strongly Disagree (SD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at professional meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual performance objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations of classroom teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal attributes (voice, health, attire, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil-teacher relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student gain scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher command of subject matter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer service on school committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
35. If the results of a teacher evaluation system were to be used ONLY "to improve teacher effectiveness," please give your opinion regarding WHO should participate in the evaluation. Please react to the inclusion of EACH. Use a scale of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 = Strongly Agree</th>
<th>2 = Agree</th>
<th>3 = Uncertain</th>
<th>4 = Disagree</th>
<th>5 = Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>Central office personnel (personnel director, curriculum coordinator, etc.)</td>
<td>35.1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>Department chairperson</td>
<td>35.2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>35.3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>35.4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>35.5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>School board members</td>
<td>35.6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>35.7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>35.8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>35.9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.10</td>
<td>Union or Association representative</td>
<td>35.10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.11</td>
<td>Other (Please specify)</td>
<td>35.11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. If the results of a teacher evaluation system were to be used ONLY "to serve administrative decision making," i.e., used in hiring, firing, promotion, transfer, RIF, etc., please give your opinion regarding WHO should participate in the evaluation. Please react to the inclusion of EACH. Use a scale of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 = Strongly Agree</th>
<th>2 = Agree</th>
<th>3 = Uncertain</th>
<th>4 = Disagree</th>
<th>5 = Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>Central office personnel (personnel director, curriculum coordinator, etc.)</td>
<td>36.1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>Department chairperson</td>
<td>36.2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>36.3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>36.4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>36.5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>School board members</td>
<td>36.6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>36.7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>36.8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>36.9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.10</td>
<td>Union or Association representative</td>
<td>36.10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.11</td>
<td>Other (Please specify)</td>
<td>36.11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No structured questionnaire can completely take into account the complexity of your personal circumstances. Please feel free to add your comments concerning the choice of criteria to be used in reduction-in-force staffing decisions, particularly in respect to the use of teacher evaluation results and seniority.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. I greatly appreciate your interest and cooperation.

Lorraine A. Marcantonio
ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Your response to this questionnaire will be treated in the strictest confidence. The code number in the top right-hand corner is for follow-up identification purposes only. When questionnaires are returned and numbers are checked, identifying code numbers will be destroyed.

1. Please indicate your specific administrative position.
   ______ Department Chairperson
   ______ Principal
   ______ Curriculum Coordinator
   ______ Assistant Superintendent (Please specify)
   ______ Superintendent
   ______ Central Office Staff (Please specify)
   ______ Other (Please specify)

2. If you are also teaching, what percentage of your time is devoted to teaching duties?

3. What is your highest academic degree?
   ______ B.A. or B.S.
   ______ M.A. or M.S.
   ______ Specialist's Degree
   ______ Ed.D. or Ph.D.
   ______ Other (Please specify)

4. How many years have you served in your present school system?
   ______ Less than 1 year
   ______ 1-5 years
   ______ 6-10 years
   ______ 11-15 years
   ______ more than 15 years (Please specify)

5. What is the teacher bargaining unit for your school district?
   ______ NEA affiliate
   ______ AFT affiliate
   ______ Other

6. Do you believe that the teachers are generally satisfied with the way the union represents their concerns and ideas to the administration?
   ______ Yes
   ______ No
   ______ Unsure

7. Did the teachers' bargaining unit participate (through teacher representatives) in the development of your district's teacher evaluation system?
   ______ Yes
   ______ No
   ______ Unsure

8. Are the teacher evaluation policies and procedures part of the teachers' master contract?
   ______ Yes
   ______ No
   ______ Unsure

9. Are you in general agreement with the teacher evaluation system that was developed?
   ______ Yes
   ______ No
   ______ Unsure

10. Are you satisfied with the way the teacher evaluation policies and procedures were developed?
    ______ Yes
    ______ No
    ______ Unsure

11. Does your district have policies and procedures to follow when reduction in force becomes necessary?
    ______ Yes
    ______ No
    ______ Unsure

12. Did the teacher bargaining unit participate (through teacher representatives) in the development of your district's reduction in force policies and procedures?
    ______ Yes
    ______ No
    ______ Unsure

13. Are the reduction in force policies and procedures part of the teachers' master contract?
    ______ Yes
    ______ No
    ______ Unsure
14. Are you in general agreement with the reduction in force policies and procedures that were developed?
   _____ Yes  _____ No  _____ Unsure

15. Are you satisfied with the way in which the reduction in force policies and procedures were developed?
   _____ Yes  _____ No  _____ Unsure

16. If your district has established policies and procedures to be used in reduction-in-force situations, are the results of teacher evaluations used when determining the order of lay off among tenured teachers?
   _____ Yes  _____ No  _____ Unsure

17. If your district has established policies and procedures to be used in reduction-in-force situations, is seniority the only criterion used when determining the order of lay off among tenured teachers?
   _____ Yes  _____ No  _____ Unsure

18. Do you believe that some form of seniority should be used when determining the order of lay off among tenured teachers in reduction-in-force situations?
   _____ Yes  _____ No  _____ Unsure

19. Do you believe that some form of teacher evaluation should be used when determining the order of lay off among tenured teachers?
   _____ Yes  _____ No  _____ Unsure

20. If seniority were to be used as the only criterion when determining the order of lay off among tenured teachers in reduction-in-force situations, how do you believe that seniority should be defined? (Check only one)
   20.1 _____ Years in the school system
   20.2 _____ Years in a particular building
   20.3 _____ Years teaching a particular subject
   20.4 _____ Years teaching at a particular grade level
   20.5 _____ Total years as a teacher
   20.6 _____ Some combination of the above (Please specify)
   20.7 _____ Other (Please specify)

21. Do you agree with the way seniority is defined in the reduction-in-force policies and procedures of your school district?
   _____ Yes  _____ NO  _____ Unsure

22. Evaluation of teachers is done for two basic purposes: (1) "to improve the teacher's effectiveness in performing his or her duties" and, (2) "to serve administrative decision making with respect to hiring, firing, promotions, transfer, reduction in force, etc."

22.1 What is the stated purpose of your district's teacher evaluation system?
   1 _____ To improve teacher effectiveness
   2 _____ To serve administrative decision making
   3 _____ A combination of (1) and (2)
   4 _____ Unsure

22.2 If the stated purpose of your district's teacher evaluation system is to improve teacher effectiveness, do you believe that this same system should be used to serve administrative decision making?
   _____ Yes  _____ No  _____ Unsure

22.3 If the stated purpose of your district's teacher evaluation system is to improve teacher effectiveness AND to serve administrative decision making, do you believe that this single evaluation system is adequate to serve the two basic purposes of evaluation?
   _____ Yes  _____ No  _____ Unsure

22.4 If two separate and distinct teacher evaluation systems were to be developed and used in your district (one specifically designed to help the teacher improve her/his effectiveness and one specifically designed to serve administrative decision making), would you be more likely to accept teacher evaluation as a criterion to be used when determining the order of lay off among tenured teachers in reduction in force situations than if just one evaluation system were used?
   _____ Yes  _____ No  _____ Unsure
23. The following numbered items are criteria that have been suggested for use when reduction-in-force staffing decisions are necessary. Please react to the inclusion of EACH of the following as a consideration in RIF decisions. Use a scale of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 = Strongly Agree (SA)</th>
<th>2 = Agree (A)</th>
<th>3 = Uncertain (U)</th>
<th>4 = Disagree (D)</th>
<th>5 = Strongly Disagree (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>Affirmative action needs of the district</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>Area(s) of certification</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>Degree status</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>Participation in extracurricular activities (building level committees, sponsor clubs, coaching, etc.)</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>Program needs of department, building, school district, etc.</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>Quality of job performance as determined by some form of teacher evaluation</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>Seniority</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>Specific experience at grade levels or in subject areas</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>Tenure status</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.10</td>
<td>Other (Please specify)</td>
<td>23.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. It has been suggested that multiple measures (indicators) should be considered in teacher evaluation systems. If the results of a teacher evaluation system were to be used ONLY “to improve teacher effectiveness,” please react to the inclusion of EACH of the following measures (Indicators). Use a scale of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 = Strongly Agree (SA)</th>
<th>2 = Agree (A)</th>
<th>3 = Uncertain (U)</th>
<th>4 = Disagree (D)</th>
<th>5 = Strongly Disagree (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>24.1 Attendance at professional meetings</th>
<th>24.2 Classroom environment</th>
<th>24.3 Individual performance objectives</th>
<th>24.4 Lesson plans</th>
<th>24.5 Observations of classroom teaching</th>
<th>24.6 Personal attributes (voice, health, attire, etc.)</th>
<th>24.7 Pupil-teacher relations</th>
<th>24.8 Student gain scores</th>
<th>24.9 Teacher command of subject matter</th>
<th>24.10 Volunteer service on school committees</th>
<th>24.11 Other (Please specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. If the results of a teacher evaluation system were used ONLY “to serve administrative decision making,” i.e., used in hiring, firing, promotions, transfers, RIF, please react to the inclusion of EACH of the following measures (indicators). Use a scale of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 = Strongly Agree (SA)</th>
<th>2 = Agree (A)</th>
<th>3 = Uncertain (U)</th>
<th>4 = Disagree (D)</th>
<th>5 = Strongly Disagree (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>25.1 Attendance at professional meetings</th>
<th>25.2 Classroom environment</th>
<th>25.3 Individual performance objectives</th>
<th>25.4 Lesson plans</th>
<th>25.5 Observations of classroom teaching</th>
<th>25.6 Personal attributes (voice, health, attire, etc.)</th>
<th>25.7 Pupil-teacher relations</th>
<th>25.8 Student gain scores</th>
<th>25.9 Teacher command of subject matter</th>
<th>25.10 Volunteer service on school committees</th>
<th>25.11 Other (Please specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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26. If the results of a teacher evaluation system were to be used ONLY "to improve teacher effectiveness" please give your opinion regarding WHO should participate in the evaluation. Please react to the inclusion of EACH. Use a scale of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 = Strongly Agree</th>
<th>2 = Agree</th>
<th>3 = Uncertain</th>
<th>4 = Disagree</th>
<th>5 = Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>26.1</strong></td>
<td>Central office personnel (personnel director, curriculum coordinator, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26.2</strong></td>
<td>Department chairperson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26.3</strong></td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26.4</strong></td>
<td>Peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26.5</strong></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26.6</strong></td>
<td>School board members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26.7</strong></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26.8</strong></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26.9</strong></td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26.10</strong></td>
<td>Union or Association representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26.11</strong></td>
<td>Other (Please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. If the results of a teacher evaluation system were to be used ONLY "to serve administrative decision making" i.e., used in hiring, firing, promotion, transfer, RIF, etc., please give your opinion regarding WHO should participate in the evaluation. Please react to the inclusion of EACH. Use a scale of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 = Strongly Agree</th>
<th>2 = Agree</th>
<th>3 = Uncertain</th>
<th>4 = Disagree</th>
<th>5 = Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>27.1</strong></td>
<td>Central office personnel (personnel director, curriculum coordinator, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27.2</strong></td>
<td>Department chairperson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27.3</strong></td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27.4</strong></td>
<td>Peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27.5</strong></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27.6</strong></td>
<td>School board members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27.7</strong></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27.8</strong></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27.9</strong></td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27.10</strong></td>
<td>Union or Association representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27.11</strong></td>
<td>Other (Please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No structured questionnaire can completely take into account the complexity of your personal circumstances. Please feel free to add your comments concerning the choice of criteria to be used in reduction-in-force staffing decisions, particularly in respect to the use of teacher evaluation results and seniority.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. I greatly appreciate your interest and cooperation.

Lorraine A. Marcantonio
Appendix G

Follow-up Letter to Teachers and Administrators
Dear Colleague:

Recently you were sent a questionnaire from which data will be sought concerning the level of agreement existing between teachers and administrators regarding criteria to be used in reduction-in-force decisions. It is my hope that the results of this study will suggest some mutually acceptable criteria that can be used in reduction-in-force situations: Criteria which are educationally sound as well as fair and equitable to all concerned.

Since only a limited number of questionnaires were sent out, your reply is extremely important to the accuracy of any conclusions which might be drawn from the data collected. Please take some time from your busy summer schedule to complete the questionnaire (an additional copy is enclosed for your convenience).

If you have already returned the completed questionnaire, please accept my thanks and appreciation for your cooperation and assistance.

Sincerely yours,

Lorraine A. Marcantonio
Doctoral Candidate

Harold W. Boles
Professor
Appendix H

Final Follow-up Letter to Teachers and Administrators
Dear Fellow Professional:

Yes, I am still attempting to obtain your personal opinions in regard to the important issue of criteria to be considered in reduction-in-force decisions and the related topics of seniority and teacher performance evaluation.

It is my hope that findings from this study will suggest areas of agreement regarding criteria to be used in reduction-in-force decisions. Moreover, it is my hope that the findings will suggest criteria which are fair and equitable as well as educationally sound—an objective all professionals would like to see accomplished.

If you can possibly spare the time from your hectic professional and personal schedule, PLEASE complete the questionnaire (an additional copy is enclosed for your convenience). Your opinions are extremely important. All replies will be held in the strictest confidence.

If you are truly too busy to thoughtfully respond to the entire questionnaire, please complete the enclosed "Non-respondent Form." A stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

My sincere best wishes for the new academic year. As educators we have many responsibilities—may we all have the wisdom and courage (and time) to meet these responsibilities.

Thank you for your cooperation, assistance, and contribution to this study. I look forward to receiving your completed questionnaire—or if this is not possible—your completed "Non-respondent Form".

Sincerely yours,

Lorraine A. Marcantonio
Doctoral Candidate

Harold W. Boles
Professor
Nonrespondent Form—Teacher

Your responses on this form will be treated in the strictest confidence. The code number in the top right-hand corner is for follow-up identification purposes only. When the forms are returned and numbers are checked, identifying code numbers will be destroyed.

1. Have you been granted tenure while teaching in your present school system?
   ____ Yes  ____ No

2. What is the total number of years that you have been teaching?
   ____ Less than 1 year
   ____ 1-5 years
   ____ 6-10 years
   ____ 11-15 years
   ____ more than 15 years (Please specify) __________________________

3. Are you a member of your local bargaining unit?
   ____ Yes  ____ No

4. If you are a member, are you generally satisfied with the way the union represents your concerns and ideas to the administration?
   ____ Yes  ____ No

5. Do you feel relatively secure in your present position, i.e., even with reduction-in-force pressures, you believe that you will probably keep your job?
   ____ Yes  ____ No

6. Are you in general agreement with the teacher evaluation system that was developed in your school system?
   ____ Yes  ____ No  ____ Unsure

7. Are you in general agreement with the reduction-in-force policies that were developed in your school system?
   ____ Yes  ____ No  ____ Unsure

8. The following are often given as reasons for not completing questionnaires. PLEASE check the one(s) that best represent(s) your explanation for not participating in this study.
   8.1 ____ I never participate in research studies
   8.2 ____ I am not interested in the topic
   8.3 ____ I am just too busy
   8.4 ____ My opinion doesn't matter
   8.5 ____ Research findings never change actual practices in the schools
   8.6 ____ Other (Please specify) __________________________
Please feel free to add your comments concerning the topics under investigation, i.e., reduction in force, seniority, performance evaluation.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this form. I greatly appreciate your cooperation.

Lorraine A. Marcantonio
Nonrespondent Form—Administrator

Your responses on this form will be treated in the strictest confidence. The code number in the top right-hand corner is for follow-up identification purposes only. When the forms are returned and numbers checked, identifying code numbers will be destroyed.

1. How many years have you served your present school district?
   ______ Less than 1 year
   ______ 1-5 years
   ______ 6-10 years
   ______ 11-15 years
   ______ more than 15 years (Please specify) 

2. Do you believe that the teachers are generally satisfied with the way the union represents their concerns and ideas to the administration?
   ______ Yes  ______ No

3. Are you in general agreement with the teacher evaluation system that was developed in your school system?
   ______ Yes  ______ No  ______ Unsure

4. Are you in general agreement with the reduction-in-force policies that were developed in your school system?
   ______ Yes  ______ No  ______ Unsure

5. Do you feel relatively secure in your present position, i.e., even with reduction-in-force pressures, you believe that you will probably keep your position?
   ______ Yes  ______ No

6. The following are often given as reasons for not completing questionnaires. PLEASE check the one(s) that best represent(s) your explanation for not participating in this study.
   6.1 ______ I never participate in research studies
   6.2 ______ I am not interested in the topic
   6.3 ______ I am just too busy
   6.4 ______ My opinion doesn't matter
   6.5 ______ Research findings never change actual practices in the schools
   6.6 ______ Other (Please specify) 

Please feel free to add your comments concerning the topics under investigation, i.e., reduction in force, seniority, performance evaluation.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this form. I greatly appreciate your cooperation.  

Lorraine A. Marcantonio
Appendix I

General Statutes of Connecticut

222

(a) Any board of education may authorize the superintendent or supervising agent to employ teachers. Any superintendent or supervising agent not authorized to employ teachers shall submit to the board of education nominations for teachers for each of the schools in the town or towns in his jurisdiction and, from the persons so nominated, teachers may be employed. Such board shall accept or reject such nominations within thirty-five days from their submission. Any such board of education may request the superintendent or supervising agent to submit multiple nominations of qualified candidates, if more than one candidate is available for nomination, for any supervisory or administrative position, in which case the superintendent or supervisory agent shall submit such a list and may place the candidates on such list in the order in which such superintendent or supervisory agent recommends such candidates. If such board rejects such nominations, the superintendent or supervising agent shall submit to such board other nominations and such board may employ teachers from the persons so nominated and shall accept or reject such nominations within one month from their submission. The contract of employment of a teacher shall be in writing and may be terminated at any time for any of the reasons enumerated in subdivisions (1) to (6), inclusive, of subsection (b) of this section, but otherwise it shall be renewed for a second, third or fourth year unless such teacher has been notified in writing prior to March first in one school year that such contract will not be renewed for the following year, provided, upon the teacher's written request, such notice shall be supplemented within five days after receipt of such request by a statement of the reason or reasons for such failure to renew. Such teacher may, upon written request filed with the board of education within ten days after the receipt of such notice, be entitled to a hearing before the board to be held within fifteen days of such request. The teacher shall have the right to appear with counsel of his choice at such hearing.

(b) Beginning with and subsequent to the fourth year of continuous employment of a teacher by a board of education, the contract of employment of a teacher shall be renewed from year to year, except that it may be terminated at any time for one or more of the following reasons:

(1) Inefficiency or incompetence;
(2) insubordination against reasonable rules of the board of education;

(3) moral misconduct;

(4) disability, as shown by competent medical evidence;

(5) elimination of the position to which the teacher was appointed, if no other position exists to which he may be appointed if qualified; or

(6) other due and sufficient cause;

provided, prior to terminating a contract, a board of education shall give the teacher concerned a written notice that termination of his contract is under consideration and, upon written request filed by such teacher with such board within five days after receipt of such notice, shall within the next succeeding five days give such teacher a statement in writing of its reasons therefor. Within twenty days after receipt from a board of education of written notice that contract termination is under consideration, the teacher concerned may file with such board a written request for a hearing, which such board shall hold within fifteen days after receipt of such request. Such hearing shall be public if the teacher so requests or the board so designates. The teacher concerned shall have the right to appear with counsel of his choice at such hearing, whether public or private. A board of education shall give the teacher concerned its written decision within fifteen days after such hearing, together with a copy of a transcript of the proceedings, which shall be furnished without cost. Nothing herein contained shall deprive a board of education of the power to suspend a teacher from duty immediately when serious misconduct is charged without prejudice to the rights of the teacher as otherwise provided in this section.

(c) For the purpose of this section, the term "teacher" shall include each employee of a board of education, below the rank of superintendent, who holds a regular certificate issued by the state board of education.

(d) The provisions of any special act regarding the dismissal or employment of teachers shall prevail over the provisions of this section in the event of conflict.

(e) After having had a contract of employment as a teacher renewed for a fourth year in any one municipality or school district, any teacher who is subsequently employed in any other municipality or school district shall become subject to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section after eighteen months of continuous employment, unless, prior to completion of the eighteenth month following commencement of the employment in such town, such teacher has
been notified in writing prior to March first in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) of this section that such contract will not be renewed for the following year irrespective of the duration of employment under the then existing contract beyond the date of said notification or unless, for a period of five or more years immediately prior to such subsequent employment, such teacher has not been employed in any public school within this state.

(f) Any teacher aggrieved by the decision of a board of education after a hearing as provided in subsection (b) of this section may appeal therefrom, within thirty days of such decision, to the court of common pleas for the county or judicial district in which such board is located. Such appeal shall be made returnable to said court in the same manner as is prescribed for civil actions brought to said court. Any such appeal shall be a privileged case to be heard by the court as soon after the return day as is practicable. The board of education shall file with the court a copy of the complete transcript of the proceedings of the hearing held by the board for such teacher, together with such other documents, or certified copies thereof, as shall constitute the record of the case appealed from. The court, upon such appeal, shall review the proceedings of such hearing and shall allow any party to such appeal to introduce evidence in addition to the contents of such transcript, if it appears to the court that additional testimony is necessary for the equitable disposition of the appeal. The court, upon such appeal and after a hearing thereon, may affirm or reverse the decision appealed from. Costs shall not be allowed against such board unless it appears to the court that it acted with gross negligence or in bad faith or with malice in making the decision appealed from.


§ 10-151a. Access of teacher to supervisory records and reports in personnel file.

Each professional employee certified by the state board of education and employed by the board of education of an-wn or regional school district shall be entitled to knowledge of. to, and, upon request, a copy of supervisory records and reports of competence, personal character and efficiency maintained in his personnel file with reference to evaluation of his performance in such school district.
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§ 10-151b. [Teacher evaluation]

(a) The superintendent of each school district shall, in accordance with guidelines established by the state board of education for the development of evaluation programs and such other guidelines as may be established by mutual agreement between the town or regional board of education and the teachers' representative chosen pursuant to section 10-153b, continuously evaluate or cause to be evaluated each teacher. The superintendent shall report the status of such evaluations to the town or regional board of education on or before June first of each year. For purposes of this section, the term "teacher" shall include each employee of a board of education, below the rank of superintendent, who holds a certificate or permit issued by the state board of education.

(b) On or before January 1, 1975, each town or regional school district shall submit, in writing, to the state board of education a report on existing evaluation procedures and plans for implementing the guidelines established by the state board of education for development of local evaluation programs.

(1974, P.A. 74-278, §§ 1, 2; eff. July 1, 1974.)
Appendix J

Position of the NEA Regarding Seniority and Affirmative Action
POSITION OF NEA REGARDING SENIORITY AND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

A. NEA believes that seniority provides an objective and equitable standard on which to base employment decisions, including decisions regarding hiring, promotion and layoff.

B. NEA's commitment to seniority is strong, but not absolute. NEA believes that there are certain situations in which a rigid application of seniority does not provide an appropriate basis for making employment decisions and that some compromise is necessary. One such situation is when, because of racial or sexual discrimination, the percentage of minorities or women in the workforce is significantly below the percentage in the relevant labor market. Although it would be preferable if the effects of this discrimination could be eliminated simply by ending the discriminatory practices and utilizing employment practices that treat people equally regardless of race or sex, this is not always possible. Affirmative action, which takes conscious account of race or sex, may be necessary to achieve true equal employment opportunity.

C. NEA believes that the choice between strict seniority and some accommodation of affirmative action is best made voluntarily by the employer and the employee organization through collective bargaining or other forms of dialogue. Where, however, there has been a judicial finding that the underrepresentation of minorities or women in the workforce is attributable to unlawful discrimination by the particular employer, a court should have the power to impose racial or sexual preferences in hiring, promotion and layoff to the extent necessary to eliminate the effects of the unlawful discrimination, even if such preferences are contrary to a bona fide seniority system.

D. The question of whether any particular racial or sexual preference represents an appropriate exercise of a court's power to eliminate the effects of unlawful discrimination must be determined on a case-by-case basis after examining all of the relevant factors.

E. NEA will not participate in any litigation involving the relationship between seniority and affirmative action without the approval of the Executive Committee. The position that NEA takes in such litigation will be in accordance with the principles set forth in Sections A through D above.

Adopted by the NEA Board of Directors
June 29, 1983
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